

Marrying by the Numbers:
Marriage Patterns of Aristocratic British Women, 1485-2000

By:
Kimberly F. Schutte

Submitted to the graduate degree program in History
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Dr. Katherine Clark
Chairperson

Dr. Victor Bailey

Dr. J.C.D. Clark

Dr. Geraldo de Sousa

Dr. Leslie Tuttle

Date Defended: April 18, 2011

The Dissertation Committee for Kimberly F. Schutte
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Marrying by the Numbers:
Marriage Patterns of Aristocratic British Women, 1485-2000

Katherine Clark
Chairperson Dr. Katherine Clark

Date Approved: April 18, 2011

Abstract

This project is a study of the marriage patterns of aristocratic British women over the more than five-century period between 1485 and 2000. It employs a two-fold evidentiary base, combining a demographic analysis with a more traditional analysis of primary sources such as letters, journals, and diaries. Together, the statistical and the written evidence provide a window into the intersection of marriage and rank among elite British women between the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries. As a result of this research, this dissertation argues that there was a remarkable level of consistency in rank identity among the British aristocracy despite great changes in government, religion, and society.

Acknowledgements

A project that has been a lifetime in the completion necessarily accumulates a number of debts, both professional and personal, debts that I gratefully acknowledge here. This work has been conducted under the painstaking guidance of my advisor, Dr. Katherine Clark. Dr. Clark read drafts with uncommon care and her comments have done a great deal to sharpen the argument and to add some elegance to the prose. The other members of the British Field at the University of Kansas, Dr. J.C.D. Clark and Dr. Victor Bailey, provided much assistance as this study took shape. My friend and former student Dawn Baker taught me the intricacies of Excel; without her sage advice I would still be trying to count exogamous marriages using hash marks. The members of the History department at Missouri Western State College (now University), both past and present, have been unflaggingly supportive as I learned how to teach and worked out what it means to be a historian. In particular, Dr. Jon Kepler provided early inspiration and made me realize that it is possible to be a professional academic. Dr. Daniel Trifan, with contributions both professional and personal, patiently read drafts of this work and provided encouragement when it all seemed to be beyond my reach – in short, he has been a true friend and mentor and indeed, this could never have been done without him. On a more personal level, I am lucky to have family and friends who supported me through the long dark nights of the soul that are the inevitable result of writing a dissertation. To the other members of the KU history graduate student community, especially the members of the dissertation writing group, I owe a deep debt for their inspiring discussion, cogent criticism, and most importantly their consistent empathy. Mark Elting taught me that there are many rhythms in the universe and that life is richer and more balanced if you keep your ear tuned to them. My mother Joyce Schutte has provided support and encouragement throughout my life and has never been satisfied with my excuses. I am blessed to have a daughter Marina Trifan, who is wise and compassionate beyond her years. This undertaking has perhaps cost her more than anyone else and she has never flagged in her encouragement and understanding. Knowing that there are young women such as her in the world gives me great confidence in the future.

The great sadness is that my father, Wayne Schutte, did not live to see this completed – though I know that he never doubted that it would be.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One: Endogamy	21
Chapter Two: The Practical Considerations of Marriage	62
Chapter Three: The Romantic Considerations of Marriage	101
Chapter Four: Elopement and Defiant Matches	132
Chapter Five: An Open Elite	177
Chapter Six: To Catch A Man	207
Chapter Seven: A Woman of Independent Means	241
Conclusion	276
Appendix I: Changing Concepts of Femininity and Masculinity	283
Appendix II: ‘British’ Marriages	307
Appendix III: Biographical Information	328
Bibliography	396

The Introduction

This study examines the marriage patterns of aristocratic British women in the period from 1485 through 2000. It demonstrates that these patterns remained remarkably stable. The underlying assertion at work in this project is that the marriage patterns of noble women are a good suggestion of the conception of rank identity held by aristocratic British families. The constancy in the marital behaviour of the women indicates that the concept of rank identity also remained remarkably stable for the British nobility.

Members of the British aristocracy belong to it largely by virtue of their birth. Over the centuries, family politics consumed a great deal of the aristocracy's attention, as these were frequently the means by which they maintained their power and prestige. They took great care in arranging the marriages of their children. Historians such as Lawrence Stone and David Cannadine¹ have examined aristocratic marriage patterns, but they have done so by focusing on men. Even when women are under discussion,² no study has ever looked at their behaviour over a long chronological period as does this one. The evidentiary base of this project, combining the statistical analysis of a large number of women over five centuries with the written evidence produced by and about these

¹ David Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (New York: Vintage, 1999) gives quite a lot of attention to the marriages of aristocratic men. The subject also looms large in Lawrence Stone's analysis in several of his works including, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), *An Open Elite? England, 1540-1880* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), and *Uncertain Unions: Marriage in England, 1660-1753* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992). David Thomas provided a statistical examination in his article "The Social Origins of Marriage Partners of the British Peerage in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," *Population Studies* 26 (1972): 99-111.

² The most notable example of a scholar who focuses on aristocratic women as a group is Barbara Harris in her important book, *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Career*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

women,³ enable the historian to understand continuities and changes in conceptions of rank identity over the *longue durée*.

As early as the sixteenth century and extending well into the twentieth, the goal for an aristocratic woman was to make a good marriage, or a fitting match. As Olwen H. Hufton writes, “An appropriate union was one in which wealth and status, religious affiliation and age, as well as less easily defined qualities such as temperament and moral qualities, were seen to be approximately consonant.”⁴ Barbara Harris is a bit more cynical in her assessment, “The explicit purpose of marriage among the upper classes was to advance the political and economic interest of the patrilineally defined family.”⁵ This was, perhaps, particularly true of women. Lawrence Stone has estimated that more than 95 percent of all surviving daughters of this rank eventually married.⁶ After the Reformation, there were no nunneries in which to place daughters as a reasonable alternative to marriage. This new limitation of what a family could do with its daughters happened in a time when it was a moral obligation on the part of families to see that their daughters married their social equals. Marriage at this level was a very complex affair in which the needs and desires of the couple were subordinated to the needs of the family as a whole. Fulfilling this obligation frequently cost families a great deal of money and

³ This study uses primary source material written both by aristocratic women and men in its analysis as long as the sources comment on the marital experience of the women. There is no question that the men played an important role in determining whom their daughters would marry, though as discussed in Chapter Two, the women’s role was not to be discounted. Since a foundational assumption for this project is that the way in which aristocratic families disposed of their daughters in marriage reveals their own self-conception, the attitudes of the men are important in understanding this phenomenon.

⁴ Olwyn H. Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe* (New York: Knopf, 1996), 65.

⁵ Barbara Harris, “Power, Profit, and Passion: Mary Tudor, Charles Brandon and the Arranged Marriage in Early Tudor England,” *Feminist Studies* 15 (1989): 60.

⁶ Lawrence Stone, *The Family Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1977), 43.

resources.⁷ Elite families had to consider many factors when arranging appropriate, profitable matches for their daughters. An examination of the marriage strategies of aristocratic families over five centuries reveals three paramount concerns: 1) continuation of the male line, 2) preservation of inherited property, and 3) the acquisition of more property and prestige.⁸

The importance of a good marriage was largely a point of agreement between children and their parents. Socialization had seen to it that British noble children on the whole looked for the same type of benefits from marriage that their families wished for them.⁹ In 1644, Sir Ralph Verney wrote to his younger sister about her upcoming marriage, “I pray mistake me not, for this is the weightiest business that ever yet befell you, for in this one action consists all your future happiness in this world; therefore, do nothing rashly.” He then added, “Good men with good fortunes are very hard to be gotten.”¹⁰ Making a good first marriage was crucial to elite women. It could set the entire tenor of their adult lives. Of course, on a personal level the success or failure of the marriage influenced their emotional happiness. On a more practical level, marriage determined their standard of living and often their family’s access to patronage, political influence and the royal court.¹¹ It could also determine the level in which a woman could expect to marry subsequently. A wealthy, well-connected widow was a sought-after

⁷ Stone, *Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 43.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 42-436.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 181.

¹⁰ Quoted in Miriam Slater, “The Weightiest Business: Marriage in an Upper-Gentry Family in Seventeenth Century England,” *Past and Present* 72 (1976), 26. Verney was writing in 1644, but his views were held in the century preceding as well.

¹¹ Barbara Harris, *English Aristocratic Women: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 43.

commodity. Aristocratic women understood the benefits they stood to gain from the status of their husbands and they generally agreed with the larger goals of their families.¹²

The importance of familial status in determining marriage choices continued well past the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century, families of the couple still played a significant role in elite marriages. The concern of the family often was not so much the great personal happiness of the man and woman, but rather, to facilitate the attainment of social advantages for the family. The system served this end with remarkable effectiveness.¹³ There is no question but that a young woman of the aristocracy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries aimed to marry and marry well. She had few if any alternatives and failure to marry meant a lifetime as an old-maid living in the households of family and friends. The importance of marriage to a mate of good rank and fortune consistently concerned noble women across the centuries.

The letters of elite women, replete with gossip, speculation and reportage about the marriages of family, friends, and even mere acquaintances, also reveal a preoccupation with the subject. The correspondence of the Robinson family¹⁴ provides a good example of a phenomenon present in many letter collections from the sixteenth through the twentieth centuries. Theresa Robinson wrote to her brother Thomas, Lord Grantham¹⁵ March 6, 1772, “Lord Inchinbroke¹⁶ is certainly going to marry Lady Mary Paulett, they say now that Dr. Leginecos(?) is to marry Lady Bridget Lane but I think it impossible.”¹⁷ Three years later, on August. 24, 1775, she wrote to her other brother

¹² Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 9.

¹³ Slater, “The Weightiest Matter,” 31.

¹⁴ The family held the title Baron Grantham.

¹⁵ Thomas Robinson, 2nd Baron Grantham (1738-1786).

¹⁶ John Montagu, later 5th Earl of Sandwich (1743-1814). His first wife was Elizabeth Montagu.

¹⁷ BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 109-110.

Frederick,¹⁸ “Miss B_____ ¹⁹is going to be married to the Earl of Ely.²⁰ I know nothing of him but hear it is a good match and she is very amusing.”²¹ Anne Robinson wrote to her brother Thomas, the 2nd Baron Grantham on February 20, 1786, “... is it true that Mr. Edgcumbe’s²² match is breaking off; I should really be sorry, it would be such a disappointment to poor Lady Mt. Edgcumbe²³...”²⁴ The concern with good matches, and the effort that women such as Lady Mount Edgcumbe put into furthering them, is a consistent theme in the writings of aristocratic women in the period between 1485 and 2000.

I. Labels

Names

In this study women are referred to by their maiden names, even if they are better known by their married names. This has been done for the sake of simplicity. Many women appear in the following pages during various phases of their lives when they had different names. The maiden name is unvarying, unlike married names or titles. Appendix III gives a brief biographical sketch of each of the women mentioned in this text.

¹⁸ Frederick Robinson (1746-1792). He is generally referred to in the correspondence as Fritz.

¹⁹ Anne Bonfoy.

²⁰ Henry Loftus, 1st Earl of Ely (1709-1783). His first wife was Frances Monroe, who died in 1774.

²¹ BL Add. MSS 28218 f. 213.

²² Presumably Richard Edgcumbe, later 2nd Earl of Mount Edgcumbe (1764-1839). He married Sophia Hobart in 1789.

²³ Emma Gilbert.

²⁴ BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 73-74.

Throughout this project several terms are used frequently and it seems that it would be helpful to provide a short discussion of those terms and how they are used in the following chapters.

Elite/Aristocracy/Noble

This study frequently uses the term elite simply as a synonym for aristocratic or noble. In this usage, the term is used more narrowly than is often the case in the historiography. Most commonly elite refers to people whose status, conferred either by wealth, birth, or power, qualifies them for membership in the very uppermost echelons of society. Conversely, this study takes a somewhat broader view than does the common law as to who belongs to the aristocracy. By the strictest definition, aristocratic or noble status it belongs only to the person who has the title; his/her children are commoners.²⁵ Since the subject of this study is the daughters of the titled peers, they (and their brothers) are *de facto* members of the aristocracy here. They certainly saw themselves as aristocrats.

Within the elite of Britain, rank was highly gradated, though these gradations did alter a bit over the centuries. In the seventeenth century, the top level of society comprised approximately 2 percent of the entire British population. Three basic groups made up this very small but powerful rank. Plain gentlemen were small landowners and professional men including civil servants, higher clergy, lawyers, and university professors. Country elite included esquires and essentially all who had the title knight or

²⁵ An exception to this is the use of courtesy titles by the sons of an aristocrat. It was not unusual for a peer to have lesser titles in addition to his primary title; for example the 3rd Duke of Norfolk also had the Earldom of Surrey. Frequently sons will use the lesser title; again, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey was the son of Thomas Howard, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk. Cannon, *Aristocratic Century*, 10.

baronet. At the top were the titular peers, whose daughters are the focus of this study. Within the peerage, those holding the title of Duke, Marquess, and Earl comprised the top rank, while the lesser titles of Viscount and Baron made up the lower rank.²⁶ The number of titular peers grew significantly over the centuries. In 1509, at the outset of the reign of Henry VIII,²⁷ there were about forty-four peers but by the time of the death of his daughter Elizabeth I²⁸ in 1603 the number had jumped to fifty-five. The growth escalated in the reign of James I,²⁹ who ennobled sixty-two people. In the period between 1615 and 1628, the number increased from eighty-one to 126. By the time of the outbreak of the Civil War, there were approximately 138 peers. When William and Mary took the throne in 1688, there were 153 nobles and at the beginning of the eighteenth century, there were 173.³⁰ By 1800, the number had increased to 267.³¹ Just over 1,000 people held peerages across the whole of the eighteenth century.³²

Since a person belonged to this rank largely by birth, the elite took enormous pride in their ancestry, an attitude which led them to invent elaborate genealogies for themselves in order to make what were sometimes quite dubious lineages appear more illustrious.³³ This emphasis on exalted origins does seem to be indicative of an increased anxiety about status and rank in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This anxiety was very likely caused by the rise of “new” men who were giving themselves the

²⁶ Lawrence Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 51-52, 59; Arthur Foss, *Dukes of Britain* (London: Herbert, 1986), 7.

²⁷ Reigned 1509-1547.

²⁸ Reigned 1558-1603.

²⁹ Reigned 1603-1625.

³⁰ John Pearson, *The Serpent and the Stag* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1984), 42; John Cannon, *The Aristocratic Century: The Peerage of Eighteenth Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 13-14.

³¹ Cannon gives the number of peers in existence on Jan. 1 each decade during the 18th century: In 1700 there were 173, 1710 – 167, 1720 – 190, 1730 – 189, 1740 – 183, 1750 – 187, 1760 – 181, 1770 – 197, 1780 – 189, 1790 – 220. Cannon, *The Aristocratic Century*, 15.

³² Cannon, *The Aristocratic Century*, 10.

³³ Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 23.

attributes of nobility, such as titles or coats of arms. What concerned the nobility was the fact that “new men” claimed these badges of honour by virtue of their wealth or office and not by their birth.³⁴ Determining the membership of the British elite is far from a straightforward endeavor. One of the few historians to attempt to examine the elite over a long period of time and grapple with the issue was Lawrence Stone. His *Open Elite?: England 1540-1880* sets out to test the long-held assumption that the secret to the survival and success of the British elite lay in their willingness to incorporate new blood.³⁵ Stone used ownership of a substantial country estate as his indicator of membership in the elite.³⁶ It is my contention that the marriage patterns of the hereditary aristocracy, especially the patterns of the women, give a more accurate indication of the permeability of this rank. Stone’s *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* also looks at the changing role of the elite in British society primarily by examining their declining economic status.³⁷ I agree that the role of the British elite was in flux, but I am not convinced that it is, or was, a rank best defined by the possession of broad acres or deep pockets.

This project is concerned with the identity of this group as a rank rather than as a social class (see discussion below for the distinction). Their self-understanding of their identity as aristocrats was an important motivating factor in many of the decisions that they made. Certainly as they made decisions concerning the marriages of their daughters one of the primary considerations was preservation of their place within their rank.

³⁴ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 7, 53.

³⁵ Lawrence Stone and Jeanne C. Fawtier Stone, *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). Chapter Five tests this idea.

³⁶ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 11.

³⁷ Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

Rank vs. Class

This project concerns itself with the aristocratic rank of Britain.³⁸ This study accepts a distinction between rank (or estate) and social class. Rank is the term employed to describe the social stratification of Britain under examination here, which has relatively little to do with economics. The term class describes those distinctions with their basis in economics; however, that type of social division is not the focus of this study. Though it is clear in the pages that follow that money was an important factor in the marital decisions of aristocratic women, rank was consistently of greater import. The distinction between rank and class follows the distinctions set out by scholars such as Talcott Parsons who themselves were working in the tradition of Max Weber. These scholars made a distinction between an “estate society,” in which status determines wealth and power and a “class society,” in which wealth and power determine status. Otto Hintze stated that Estate Society had its basis in the principal of inequality before the law.³⁹ In *The World We Have Lost*, Peter Laslett argues that pre-industrial England was a one-class society; a contention that does not sit well with E.P. Thompson’s argument that class is a relationship. The relationship vital to Thompson’s definition seems to have emerged with the industrial revolution of the late eighteenth century.⁴⁰ This study will extend Thompson’s location of class consciousness from working men (and women) to noble women. Thompson’s work has highlighted the importance of shifting conceptions of class and the emergence of a self-awareness of class affiliation within the working

³⁸ The definition of Britain is given below.

³⁹ See Peter Burke, “The Language of Orders in Early Modern Europe,” in *Social Orders and Social Classes in Europe Since 1500: Studies in Social Stratification*, M.L. Bush ed. (London: Longman, 1991).

⁴⁰ This development is discussed most famously, and controversially, in *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Pantheon, 1964). Several of his later essays, found in *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (New York: New Press, 1993), also explore this issue; notably, “The Patricians and the Plebs.”

class. This study applies that argument to the elite over five centuries. An important part of Thompson's contention is that within the labouring class an understanding of class identity and a willingness to act in their class interest developed. This project argues that the same process was occurring higher on the social ladder in the aristocratic rank and that an important part of acting in rank interest involved regulating the marital patterns of elite women.

The issue of rank was central to the lives and expectations of elite British women. Barbara Harris's argument that for the sixteenth century, "class⁴¹ and gender jointly constructed aristocratic women's identity, social position, and roles; and, reciprocally, how their identity, social position, and roles constructed the meaning of class and gender in their society"⁴² holds true well into the twentieth. These women were to be chaste, silent, and obedient. However, if they were from the upper ranks of society the latter two requirements might well be waived.⁴³ British society defined women by their social rank as much as by their gender.

Historians frequently argue that in the nineteenth century, men of wealth infiltrated the aristocracy and that the established aristocracy perceived this invasion as being detrimental to their own status. However, indications of this so-called invasion appear as early as the sixteenth century and consistently appear through the twentieth century. In the seventeenth century, the policies of the early Stuart kings heightened concern over the purity of the nobility. In 1611, James I introduced the baronet, which he designed specifically for sale. In addition to being a fund-raising proposition for the

⁴¹ Here Harris is using the term class interchangeably with rank.

⁴² Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 11.

⁴³ Margaret P. Hannay, "'O Daughter Heare,' Reconstructing the Lives of Aristocratic Englishwomen," in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, ed. Betty S. Travitsky and Adele F. Seef (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994), 38.

crown, it also served as a replacement for the knighthood that had already been grossly devalued.⁴⁴ In the 1620s, the Duke of Buckingham⁴⁵ was selling knighthoods at the fire-sale price of £100.⁴⁶ As will be shown by the statistical analysis in the following chapters, a distinct division between the peerage and the baronetage/knightly rank arose, one which increased aristocratic attachment to the concept of nobility through bloodline.

Society

Throughout this project, I maintain a distinction between Society (with a capital S) and society (lower-case). When capitalized this word refers to the nobility and their activities. At times, commentators referred to Society much as if it were an individual person rather than a collective. For example, references to Society's disapproval or standards occur frequently in the following chapters. Society with a lower-case s refers to Britain (or England, or Scotland, or Ireland as indicated) as a whole. The lower-case usage is the general collective noun.

Britain

This project examines the marriage patterns of British aristocratic women. When the term British is used here it refers collectively to England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. It is not used as a synonym for England. When discussing the aristocracy of a particular nation the particular name of that nation is used. This emphasis on the collective is deliberate in this study. Most of the research on the aristocracy focuses on the English peerage. While that group was certainly the largest, the titular nobilities of the

⁴⁴ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 261.

⁴⁵ George Villiers (1592-1628), 1st Duke of Buckingham.

⁴⁶ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 186.

other nations were important as well. This study at times considers the marriage patterns of the daughters of the British as a whole and at other times, it examines the patterns for each of the nations. Just as it is not intellectually viable anymore to use the English to stand for all of Britain, neither is it appropriate to simply look at the British aristocracy as if it were a homogenous whole.

Endogamy, Hypogamy, and Exogamy

The use of jargon has been avoided throughout this project, with these few exceptions: endogamy, hypogamy, and exogamy. The term endogamy refers to a marriage in which a woman whose father held the title of Baron or above married a man who was either titled himself or the son of a title holder (of the rank of Baron or above). This type of marriage can be referred to as an in-marriage and was the ideal union for women of aristocratic rank. Hypogamy indicates a marriage in which an aristocratic woman married a man who came from the ranks of the Knighthood or the Baronetcy. The term down-marriage can also be used to classify such a union. Exogamy describes the marriage of an elite woman to a man with no title at all and whose father also had no title. Out-marriage refers to this type of marriage.

II. Overview of Women's Marriage Patterns

In the early centuries under consideration here, elite women expected to marry (and their families expected it for them). How these women married -- that is, did they marry endogamously, hypogamously, or exogamously -- or whether they remained single, is the subject of this enquiry. Overall, until the period between 1880 and 1920,

aristocratic women showed a tendency to marry endogamously. The statistical analysis undertaken for this study demonstrates that aristocratic women were more likely to marry endogamously than were their brothers. However, the numbers only tell a part of the story. An examination of the written works of the women of this era helps to put flesh on the bare bones of the statistics. The letters, diaries, and memoirs of aristocratic women reveal at least a partial explanation of the patterns reflected in the statistics. They also suggest an even higher level of rank identity than is reflected in the statistics. The written evidence likely reflects the ideal while the statistics give a picture of what was actually happening. Aristocratic women and their families were consistent in their stated desire that they marry endogamously. That was the ideal outcome for such a woman. But life frequently is not ideal and because aristocratic men tended to marry exogamously, many of these women had little recourse but to marry either hypogamously or exogamously or not to marry at all.

This study argues that for at least the period of the mid eighteenth century through 1920 aristocratic women took an active role in safeguarding rank identity. Over this period, elite males married for many reasons, among them love, lust, and certainly, money. The aristocracy could tolerate those unions as long as it kept the marriages of the female members under control.⁴⁷ It would seem that a duke's sons might marry Miss Cadbury Candy⁴⁸ or the local Gaiety Girl and the family's status within the ranks of the elite remained secure as long as the daughters did not contract such marriages. The

⁴⁷ As will be seen throughout this study, the control exercised over aristocratic women's marriages was not simply a matter of male oppression and the denial of female agency. The women themselves were very invested in the promotion of endogamous marriage and the safeguarding of elite rank identity.

⁴⁸ This refers to the Cadbury chocolate company that was founded by the Quaker businessman John Cadbury in the early 1830s. Though the family became very wealthy as a result of their confectionary business, they were not titled.

statistical analysis indicates a much higher level of endogamy for aristocratic women than for aristocratic men during that period,⁴⁹ as well as an increasing tendency for the women to remain unmarried. It appears that it was far better for such a woman to remain unmarried than to marry outside of her rank.

III. Evidence

This study combines a statistical analysis with analysis of primary sources such as letters, journals, and diaries. I undertook a statistical analysis of the marriage patterns of 6,289 women. These women represent the female offspring of more than 750 aristocratic families.⁵⁰ A number of printed peerages, including *Debrett's* and *Cokayne's*, as well as on-line genealogical sources and other sources such as biographies provided the raw data.⁵¹ The statistics used throughout this study come from the analysis of this database.

The statistics that provide the foundation of this project are based upon the collection and

⁴⁹ Mid eighteenth century through 1920.

⁵⁰ It is difficult to be precise as to the number of families represented in the data since many families held multiple titles and at times a younger son was given an independent title. This meant that in the next generation the two titles were held by cousins and as the generations progressed they became more distantly related so the question then becomes, at what point does it go from being one family to two?

⁵¹ There are a large number of genealogical handbooks which detail the lineages of the British aristocracy. Those consulted in order to compile the data base upon which the statistical portion of this study rests were: *Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage* (Kingston Upon Thames: Kelly's Directories, 1976-), John Debrett, *The Peerage of England, Scotland and Ireland: Or the Ancient and Present State of the Nobility, Vol. II: The Peerage of Scotland*. (London: W. Owen, 1790), George E. Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct, or Dormant*, new ed. Vicary Gibbs, ed. (London: The St. Catherine Press, 1910-1959), Arthur Collins, *The Peerage of England: or, an Historical and Genealogical Account of the Present Nobility. Containing the Descent, Creations, and Most Remarkable Actions*, 4th ed. (London: W. Taylor, 1717), John Burke, *A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire* (London: Henry Colburn, 1840), Bernard Burke, *A Genealogical History of the Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited, and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire* (London: Harrison, 1866), John Burke, *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland Enjoying Territorial Possessions or High Official Rank but Unvested with Heritable Honours*. (London: Henry Colburn, 1838), and *Burke's Peerage and Baronetage*. 106th ed. Charles Mosley, editor-in-chief. (Crans, Switzerland: Burke's Peerage, 1999). Several on-line sources were used as well. The most important (and consistently reliable) was thePeerage.com, "A genealogical survey of the peerage of Britain as well as the royal families of Europe," compiled by Darryl Lundy, <http://www.thepeerage.com/index.htm>.

analysis of demographic data on women whose fathers held the title of Baron or above during the period of 1485 through 2000. This data was mined for a variety of types of information ranging from the simple (did the woman marry endogamously or exogamously?) to the more precisely complex, (for example, did the daughters of viscounts in the seventeenth century have a different marital pattern than the daughters of earls in the same period?). The results of the statistical analysis are presented throughout in the form of tables and charts as well as references in the text. Unless otherwise indicated, all statistical information presented in the project is based on the author's data.⁵²

While there is a great deal of genealogical information available for the British aristocracy since the Tudor era, there are some challenges when using this material to study the lives of elite women. Following a list of the named sons of a duke it is not unusual to find in the records statements such as “and four daughters” with no additional information. More often than not one can assume that if any of those four daughters had married into another noble family she would merit a mention, if not in the records of her natal family, then in those of the family into which she married.⁵³ Daughters who did not marry, and thus did not add to the progeny of the family, were frequently left out of the genealogical records. Although this problem is far more acute for the early centuries

⁵² While at times reference will be made to issues of “statistical significance,” this concept does not figure largely in the analysis. One of the primary functions of figuring statistical significance is to correct for sampling error when the sample used is only a subset of a much greater whole (for example, when pollsters ask 3,000 people their beliefs concerning the performance of the President and then extrapolate from that number the attitudes of the nation as a whole), but the numbers used here are essentially the whole of the group under study. Instead, most of the data analysis in this project uses what Gary M. Klass describes as “just plain data analysis” where interval measures such as percentages are the basis for the comparison. Gary M. Klass, *Just Plain Data Analysis: Finding, Presenting, and Interpreting Social Science Data* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008), xix. An example of this technique used in recent historical research is Michael McCahill and Ellis Archer Wasson, “The New Peerage: Recruitment to the House of Lords, 1704-1847,” *The Historical Journal* 46:1 (March, 2003): 1-38.

⁵³ Certainly, only if the union produced children. If that were not the case then she might well not make the records.

under consideration, the issue does not disappear even in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁵⁴ The use of a variety of genealogical sources has enabled me to mitigate this problem to some extent.

In addition to the demographic analysis, the diaries, memoirs, and letters of approximately 150 aristocratic women were examined for statements about and attitudes toward marriage and rank.⁵⁵ The evidence drawn from these sources forms the basis of the non-statistical portion of the study. The combination of the statistical and literary analysis helps to illustrate what was really happening in terms of marriage patterns as well as how the women felt about their own experiences and the experiences of those they knew. Together the statistical and the literary evidence demonstrates a remarkable consistency in marriage patterns and in the perception and values attached to rank.

There are both strengths and weaknesses to the approach taken in this project. The large data set covering the extended time period allows for patterns to emerge. It is possible to compare multiple groups with one another, both within a given time frame and across the more than five centuries under consideration. However, this study sacrifices some depth in its emphasis on breadth. The picture that emerges is painted in

⁵⁴ In his demographical study of the families of British Dukes, T.H. Hollingsworth addresses this issue: “The amount of information available about such exalted people [dukes] is very great and since about 1700 seems to be almost as complete demographically as it is reasonable to desire. In 1676 Sir William Dugdale produced his *Baronage*, and in 1710 Arthur Collins his *Peerage* and these works account for the great improvement in the completeness of peerage records at the time. Since 1780, the only information missing at all often relates to the birth dates of dukes’ wives and the families of dukes’ daughters who married commoners. On the other hand, before 1500 it seems clear that quite large numbers of duke’s children are not mentioned at all.” Hollingsworth’s assertion of the completeness of the demographic record beginning in the eighteenth century is true for the title-holders themselves, but it is less true for their daughters.

⁵⁵ This is a challenge for the sixteenth century as there is little extant material produced by women during that period. As is pointed out by Sheridan Harvey in his unpublished dissertation on the Cooke sisters, a “difficulty in writing about Tudor women is that little written by women has survived compared to men’s correspondence; there is only a single extant letter from one Cooke sister to another, and it is of debatable authority. One cannot tell today whether women rarely wrote, whether they destroyed their own correspondence, or whether subsequent generations deemed these female epistles of no importance and discarded them.” Sheridan Harvey, “The Cooke Sisters: A Study of Tudor Gentlewomen” (PhD dissertation, Indiana University, 1981), 15.

broad brush strokes, and though case studies have been employed throughout, a bit of precise detail has been neglected. This is essentially an exploratory project that serves as a test of the use of statistical and written evidence to shed light on the marital patterns of this large group of women. Further studies will take a more in-depth view of many of the patterns that emerge in these pages.

IV. Findings

The analysis of the evidence, both statistical and written, gathered for this project reveals that there was a remarkable level of constancy in the marriage patterns of aristocratic women over the period from 1485 to 1880-1920. Looking at the percentages of endogamous and exogamous marriages there was relatively little change in the period between 1485 and 1880-1920. Based on this consistency it is my assertion that conceptions of rank identity within the elite remained quite constant until the great disruption of the First World War. Chapter One examines endogamous marriage and argues that for the period from the late fifteenth century until the period comprised of the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth century, the endogamy rate for aristocratic women remained remarkably stable. The written works of these women consistently present endogamy as the most desirable form of marriage. The statistics prove that while endogamy was the aim, only about 50 percent of aristocratic women in the period to 1880-1920 married within titled ranks, while after 1920 the rate dropped to about 20 percent. This constancy followed by the abrupt change indicates that the conception of rank identity remained consistent until the First World War fundamentally altered it. Chapter Two studies the practical considerations present in the contracting of aristocratic marriages. The language of duty often provided the strong

push toward endogamy found in the documentation in Chapter One. Society generally did not see aristocratic women as individuals. Rather, they functioned as parts of the larger whole of the family. As a part of that larger unit, they had a responsibility to marry in such a way as to further the interests of the family. Women wanted emotionally fulfilling marriages but family duty remained paramount. This chapter discusses in some detail the financial arrangements that were often one of the most important practical concerns. Chapter Three explores the desire for love that existed for the entire period from 1485-2000. Since aristocratic families very often arranged the marriages of their children, historians have generally seen it as an emotionally cold endeavor. This chapter challenges that perception and shows that though duty was often the primary concern, aristocratic women consistently sought emotional fulfillment in their marriages. Chapter Four investigates the marriages undertaken by aristocratic women without Societal or familial sanction. When women entered into elopements or defiant matches this represented a threat to the rank identity and Society generally had little sympathy for the women. Chapter Five explores the historiographical question of the so-called Open Elite. For many years, historians and observers argued that the English aristocracy⁵⁶ readily integrated newcomers. The work of Lawrence Stone most famously called that assumption into question. This chapter uses an analysis of the marriage patterns of the daughters of established versus new nobles to investigate the question and finds that the British aristocracy was far less open than has often been asserted. Its relatively closed nature was true from the onset of the Tudor era to the end of World War One. The methods by which women acquired desirable spouses, both for themselves and for family members, are the subject of Chapter Six. This chapter demonstrates the continuity present

⁵⁶ There was little scholarly work on the nature of the aristocracies of Scotland and Ireland in this area.

in these undertakings across the centuries as well as the operation of the marriage market both in London and the countryside. Chapter Seven discusses women who had more room for independent maneuver than was generally the case for aristocratic women: heiresses, widows, peeresses in their own right, and those who remained unmarried. While under intense societal pressure to marry well, their freedom was due to a combination of financial means as well as a bit more maturity in most cases. This study demonstrates that despite great changes in the British economy, polity, and society, the marital patterns of aristocratic women remained remarkably consistent from the sixteenth to the early twentieth century. Moreover, my research suggests that these women played just as important a role as their male counterparts in preserving a social system based upon birth, rank, and title.

V. Conclusion: Continuity

History often focuses on change and transition⁵⁷ but unchanging ideals, consistent codes of conduct, and persistent patterns of behaviour can also tell us important things about the past. The work of prominent historians of women, such as Judith M. Bennett, identifies continuity as a major explanatory model.⁵⁸ This emphasis on continuity began in the field of women's history in the 1960s and the 1970s, at about the same time that other economic and social historians such as Keith Wrightson, Alan

⁵⁷ A simple J-Store search illustrates the point: using only history as a discipline and confining the search to the number of times the words change, transition, and revolution appear in the titles of articles, the result is 20,052. Scholars have been known to argue that history is indeed change. For example, the late Bridget Hill in an essay critiquing the work of Judith M. Bennett wrote of the centrality of change to the historical enterprise. Bridget Hill, "Women's History: A Study in Change, Continuity, or Standing Still?" *Women's History Review* 2:1 (1993): 5-22.

⁵⁸ She set out her position on this issue in opposition to the criticism of Bridget Hill in "Women's History: A Study in Continuity and Change," *Women's History Review* 2:2 (June 1993): 173-184

MacFarlane, and Peter Laslett also began to focus on the concept in their work.⁵⁹ In 1962 Alexander Gerschenkron wrote a highly theoretical (and quite mathematical) article about the concept of continuity in history. He made the point that one way to understand continuity is as a lack of change in the midst of an otherwise changing world.⁶⁰ This is the way that I understand the role of continuity in this project. The political, social, economic world of Britain changed radically in the period between 1485 and 2000. Yet, for much of that period, at least until 1880-1920, the marriage patterns of aristocratic British women remained remarkably stable. This continuity indicates the stability of the self-understanding of the rank identity of the British aristocracy during that time.

⁵⁹ Naomi Tadmor, "Early Modern English Kinship in the Long Run: Reflections on Continuity and Change." *Continuity and Change* 25:1 (May, 2010): 18.

⁶⁰ Alexander Gerschenkron, "On the Concept of Continuity in History," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106:3 (May 1962): 195.

Chapter One: Endogamy

I. Introduction

Commentators generally agree that Britain is, or at least was, a very rank-conscious society. There is less agreement as to how to measure such a consciousness and when, or if, that consciousness changed. In his important study, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England*, Lawrence Stone points out that all strata of English society married within a very limited social and geographical range. The custom of the dowry, together with the great sensitivity to status and rank, meant that there was a very high degree of social and economic endogamy.¹ David Cannadine in *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* argues that the last two decades of the nineteenth century witnessed a reduction in endogamous marriages, “at the very time that society was becoming more plutocratic, the peerage was becoming more plebeian.”² Cannadine states that the number of endogamous marriages within the nineteenth-century aristocracy declined sharply and he gives several examples of marriages between plutocratic and aristocratic families. His study focuses on the marriages of aristocratic males and finds a rather sharp break in the pattern of their behaviour. When the marriages of aristocratic females are examined one does find somewhat the same pattern, though it is more complicated than that described by Cannadine. In the period between 1880 and 1920, the number of elite women marrying endogamously began to drop while the number marrying exogamously increased. Despite this change, which is in line with the Cannadine findings, the overall

¹ Stone, *Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 60.

² David Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990; New York: Vintage, 1999), 347. Citations are to the Vintage edition.

pattern of constancy remained essentially intact until the end of the First World War.³

This project does not undermine the findings of Stone and Cannadine, but rather it shows that the question of aristocratic rank identity is more complex when the factors of gender and extended time period are considered.

Historians have utilized many different measures to attempt to understand the level of rank-consciousness and identity.⁴ It is the contention of this study that the marital patterns of elite women provide a lens through which to examine this issue. This project uses the marriage patterns of the daughters of aristocrats⁵ to understand the conception of rank identity among the British nobility. The fundamental assumption being that the stronger the sense of aristocratic rank identity is at a given time the more likely noble families are to marry their daughters to others of titled rank.⁶ As a group, the aristocracy define themselves by blood-line and they have demonstrated a strong concern with that line and the identity it confers, both as it extends into the past and certainly as it continues into the future. In their behaviour, at least until the period from 1880 to 1920, they have shown a great deal of interest in preserving the trappings of rank identity – things such as country houses, art collections, and political influence. In a crude, but ultimately accurate, way their children were not so different from their houses. Their children are a part of their legacy. Since the sons will carry on the family name, and in many cases the title as well, the rank of their spouse is not as vital as it is for daughters. If the son of the Duke of Marlborough marries Miss Smith the Duke's grandchildren remain Churchills

³ This process appears to have been a change that took place over several decades with the major break following the war.

⁴ When they do so the term generally used is class-consciousness. For the reasons set out in the Introduction I employ the term rank rather than class.

⁵ For the purposes of this study, aristocrat is defined as one who holds a title higher than baronet.

⁶ This study makes no claim to look at the issue of rank on anything other than the very elite level and certainly, no claim is made that these findings are applicable to anything beyond the very elite.

with all of the privileges attendant upon that status. However, if the daughter of the Duke marries Mr. Smith the grandchildren are Smiths with that status and with each succeeding generation the children are farther and farther outside of the aristocratic rank.

The endogamy rate of the daughters of the British aristocracy remained remarkably stable from 1485 to 1880-1920.⁷ As is shown in Table 1 below, the rate of shift in that period remained within about 10 percent.⁸ This consistency is all the more remarkable when considering the social, economic, and political transformations of the period. Despite the great changes that affected Britain, the conception of rank identity among the nobility⁹ remained quite static. That social group maintained a strong sense of cohesion and stable identity for a period of nearly 450 years.

II. Endogamy and its shifting importance and its relationship to rank

Among the most valuable possessions noble families had were their offspring, though like many of their possessions (such as large landed estates) children, perhaps especially daughters, could also be a financial burden. Aristocratic families tended to be careful about the marriages they contracted for their daughters, seeing those marriages as a means to further the family's position. Thus, these unions can provide considerable insight into aristocratic attitudes toward rank identity. The stability of the rate at which these families married their daughters endogamously is a good indication of a stability in

⁷ In the wake of World War I, the pattern shifts dramatically for reasons that will be discussed later in this chapter.

⁸ There was a statistically significant spike in endogamy in the seventeenth century, when the rate rose from 48.46 percent in the sixteenth century to 58.59 percent in the seventeenth. If that spike is disregarded the rate of fluctuation is no more than 6.45 percent between the eighteenth century (51.51 percent) and 1901-1920 (45.06 percent). This is a statistically significant difference; however, the difference between the eighteenth-century rate and the nineteenth-century rate is not statistically significant, nor is the difference between the nineteenth-century rate and the rate during the first two decades of the twentieth century.

⁹ As indicated by the marital behaviour of the elite women.

the self-conception of rank identity. Table 1 shows the marital patterns of British elite women from the sixteenth through the twentieth centuries. From the sixteenth century through the first two decades of the twentieth century, the rates of endogamous marriages remained remarkably constant, with the shifts between the centuries occurring at a very gradual rate.¹⁰ This stasis indicates a relatively steady sense of rank identity among the elite over a period of more than four centuries.¹¹

Table 1: Basic British Marriage Patterns¹²

Century	Endogamous ¹³	Hypogamous ¹⁴	Exogamous ¹⁵	Unmarried ¹⁶
16th	486/1003 48.46%	243/1003 ¹⁷ 24.22%	274/1003 27.32%	29/850 3.41%
17th	699/1193 58.59%	224/1193 18.78%	270/1193 22.63%	74/1071 6.91%
18th	564/1095 51.51%	137/1095 12.51%	394/1095 35.98%	124/1115 11.12%
19th	869/1722 50.46%	185/1722 10.75%	668/1722 38.79%	299/1925 15.53%
20th	358/1386 25.83%	111/1386 8.01%	917/1386 66.16%	151/1322 11.42%
20th through 1920	162/381 42.52%	39/381 10.24%	180/381 47.24%	It is not possible to determine a decade in which someone did not marry

Statistics demonstrate a consistent, though not unvarying, tendency of aristocratic women to marry within rank,¹⁸ but these findings are not wholly supported by the written

¹⁰ Variables in the seventeenth and twentieth centuries are discussed later in this chapter.

¹¹ The mean rate for endogamous marriage in the period from 1485-1920 is 50.82 percent. With the exception of the seventeenth century, all other time periods hover within 6 percent of the mean.

¹² Statistical tables, unless otherwise indicated, are based on the data collected and analyzed by the author.

¹³ These figures are generated by dividing the number of endogamous marriages by the total number of marriages in the century.

¹⁴ These figures are generated by dividing the number of hypogamous marriages by the total number of marriages in the century.

¹⁵ These figures are generated by dividing the number of exogamous marriages by the total number of marriages in the century.

¹⁶ These figures are generated by dividing the number of women who remained unmarried by the total number of women who either married or were expected to marry [that is they were at least twenty-two years old] in the century.

¹⁷ In the 16th century, hypogamy was not as much of a problem as marriage to a man with the title Sir had not yet been devalued by the creation of the baronet for sale.

evidence. Letters and memoirs of aristocratic women from 1485-2000 reveal the consistently high value they placed upon rank and its role in the marriages of noble women. The written evidence consistently presents endogamous marriage as being of far greater importance than the actual marriage patterns demonstrate. Aristocratic British women actually married endogamously at a constant rate of about fifty percent, but the commentary found in their written remains indicates a social attitude that nearly always made endogamy a goal.

The primary concern governing marriage among the elites of the sixteenth century was the preservation of the family's place within the hierarchy. The aristocracy regarded the preservation of rank as their collective responsibility. Even the monarchy became involved in these matters. In 1536, Margaret Douglas, the daughter of the Scottish Earl of Angus¹⁹ and Henry VIII's sister Margaret Tudor,²⁰ entered into a secret relationship (which may well have been a clandestine marriage) with the half brother of Thomas Howard, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk, confusingly also named Thomas Howard. Because the latter Thomas and Anne Boleyn were related and because her disgrace and execution made Margaret's position in the line of succession a live issue once again, the

¹⁸ This consistent trend toward endogamy is not found among male aristocrats. In his 1957 study of the demographic patterns of British ducal families, T.H. Hollingsworth examined, among many other things, the natal background of the first wives of the dukes. He found that in the period from 1330 to 1934 the percentage of dukes who married the daughters and granddaughters of nobles dropped from 60 percent to 40 percent. His findings are shown in the Table below:

Natal Origins of Dukes' First Wives

Ist Wife's Origin	Men born 1330 - 1679	Men born 1680-1829	Men born 1830-1934
Peerage	72 60.00%	121 50.84%	62 40.00%
Commoner	29 24.17%	97 40.76%	67 43.23%
Foreign	19 15.83%	20 8.40%	26 16.77%
Total Number of Dukes	120	238	155

T.H. Hollingsworth, "A Demographic Study," 23-25.

¹⁹ Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus (c. 1490-1557).

²⁰ Margaret married Angus in 1514 following the death at Flodden Field of her first husband King James IV of Scotland.

government showed little mercy to the pair. During the Boleyn family's ascendancy, Margaret was far enough away from both the English and the Scottish thrones²¹ that her marriage to a minor member of a major noble house constituted an adequate match. After the execution of Queen Anne and the subsequent declaration of her daughter Elizabeth's bastardy, Henry and his ministers decided that Margaret needed to marry someone well above the rank of Thomas.²² The government imprisoned both Margaret and Thomas despite the evidence that indicated that Henry had been aware of their plans to marry before the fall of the Boleyns. The law regarding royal marriages changed as a result of this relationship, making it treason for "any man, of whatever estate, degree, or condition' to marry, attempt to marry, or to deflower any member of the royal family 'without the special license, assent, consent, and agreement of the king under the great seal.' Further, anyone who aided or advised a man to make such a contract or marriage was to be adjudged a traitor and to share the penalties for high treason."²³

In early modern Britain, the marriage of an aristocrat to a wealthy and powerful person without title elicited comment, no matter how rich and powerful the non-titled spouse's family. The strong societal desire for endogamy in the early modern period sometimes led to the taking of a great deal of trouble to ensure that matches at least appeared to be endogamous. Even in a case as anomalous and scandalous as Henry VIII's

²¹ Margaret was the daughter of Henry VIII's elder sister Margaret, the Dowager Queen of Scotland, and her second husband Archibald Douglas, the Earl of Angus. She had an elder half-brother James V of Scotland and in England, even if Henry's daughter Mary from his first marriage was held to be illegitimate, the Princess Elizabeth was ahead of her in the succession.

²² David Head, "Beying Ledde and Seduced by the Devyll" The Attainder of Lord Thomas Howard and the Tudor Law of Treason," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 13:4 (Winter 1982): 8. If Margaret were truly a viable heir then Thomas may well not have been of sufficient status for such a bride. Even he acknowledged the disparity of their backgrounds in a poem he entered in the Devonshire Manuscript following his incarceration stating that by loving him "ye desende from yor degree." Raymond Southall, *The Courtly Maker: An Essay on the Poetry of Wyatt and His Contemporaries* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964), 24.

²³ Head, "Beying Ledde and Seduced by the Devyll," 13-14.

marriage to Anne Boleyn, those involved showed concern for the proprieties of the situation. On December 13, 1529, the Imperial Ambassador Eustace Chapuys²⁴ reported to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V²⁵ that members of the Boleyn family were “lately created earls, for it was considered essential that before her being raised to the rank of Queen her own family should be somewhat exalted.”²⁶ Anne Boleyn was cognizant of the linkage between rank and marriage. In April 1533, just months after her clandestine marriage to Henry, Chapuys wrote that Anne had boasted that she would either make the Princess Mary,²⁷ Henry’s daughter from his first marriage, her maid or marry her to a varlet.²⁸ There were, in the hierarchy of the sixteenth century,²⁹ few more powerful ways to devalue a female than to match her with “a varlet.”³⁰

This issue of female status concerned the Tudor elite even when they contemplated marriages quite close to home. In 1537, Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle, decided to marry his eldest daughter Frances to his stepson John Bassett³¹ in order

²⁴ Eustace Chapuys (c. 1490-1556) was a Savoyard diplomat in the service of the Holy Roman Empire. He consistently championed the cause of Henry VIII’s first wife Katherine of Aragon and her daughter the future Mary I.

²⁵ Charles V (1500-1558) was King of Spain and Holy Roman Emperor. His mother was the Infanta Juana, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella and his father was Philip the son of the Hapsburg Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian I. He was Katherine of Aragon’s nephew and supported (sometimes a bit tepidly) her cause.

²⁶ *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere*, ed. Pascual de Gayangos, et. al. (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1888) 4:1, 232.

²⁷ Later Mary I (1516-1558). She married Prince Philip of Spain (1527-1598) in 1554.

²⁸ J.S. Brewer, ed., *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England*. 21 vols. (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1867; reprint ed., Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1965), 6:324. Hereafter cited as *L&P*.

²⁹ Or indeed for the period until at least 1920. As is discussed below, a woman’s status was placed in real jeopardy if she married out of her social rank.

³⁰ A varlet was a man who was a menial servant.

³¹ John Bassett (1518-1541) was the son of Lisle’s second wife Honor Grenville by her first marriage to Sir John Bassett.

to save the costs of the dowry. The possible effect of this union on Frances' status³² caused the family some concern, so the Lisles canvassed opinion about the ramifications of the match. As the editor of the *Lisle Letters*, Muriel St. Clare Byrne, commented:

it was . . . obviously of some concern to the family to understand clearly what the position of Lisle's eldest daughter would be if she were contracted to her stepmother's eldest son. The bride was of Plantagenet descent, to say nothing of the fact that through her mother, a baroness in her own right, she was also descended from Berkeleys, Talbots, and Lisles; the groom was nothing but a plain Devonshire squire – a landed gentleman, of honourable family and 'well-allied,' but still John Basset, armiger.³³

The family asked their man of business in London, John Hussee, to make enquiries in London as to Frances' status in the event of the marriage in order to allay their concerns.

On June 23, 1537, Hussee wrote to Lady Lisle,³⁴ "I moved my Lady Rutland³⁵ again concerning . . . Frances and her ladyship standeth in doubt of the matter. But madam, I have been in hand with the Heralds of Arms, and they saith plainly that the woman shall never lose no part of her degree, but shall always be taken as her father's daughter."³⁶

This comforted the family somewhat, but they remained unsure. Hussee wrote again to Lady Lisle on June 29, "And touching . . . Frances, the heralds saith plainly that she shall lose no degree, but use the same according to the dignity of her father. Howbeit, if I might speak with my Lady Wiltshire,³⁷ I will not fail to have her advice on it."³⁸ He

³² Lisle (c. 1462-1542) was the illegitimate son of Edward IV and his first wife had been a baroness in her own right. Frances was thus linked to the leading families of the aristocracy. John Bassett was the son of a minor member of the gentry.

³³ Muriel St. Clare Byrne, *The Lisle Letters* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), IV:73-74. Hereafter cited as *LL*. The term armiger originally meant armour-bearer, but came to mean essentially esquire; that is, a person of good, but not noble, birth.

³⁴ Honor Grenville.

³⁵ This could either be Eleanor Paston, the Dowager Duchess of Rutland (who somewhat ironically given her attitude in this case, was not born into the nobility) or Margaret Neville, the wife of the 2nd Earl.

³⁶ *LL* IV: 74 (#856). It seems likely that the College of Arms is giving Hussee the answer that he wants, and is perhaps paying for. It was during this period that the Heralds made a great deal of money by producing utterly spurious genealogies for newly-minted elites.

³⁷ Elizabeth Howard

³⁸ *LL* IV: 148 (#884).

wrote once more on July 17 concerning the opinion of Lady Rutland³⁹ who stated, “there is no remedy, she thinketh, but the party must lose her estate and take the degree of her wedlock.” Despite Lady Rutland’s opinion, Hussee continued to agree with the heralds that Frances would not lose her status.⁴⁰ The family apparently took Hussee and the heralds’ judgments to heart and decided to brave the opinion of those like Lady Rutland and before July ended the marriage had been arranged.⁴¹

As will be discussed later in this chapter, subsequent unions had a rate of hypogamous and exogamous marriage quite a bit higher than that for first marriages, which posed a potential problem for the women concerned. Frequently aristocratic women maintained the titles of their first husbands if those titles were more exalted than the titles held by their subsequent husbands. This desire to preserve the higher titular status indicates a strong element of rank consciousness. For example, Henry VIII’s sister Mary continued to use title the French Queen even after her marriage to the Duke of Suffolk.⁴² Lady Margaret Bouchier kept her title as Lady Bryan following her subsequent marriage to David Souche, as did Lady Jane (Joan) Poynings, Lady Clinton, when she became the wife of Sir Robert Wingfield.⁴³ This retention of the previous title permitted women to maintain the status garnered from their first, endogamous, marriages even when they entered into subsequent, exogamous, matches. In his 1642 treatise on the

³⁹ Eleanor Paston.

⁴⁰ *LL IV*: 75.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Mary Tudor married Louis XII (1462-1515) of France in October, 1514. Following the aged King’s death in January 1515, Mary married Charles Brandon without the permission of her brother.

⁴³ *LL IV*:291. A later example of this was Catherine Wotton whose first husband was Sir Henry Stanhope, the son and heir of the 1st Earl of Chesterfield. Stanhope died before his father, thus denying Catherine the right to the title of Countess, but Charles II conferred it upon her anyway. Her 3rd husband, Daniel O’Neal died in 1664 and she had him buried in a tomb with an inscription about his illustrious background including the line: “He was married to the Right Honourable Katherine, Countess of Chesterfield, who erected him this monument.” William Montgomery, *The Montgomery Manuscripts, 1603-1706: Compiled from Family Manuscripts* (Belfast: James Cleeland, 1859),83n.

confusion over the inheritance of the Barony of Abergavenny, William Bird had some sharp words to say about the practice of women retaining the higher title: "... by the law of chivalry, if the widow of a Duke, Earl, Baron, . . . do marry with a Knight, Esquire, or Gentleman, then nevertheless she retaineth her name of honour, whereas the Common Law doth otherwise determine thereof, and therefore they conclude that the common law doth not determine this kind of controversie concerning the title, honours, and dignities Noble." He continued, "For if she be honoured with any title in respect of her husband, it is reason that after his death she marrying with an inferior... that she should be of like qualitie and reputation as said husband. For as she was ennobled by the one, so must she be content to leave that nobility by the strict course of the law for lieu of the other so that in this point the law is one way and the honour and courtesy of ladies another."⁴⁴ His basic rule appears to be that a woman who married below her station had made her bed, so she should be compelled to sleep in it.

The statistics compiled for this study indicate that the seventeenth century was the most rank-conscious century. It had the highest rate of endogamous marriage: 58.59 percent as compared to the next highest rate of 51.51 percent for the eighteenth century⁴⁵ and the lowest rate of exogamous marriage: 22.63 percent as compared to the next lowest rate of 27.32 percent for the sixteenth century.⁴⁶ An analysis of those seventeenth-century marriages for which a specific date is available shows little fluctuation in the rates of endogamy over the century so the pattern does not appear to have any relationship to the political turbulence of civil war, interregnum, and restoration. The question then is, why

⁴⁴ William Bird, *A Treatise of the Nobilitie of the Realme Collected Out of the Body of the Common Law, with Mention of Such Statutes as are Incident Hereunto, Upon a Debate of the Barony of Aburgavenny: With a Table of the Heads Contained in this Treatise* (London: A.N., 1642), 17- 18.

⁴⁵ This difference is statistically significant. See Table One.

⁴⁶ This difference is statistically significant. See Table One.

was that century so rank conscious? In his 1985 review of the Stones' *An Open Elite?* Christopher Hill posits a possible answer, "Neither Pym, Oliver Cromwell, or Thurloe, who ruled England in the sixteen-forties and fifties, had a great house. Would this not affect the mentality of those who regained their privileged position in 1660? May it not explain their increasing class-consciousness, their determination to cut themselves off from the vulgar, to concentrate on preserving the family inheritance?"⁴⁷ The seventeenth-century aristocracy became more determined to maintain their sense of rank identity because of the challenges to that identity that they faced. This determination to maintain rank cohesion led to an increase in endogamous marriages among aristocratic women.⁴⁸

The rate of endogamous marriage fell off in the eighteenth century, from 58.59 percent in the seventeenth century to 51.51 percent in the eighteenth, a level that still remained well higher than the 48.46 percent of the sixteenth century.⁴⁹ In the very upper strata of the aristocracy, the strong inclination was still to marry endogamously. In the late eighteenth century, Jane Maxwell, the Duchess of Gordon⁵⁰ was renowned for her matchmaking ability and her determination to see to it that her five daughters married

⁴⁷ Christopher Hill, "Review of *An Open Elite?*" *Renaissance Quarterly* 38:2 (Summer, 1985), 339.

⁴⁸ Despite this increased emphasis on endogamy, about 41 percent of the marriages of aristocratic women were to men outside of titled ranks. The general consensus was that such marriages tended to lower the status of the woman, at least socially, if not legally. This general contention was challenged by the seventeenth-century commentator William Bird writing on the issue of noble women who married below themselves in terms of rank, "Likewise, the said first rule touching the nobility of women married unto persons ignoble doth fail where they inherit those dignities. For if a Dukedom, Earldom, or Barony descend to any woman, who taketh an ignoble man to husband, that husband shall not debase the wife, having such dignities descended, but rather he in her right shall bear the title of such dignities especially if he be entitled by the courtesy." The contention that the rank of the wife can elevate the rank of the husband appears only to be present in the seventeenth century. Exalted rank identity, whether it is held by the male or the female, persists despite marriage outside of the rank. This attitude is in line with the strong rank-consciousness of the seventeenth century shown in the statistics Bird, *A Treatise of the Nobilitie of the Realme*, 19.

⁴⁹ The rate of hypogamy also declined sharply, from 18.78 percent in the seventeenth century to 12.51 percent in the eighteenth. This difference is statistically significant. The rate of exogamy grew from 22.63 percent in the seventeenth century to 35.98 percent in the eighteenth century. This difference is statistically significant. Perhaps most interestingly, the rate of unmarried rose from 6.91 percent in the seventeenth century to 11.12 percent in the eighteenth. This difference is statistically significant.

⁵⁰ She was married to Alexander Gordon, 4th Duke of Gordon. Both the Maxwells and the Gordons were staunch Whigs.

well. By the accounts of the day, it was wholly the Duchess who exhibited this social determination. The Duke busied himself with country pursuits.⁵¹ Part of her determination on this score may well have come from her own background. She was not born into the nobility. Her father was William Maxwell, 3rd Baronet, a member of the prominent Scottish family. She attracted the attention Alexander, the young 4th Duke of Gordon through her beauty and her wit. The couple married when she was eighteen. The marriage itself was not happy, ending in a separation in 1793. She did have seven children while married to the Duke.⁵² She worked to marry her daughter Georgiana Gordon to Francis Russell, 5th Duke of Bedford.⁵³ Unfortunately for the Duchess's plans, in 1802 Francis died from complications from a hernia surgery before the marriage could take place. The determined Duchess did not let that small setback ruin her plans to make her daughter Duchess of Bedford.⁵⁴ The new Duke, John Russell,⁵⁵ was a recent widower⁵⁶ and thus in need of a Duchess.⁵⁷ Jane had Georgiana dress in widow's weeds (black was thought to be very becoming to young woman) and arranged a meeting between the bereaved fiancée and the new duke. Not long after, Lady Georgiana became

⁵¹ Grace Wharton and John Cockburn Thomson, *The Queens of Society* (London: Routledge, 1867), 231.

⁵² During the negotiations for the marriage of her daughter Louisa to Charles Cornwallis, 2nd Marquess of Cornwallis concerns were raised about the prevalence of insanity in the Gordon family. Jane assured the prospective groom that there was not a drop of Gordon blood in Louisa. Christine Lodge, "Gordon, Jane. Duchess of Gordon (1748.49-1812)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. online edn, Oct 2007. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/11059>, accessed 26 Dec 2010].

⁵³ Francis Russell (1765-1802).

⁵⁴ Part of the Duchess's determination may have been due to the fact that Georgiana had come out in Society three years before. "The Duchess of Gordon's Ball," *The London Times*, Feb. 12, 1799, #4407, pg. 4.

⁵⁵ John Russell (1766-1839).

⁵⁶ His first wife, Georgiana Byng, daughter of 4th Viscount Torrington, had recently died in 1801. He was said to have neglected her. F. M. L. Thompson, "Russell, John, sixth duke of Bedford (1766-1839)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/24322>, accessed 29 Dec 2010]

⁵⁷ He was a Whig politician, sitting in the House of Commons from 1788-1802. Thompson, "Russell, John."

engaged to John and the couple married on June 23, 1803.⁵⁸ Jane's other four daughters married equally well.⁵⁹ In her determination to see that her daughters married men of appropriate standing, Jane Maxwell was a part of a larger phenomenon of aristocratic women working to uphold the distinctions of their rank.

The Duchess of Gordon worked within an established pattern. During the period from the sixteenth to the twentieth century, the higher a woman was in the hierarchy, the more likely she was to marry endogamously. Tables 2 to 7 illustrate the point. In all of the centuries, except the sixteenth, the daughters of marquesses and dukes were more likely to marry a man from the titled aristocracy than were the daughters of barons, viscounts, and earls. Overall, the rate of endogamy increased as the level in the hierarchy also increased. This is not surprising as those families at the higher levels in the aristocracy generally would have had the means and the prestige to make their daughters attractive mates to others of noble rank at all levels in the hierarchy. A duke's daughter was a good catch for any family while a baron's daughter would need a substantial dowry to make her appealing to a marquess.

⁵⁸ The Duke was said to have been more kind to his second wife than he had been to his first and they had ten children together. Mabell, Countess of Airlie, *In Whig Society: Compiled from the Hitherto Unpublished Correspondence of Elizabeth Viscountess Melbourne and Emily Lamb Countess Cowper, Afterwards Viscountess Palmerston* (London: Hodder Stoughton, 1921), 50; Harry Graham, *A Group of Scottish Women* (London: Methuen, 1908), 237; Thompson, "Russell, John."

⁵⁹ Charlotte married the 4th Duke of Richmond; Susan married the 5th Duke of Manchester; and Louisa married the 2nd Marquess of Cornwallis. The daughter who did not do as well was Madelina who married first a baronet and then a man with no title at all. It is interesting to note that she did not exercise her abilities on behalf of her sons. Her eldest son, George (1770-1836), later the 5th Duke, did not marry until after her death and her second son, Alexander (1785-1808) died unmarried.

Table 2: Sixteenth Century: Marriages by Title

Title ⁶⁰	Endogamous ⁶¹	Hypogamous ⁶²	Exogamous ⁶³	Unmarried ⁶⁴
Baron	183/498 36.75%	134/498 26.80%	181/498 36.45%	5/416 1.20%
Viscount	19/38 50.00%	8/38 21.05%	11/38 28.95%	1/32 3.13%
Earl	245/395 62.03%	80/395 20.25%	70/395 17.72%	17/340 5.00%
Marquess	14/34 41.18%	15/34 44.12%	5/34 14.70%	0/26 0%
Duke	25/38 65.79%	6/38 15.79%	7/38 18.42%	6/36 ⁶⁵ 16.67%

Table 3: Seventeenth: Marriages by Title

Title ⁶⁶	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous	Unmarried
Baron	147/335 43.88%	87/335 25.97%	101/335 30.15%	31/305 10.16%
Viscount	65/144 45.14%	32/144 22.22%	47/144 32.64%	8/130 6.15%
Earl	413/625 66.08%	101/625 16.16%	111/625 17.76%	33/559 5.90%
Marquess	32/37 86.49%	1/37 2.70%	4/37 10.81%	2/36 5.56%
Duke	42/52 80.77%	3/52 5.77%	7/52 13.46%	0/52 0%

⁶⁰ Of Bride's father.

⁶¹ These figures are generated by dividing the number of endogamous marriages for the daughters of men who hold this title by the total number of the marriages of the daughters of men who hold this title.

⁶² These figures are generated by dividing the number of hypogamous marriages for the daughters of men who hold this title by the total number of marriages of the daughters of men who hold this title.

⁶³ These figures are generated by dividing the number of exogamous marriages for the daughters of men who hold this title by the total number of marriages of the daughters of men who hold this title.

⁶⁴ These figures are generated by dividing the number of the daughters of men who hold this title who remained unmarried by the total number of daughters of men who hold this title.

⁶⁵ This number is disproportionately high as 4 of the 6 are the daughters of the 1st Duke of Somerset.

⁶⁶ Of Bride's father.

Table 4: Eighteenth Century: Marriages by Title

Title ⁶⁷	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous	Unmarried
Baron	73/214 34.11%	30/214 14.02%	111/214 51.87%	24/220 10.91%
Viscount	51/121 42.15%	24/121 19.83%	46/121 38.02%	17/128 13.28%
Earl	298/552 53.99%	66/552 12.56%	188/552 33.45%	66/562 11.74%
Marquess	41/58 70.69%	4/58 6.90%	13/58 22.41%	2/55 3.63%
Duke	101/150 67.33%	13/150 8.67%	36/150 24.00%	15/150 10.00%

Table 5: Nineteenth Century: Marriages by Title

Title ⁶⁸	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous	Unmarried
Baron	143/328 43.60%	28/328 8.53%	157/328 47.87%	66/378 17.46%
Viscount	61/145 42.07%	14/145 9.65%	70/145 48.28%	24/165 14.55%
Earl	448/870 51.49%	100/870 11.50%	322/870 37.01%	156/973 16.03%
Marquess	107/197 54.32%	21/197 10.65%	69/197 35.03%	23/205 11.22%
Duke	110/182 60.44%	22/182 12.09%	50/182 27.47%	30/204 14.71%

Table 6: Twentieth Century: Marriages by Title

Title ⁶⁹	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous	Unmarried
Baron	75/335 22.39%	27/335 8.06%	233/335 69.55%	34/330 10.30%
Viscount	41/178 23.03%	17/178 9.55%	120/178 67.42%	24/171 14.04%
Earl	154/612 25.16%	48/612 7.85%	410/612 66.99%	70/582 12.03%
Marquess	44/127 34.65%	13/127 10.23%	70/127 55.12%	14/123 11.38%
Duke	44/134 32.84%	6/134 4.47%	84/134 62.69%	9/116 7.76%

⁶⁷ Of Bride's father.

⁶⁸ Of Bride's father.

⁶⁹ Of Bride's father.

Table 7: Twentieth Century to 1920: Marriages by Title

Title ⁷⁰	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
Baron	31/100 31.00%	8/100 8.00%	61/100 61.00%
Viscount	15/33 45.45%	4/33 12.13%	14/33 42.42%
Earl	69/174 39.66%	20/174 11.49%	85/174 48.85%
Marquess	24/40 60.00%	5/40 12.50%	11/40 27.50%
Duke	23/34 67.65%	2/34 5.88%	9/34 26.47%

Accounts of elite marriages from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries also underscore this consistency in the concern for rank, and they suggest that often these celebrations had a feudal feel. The Spencer Family Papers⁷¹ contain an account of the marriage of Georgiana Spencer to the 5th Duke of Devonshire in 1774. A major part of the wedding was the distribution of gifts, which appeared deliberately to echo the practices of previous centuries, to the household servants and the estate workers.⁷² In February 1868, *The Times* ran an article on the marriage of Gwendolyn Mary Stanhope, the daughter of Earl Stanhope⁷³ and Frederick Lygon, 6th Earl of Beauchamp.⁷⁴ The reporter noted the celebrations by Beauchamp's tenants, which included a huge dinner, the firing of an artillery salvo, a torchlight procession, as well as a gift of Worcester china (the groom's seat was in Worcester).⁷⁵ This type of celebration by the tenants seemed quite reminiscent of the feudalism of the medieval era. Four years later, the paper printed

⁷⁰ Of Bride's father.

⁷¹ Held in the British Library.

⁷² BL Add. MSS 75609.

⁷³ Philip Stanhope (1805-1875), 4th Earl Stanhope.

⁷⁴ Philip Lygon (1830-1891), 6th Earl of Beauchamp.

⁷⁵ "The Marriage of Frederick, Sixth Earl of Beauchamp," *The London Times*, Feb. 19, 1868 #26051, p. 9.

an account of the nuptials of Mary FitzAlan Howard,⁷⁶ the daughter of Lord Howard of Glossop⁷⁷ and John Crichton-Stuart, the 3rd Marquess of Bute.⁷⁸ The Marquess had extensive holdings in Cardiff, where a triumphal arch hung with banners adorned with the arms of Bute and Howard greeted the couple. The young pair (she was nineteen, he was twenty-five) listened to a welcoming address by the Mayor.⁷⁹ The pageantry associated with these unions indicates the continuing importance of noble rank.

An examination of the marriage patterns of aristocratic men and women supports the increasing “plebeianization” of the aristocracy after 1880 posited by David Cannadine, though the figures for the women indicate that the change in their behaviour occurred at a more gradual rate over the period from 1880 to 1920. The exogamy rate among aristocratic daughters did increase after that date, though the rates are not as high as they are for the men. In the period from 1871-1880, aristocratic women married exogamously 34.41 percent of the time.⁸⁰ In the following decade (1881-1890), the one in which Cannadine argues that the fundamental alteration occurred, the exogamy rate did increase to 42.37 percent.⁸¹ The increase continued in the following ten years (1891-1900), up to 51.38 percent.⁸² This trend toward increased exogamy did not continue on a smooth course, in the period from 1901-1910 the rate decreased by 8.82 percent to 42.56

⁷⁶ Her first name was Gwendolyn, but she preferred to go by her second name Mary.

⁷⁷ Edward Fitzalan Howard (1818-1883), 1st Baron Howard of Glossop.

⁷⁸ John Crichton-Stuart (1847-1900).

⁷⁹ “Marriage of the Marquess of Bute,” *The London Times*, April 17, 1872, #27353, p. 12.

⁸⁰ This represents 64 exogamous unions out of a total of 186 marriages in that decade.

⁸¹ This represents 75 exogamous unions out of a total of 177 marriages in that decade. The difference between the rate of 1871-80 and that of 1881-1890 is not statistically significant.

⁸² This represents 93 exogamous unions out of a total of 181 marriages in that decade. The difference between the rate of 1881-1890 and 1891-1900 is not statistically significant; however, the difference between the 1871-1880 rate and the 1891-1900 rate is statistically significant underscoring the argument here that the change in the marriage rates of women was a longer term process than was that of the men.

percent.⁸³ It increased once again from 1911-1920 to 52.15 percent.⁸⁴ The acceleration continued in the next decade (1921-1930), jumping to 61.60 percent.⁸⁵ If the period from 1881 to 1920 is treated as a whole, the exogamy rate is 47.09 percent,⁸⁶ significantly higher than the 1871-1880 rate of 34.41 percent and significantly lower than the 1921-1930 rate of 61.60 percent. This indicates that a change in aristocratic rank identity as evidenced by the marriage patterns of noble women did occur over the four-decade period from 1880 to 1920.

The nineteenth century was a period of significant change for the members of the British aristocracy. The perception given by contemporaries, as well as historians, is that the nobility was under attack by the encroaching forces of democratization as well as being hopelessly diluted as a rank⁸⁷ by the incursions of the merely wealthy. One of the primary supports to this contention is the common assertion that as a rank they began to practice exogamous marriage at an increasing rate during the course of the century and that this change in marriage patterns indicates the weakening of rank identity. The marriage patterns and attitudes of aristocratic women, rather than the more usual practice of studying the marital patterns of men, however, challenges this traditional view of the weakening of rank consciousness in the nineteenth century. David Thomas examined the marriage patterns of aristocratic males during this period and found that the majority of

⁸³ This represents 83 exogamous unions out of a total of 195 marriages in that decade. The difference between the rate of 1891-1900 and 1901-1910 is statistically significant. The difference between the 1901-1910 rate and the 1871-1880 rate is not statistically significant.

⁸⁴ This represents 97 exogamous marriages out of a total of 186 marriages in that decade. This increase from the 1901-1910 rate is not statistically significant.

⁸⁵ This represents 93 exogamous marriages out of a total of 151 marriages in that decade. This increase from the 1911-1920 rate is not statistically significant.

⁸⁶ This represents 348 exogamous marriages out of a total of 739 marriages in this period.

⁸⁷ Though it is true that there are five ranks within the aristocracy, here I am referring to them as a whole.

these men married outside of their rank.⁸⁸ Indeed, as one looks at the numbers over the course of the long nineteenth century, it appears that there is relatively little change in the pattern. Certainly, there was no dramatic increase in the propensity of noble men to marry outside of their social rank. Table 8 presents the percentages reported by Thomas:

Table 8: Marriage Patterns of 19th Century Aristocratic Men⁸⁹

Date of First marriage ⁹⁰	Total Number ⁹¹	Percentage of Endogamous Marriages	Percentage of Exogamous Marriages	Percentage Unmarried
1790-1809	465	24	48	28
1810-1829	468	23	42	35
1830-1849	524	24	48	28
1850-1869	462	29	46	25
1870-1889	521	21	52	27
1890-1919	445	20	52	28

The marriage patterns of aristocratic women of the era paint a different picture. Across the century, these women were significantly more likely than the men to marry endogamously and less likely to marry exogamously. The women also show a more striking change in their patterns following 1880, as is shown in Tables 9, 10 and 11.⁹²

⁸⁸ David Thomas, “The Social Origins of Marriage Partners of the British Peerage in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” *Population Studies* 26 (1972): 99-111.

⁸⁹ Statistics are adapted from the information provided in Thomas, “The Social Origins of Marriage Partners,” 100, 102, & 105. Thomas examines “peers and their legitimate sons” of the rank of Duke, Marquess, Earl, Viscount, and Baron.

⁹⁰ Thomas divides his cohorts based on date of birth. This is not possible for women as that information is often not provided in the sources. Based on his information, the average age of marriage for elite men was approximately 30; that is the number that I have used to place them within the cohorts on this table. Because Thomas bases his cohorts on date of birth it is possible for him to give numbers for those who were unmarried, this works less well for the women so that measurement is not included in Table 9. Thomas, “The Social Origins,” 100. The division of the cohorts into 20-year spans is Thomas’s method.

⁹¹ Of persons examined.

⁹² According to the figures provided by Thomas, the change in the endogamy rate of the men in the cohorts marrying for the first time in 1870-1889 was only statistically significantly different from the rate of those marrying in 1850-1869; the difference in the rate between the 1870-1889 group and all other groups was not significant. The pattern is the same for the group marrying for the first time in 1890-1919; they only differ significantly from the 1850-1869 cohort (which also differed significantly from the 1810-1829 cohort). The figures generated for this project indicate that while there was a 9.08 percent drop in the endogamy rate for women marrying in 1881-1890 as compared to those marrying in 1871-1880, that difference is not statistically significant. It does represent the second highest shift in the endogamy rate from one decade to another, only beaten by the 9.85 percent drop from the 1881-1890 rate to the 1891-1900

Table 9: Nineteenth Century (by decade) Marriages of Elite Women – following Thomas Dates⁹³

Date of 1st Marriage	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
1790-1809	157/260	60.39%	25/260	9.61%	78/260	30.00%
1810-1829	154/277	55.96%	23/277	7.94%	100/277	36.10%
1830-1849	169/316	53.48%	23/316	9.49%	117/316	37.03%
1850-1869	171/322	53.11%	39/322	12.11%	112/322	34.78%
1870-1889	171/342	50.00%	40/342	11.70%	94/342	38.30%
1890-1919	228/529	43.10%	59/529	11.15%	242/529	45.75%

Table 10: Marriage Patterns by decade of 19th Century Elite Women⁹⁴

Decade	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
1801-1810	76/133	57.14%	20/133	15.08%	37/133	27.82%
1811-1820	76/136	55.88%	13/136	09.56%	47/136	34.56%
1821-1830	91/157	57.96%	8/157	05.10%	58/157	36.94%
1831-1840	86/172	50.00%	16/172	09.30%	70/172	40.70%
1841-1850	85/159	53.46%	15/159	09.43%	59/159	37.11%
1851-1860	83/158	52.53%	22/158	13.93%	53/158	33.54%
1861-1870	95/184	51.63%	22/184	11.96%	67/184	36.41%
1871-1880	102/186	54.84%	20/186	10.75%	64/186	34.41%
1881-1890	81/177	45.76%	21/177	11.87%	75/177	42.37%
1891-1900	65/181	35.91%	23/181	12.71%	93/181	51.38%

rate, which is also not statistically significant (though it is worth noting that the difference between the 1891-1900 rate and all other cohorts is significant.).

⁹³ These numbers include only those women who married, both first and subsequent unions, they do not reflect those women who remained unmarried.

⁹⁴ These numbers include only those women who married, both first and subsequent unions, they do not reflect those women who remained unmarried.

Table 11: Twentieth Century (through 1920) Marriages by Decade⁹⁵

Decade	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
1901-1910	90/195 46.15%	22/195 11.29%	83/195 42.56%
1911-1920	72/186 38.71%	17/186 9.14%	97/186 52.15%

Commentators of the era, as well as historians such as David Cannadine, often stated that it was in about 1880 that changes began to take place that undermined traditional society. At that point, the aristocracy lost its overwhelming dominance in politics, economics, and culture. The patterns revealed in Table 10 above support these anecdotal perceptions. There is a significant (18.93 percent) decrease in endogamous marriage among these women between 1871 and 1900 that is echoed by a significant increase in exogamous marriage that is nearly as large (16.97 percent).

Some observers of the era pointed to a chafing against the social restrictions by the younger generation as an explanation for the increase in exogamous marriages in the latter part of the nineteenth century.⁹⁶ Cannadine, who points to the large number of marriages with American women and the daughters of wealthy capitalists as an indication of the increased porousness of the boundaries that divided the ranks socially after 1880 agrees with this assertion.⁹⁷ However, he refers only to the marriages of the men. There is no indication that the younger generation of aristocratic women mixed with a wider element in society, nor did they marry outside of their rank in larger numbers.

A closer examination of the specifics of the marital patterns for the last years of the nineteenth century indicates that the difference between the elite men and the women

⁹⁵ These numbers include only those women who married, both first and subsequent unions, they do not reflect those women who remained unmarried.

⁹⁶ Angela Lambert, *Unquiet Souls : A Social History of the Illustrious, Irreverent, Intimate Group of British Aristocrats Known as 'The Souls'* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 21.

⁹⁷ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 348.

was in actuality far more marked than the tables indicate. Many of the non-titled men who married aristocratic women had close ties to the aristocracy; for example, many had titled maternal grandfathers. Thus, the numbers indicate a substantial increase in non-endogamous marriages for women in that period, but the reality is more nuanced. The marital patterns of aristocratic men began to change due to the agricultural depression that seriously hurt incomes derived from land after 1880. At that point, they undertook other money-making endeavors, including marriage from a wider group of women. In the 1880s, 32 percent of peers (male) married endogamously, by 1900-1909 the number declined to less than 20 percent.⁹⁸ The pattern differed for women. As Tables 9 and 10 show, in the 1880s, 45.76 percent married within the aristocracy and by 1901-1910 the number remained quite stable at 46.15 percent.⁹⁹ The marital patterns of aristocratic British women remained far more constant than did those of aristocratic men.

The desires of elite women drove, at least in part, this continued emphasis on the importance of endogamy at the apex of the titular hierarchy in the nineteenth century. In the mid nineteenth century, Louisa Russell, Duchess of Abercorn¹⁰⁰ gained notoriety for her skills as a matchmaker. The Abercorns had seven daughters who all married into the titled nobility.¹⁰¹ According to Consuelo Vanderbilt, the American heiress who married

⁹⁸ Pamela Horn, *Ladies of the Manor: Wives and Daughters in Country-House Society, 1830-1918* (London: Alan Sutton, 1991), 70. Horn has taken her statistics from David Thomas, "The Social Origins of Marriage Partners."

⁹⁹ This difference is not statistically significant.

¹⁰⁰ She was married to James Hamilton (1811-1885), 1st Duke of Abercorn. He was the son of James Hamilton, Viscount Hamilton and the grandson of the 1st Marquess of Abercorn. He was a descendant of the Hamiltons whose leading place in peerage of Scotland goes back well before the sixteenth century.

¹⁰¹ Harriett married Thomas Anson, 2nd Earl of Lichfield; Beatrix married George Lambton, 2nd Earl of Durham; Louisa married William Montagu Douglas Scott, 6th Duke of Buccleuch; Katherine married William Edgcumbe, 4th Earl of Mount Edgcumbe; Georgiana married Edward Turnour, 5th Earl of Winteron; Albertha married George Spencer Churchill, 8th Duke of Marlborough; and Maud married Henry Petty-FitzMaurice, 5th Marquess of Lansdowne.

Louisa's grandson the 9th Duke of Marlborough,¹⁰² the young women had no choice about men whom they married. The Duchess made the choices based primarily on rank.¹⁰³ Like many other noble women, Louisa made no secret of her pursuit of a husband with a title for her daughters. Powerful women, who imposed exacting standards, enforced the distinctions as to appropriateness in the choice of spouse. Suitable social rank was an important consideration for aristocratic women when choosing a mate for themselves or their daughters. Dorothy Walpole writing in the first quarter of the twentieth century recalled, "Up to the middle of the last century 'birth' from a social point of view counted for everything..."¹⁰⁴ Dorothy's observation puts the change about three decades earlier than does Cannadine. The statistics support Cannadine's contention more than Walpole's.¹⁰⁵

The written remains of aristocratic women indicate their inclination toward endogamous marriage if at all possible, but because of changes in societal expectations toward the marriages of aristocratic men in the nineteenth century, many of these women found themselves without a suitable mate. In that case, they often remained unmarried. It is the contention of this study that aristocratic women were, in a sense, the personification of their rank. Families could safely consider themselves aristocratic if their daughters married within rank (or failing that did not marry at all) no matter whom their sons might marry. When the emphasis is on the marriage patterns of the women, it becomes evident

¹⁰² Charles Spencer-Churchill (1871-1934).

¹⁰³ Consuelo Balsan, *The Glitter and the Gold* (New York: Harper, 1953), 56.

¹⁰⁴ Dorothy Nevill, *Life and Letters of Lady Dorothy Nevill* (London: Methuen, 1919), 184.

¹⁰⁵ There is a relatively consistent falling off in the endogamy rate across the decades of the nineteenth century. The rate for 1841-50 was 53.46 percent; 1851-60: 52.53 percent (not a statistically significant difference); 1861-70: 51.63 percent (not a statistically significant difference). In 1871-80 the rate jumped to 54.84 percent (the difference is not statistically significant) before falling sharply to 45.76 percent in 1881-90 (not a statistically significant difference) and further dropping in the last decade of the century to 35.91 percent (this is not a statistically significant difference).

that social rank identification among aristocratic women remained vital throughout the long nineteenth century. The motivations toward marriage can be seen as essentially gendered. Aristocratic men married for reasons that differed from those of aristocratic women. It became the role of the women of this rank to maintain a sense of rank identity. One of the primary ways by which they did so was through their marriage choices and the marriages that they arranged for members of their families. The changing mores of society and the unchanging expectations of the aristocracy in the nineteenth century placed these women in a difficult position. They were very much a group under pressure.

Nineteenth-century aristocratic women worked diligently to maintain their rank and their place in the hierarchy, and they felt the loss keenly if their marriages did not allow them to preserve that status. Harriet Cavendish, Countess Granville wrote: “Mrs. Beilby Thompson¹⁰⁶ was a daughter of Lord Braybrooke.¹⁰⁷ She married Mr. Lawley who took the name Thompson, and she lamented her fate – to be born a Neville, to become a Lawley, and to die a Thompson.”¹⁰⁸ Lady Charlotte Bertie,¹⁰⁹ who felt that she had been placed outside of the bounds of polite company by her marriage into “trade” as well as her mother’s¹¹⁰ own unfortunate second marriage, made great efforts “to place my children on that footing with theirs [the children of the aristocracy]...”¹¹¹ She wrote in 1838:

¹⁰⁶ Caroline Neville.

¹⁰⁷ Richard Griffin (1751-1825), 2nd Baron Braybrooke. He was the son of Richard Neville. The 2nd Baron legally changed his name to Richard Griffin in 1797.

¹⁰⁸ Hon. F. Leveson-Gower, ed. *Letters of Harriet Countess Granville, 1810-1845* (London: Longmans, Green, 1894), II:33n.

¹⁰⁹ She was the daughter of the 9th Earl of Lindsey. She married Josiah Guest, one of the wealthiest industrialists of the time.

¹¹⁰ Charlotte Layard.

¹¹¹ Earl of Bessborough, ed., *Lady Charlotte Guest: Extracts from Her Journal, 1833-52* (London: John Murray, 1950), 71 & 131.

I have striven hard to place myself in the situation of life in which I was born and from which my mother's unfortunate marriage so long excluded me and now I really believe I have accomplished it and need not henceforth toil through pleasures for the sake of Society.¹¹² My children now, I hope and believe, will have none of those struggles to make which I have felt so much humiliated.¹¹³

These women believed that when they married exogamously they devalued their natal status as members of the aristocracy.

The relatively stable pattern changed dramatically in the twentieth century. It is generally argued that the attitudes toward rank and traditional Society in Britain changed radically after World War One.¹¹⁴ Some of the women who lived through the conflict echoed that sentiment. Edith Chaplin, the Marchioness of Londonderry wrote, "The war itself broke down many class barriers and the younger generation mix much more at games..."¹¹⁵ The implication was that if they "mix[ed] much more at games" they mixed much more elsewhere. The statistics support the assumption that aristocratic women married endogamously in somewhat smaller numbers in the period from 1890-1919,¹¹⁶ though the percentage of exogamous marriage did not significantly change.¹¹⁷ As Table

¹¹² There is a distinction between Society (with a capital S) and society (lower-case). Society when capitalized in this study refers to a specific group of elite people and their activities. Society with a lower-case s refers to Britain (or England, or Scotland, or Ireland as indicated) as a whole. The lower-case usage is the general collective noun. See the explanation in the Introduction.

¹¹³ Bessborough, *Lady Charlotte Guest*, 71. Her hopes would seem to have been realized. Her eldest son Ivor Guest was made 1st Baron Wimborne and married Cornelia Spencer-Churchill, daughter of the 7th Duke of Marlborough in 1868. Another of her sons, Thomas, married into elite circles, wedding Theodora Grosvenor, daughter of the 2nd Marquess of Westminster in 1877. Two of her daughters also married well: Constance married Hon. Charles Eliot, son of the 3rd Earl of St. Germans in 1865; Blanche married Edward Ponsonby, 8th Earl of Bessborough in 1875. Other daughters made less exalted matches: Katherine married Rev. Frederick Alderson; Charlotte married Richard DuCane.

¹¹⁴ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 351; Lenore Davidoff, *The Best Circles: Society, Etiquette, and the Season* (London: Croom Helm, 1973), 68. It would be interesting to look carefully at the marriage patterns of the aristocracy, both the men and the women, after the war to see if this observation is in fact accurate. A close examination of the backgrounds of the non-noble spouses might lead to interesting insights into the changes that occurred.

¹¹⁵ The Marchioness of Londonderry, *Retrospect* (London: Frederick Muller, 1938), 11.

¹¹⁶ In the period from 1870-1889 the endogamy rate was 50 percent and it fell to 43.10 percent in the period from 1890-1919. This is a statistically significant difference.

¹¹⁷ The exogamy rate increased from 38.3 percent in 1870-1889 to 45.75 percent in 1880-1919. This difference is statistically significant.

12 indicates, the first two decades of the twentieth century followed much the same pattern in endogamous marriage as the previous centuries (though exogamous marriage was already on the rise). It is in the third decade, following the end of the war, that there is the sharp decline in elite women marrying within their social rank.¹¹⁸

Table 12: Twentieth Century Marriages by Decade

Decade	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
1901-1910	90/195	46.15%	22/195	11.29%	83/195	42.56%
1911-1920	72/186	38.71%	17/186	9.14%	97/186	52.15%
1921-1930	44/151	29.14%	14/151	9.26%	93/151	61.60%
1931-1940	46/164	28.05%	11/164	6.71%	107/164	65.24%
1941-1950	27/152	17.76%	12/152	7.90%	113/152	74.34%
1951-1960	24/119	20.17%	15/119	12.60%	80/119	67.23%
1961-1970	18/118	15.25%	5/118	4.24%	95/118	80.51%
1971-1980	17/114	14.91%	8/114	7.02%	89/114	78.07%
1981-1990	14/122	11.45%	4/122	3.30%	104/122	85.25%
1991-2000	5/43	11.63%	1/43	2.32%	37/43	86.05%

A possible reason for this is the vast number of elite men who died in the conflict. The titled ranks were proportionately harder hit than were other social groups. In the first year of the war one out of every seven officers died in the conflict as compared with one out of every seventeen non-officers. Of the British and Irish peers and their sons who served 20 percent died in the fighting and of titled families owning 3,000 or more acres in 1883, nearly 10 percent lost their direct heir.¹¹⁹ The change in the marriage patterns may be due to a cause as simple as the fact that there were no longer enough noble men to go around. Other commentators put the change down to a more abstract alteration in attitudes: “The patriotic fervour of the armistice attached little place to social distinctions. Before the war, the officer corps had been the exclusive preserve of the upper classes. After 1918,

¹¹⁸ The decline in the endogamy rate of those marrying in 1921-1930 as compared with the previous decade is 9.57 percent, a large drop though one that is not statistically significant. The 17.01 percent difference between 1901-1910 and 1921-1930 is significant.

¹¹⁹ Madeleine Beard, *English Landed Society in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 1989), 25-26. Further discussion of this high death rate is found in the Conclusion.

any man with the title of Major or Captain was accepted as an equal.”¹²⁰ This quotation does not really serve to answer the question of “why?” It seems to simply restate the old truism that everything changed as a result of the Great War.¹²¹ Since the officer corps had been the bastion of the elite, after the War – even though officers were no longer automatically elite by birth – there was a tendency to continue to see members of that corps as being a part of the elite.

In 1916, Frances Maynard, Countess of Warwick wrote her reflections on the effect of World War One, “Without regard to money or to good looks some of the best elements of the race have mated. . . The minorities, noisy or silent, with which we must hereafter deal, the residue of profit hunters and pleasure-seekers, pass almost out of mind as one sees the extraordinary transformation that war has wrought in a class that was supposed to be utterly deaf to any call save the call of amusement.”¹²² She expanded on her views concerning the changes brought by the war on aristocratic women:

Over the not inconsiderable circle that I have the opportunity of observing there came, in the vast majority of cases, a startling change. . . They passed pleasure by, sought duty wherever it was to be found, and became supremely happy in its pursuit. . . But just as they were prepared less than two years ago to enjoy as good a time as life could afford, they are now committed to the hardest tasks within their competence. What they have lost in pleasure they have gained in self-respect, and a sense of true citizenship. . . They have one additional advantage in their new sphere: they have never known the pursuits of normal times. While the doors of the ball-room and all that lies beyond were still shut, the doors of the Temple of Janus were torn asunder. They have no regrets, they do not miss the flavour of what they have never tasted. Life is so full for them that if pleasure were within their grasp they would lack the leisure as well as the inclination to grasp it.¹²³

¹²⁰ Beard, *English Landed Society*, 56.

¹²¹ These types of statements are found scattered throughout the literature on the period. Very often, the writer gives no explanation of any depth as to why everything changed. The author simply states that everything did change.

¹²² Frances Greville, Countess of Warwick, *A Woman and the War* (New York: George H. Doon, c. 1916), 203.

¹²³ Warwick, *A Woman and the War*, 199-201.

While this picture of the nearly ascetic outlook of aristocratic women is certainly overdrawn (one just has to think of the “bright young things” of the 1920s), Frances is perhaps correct in her assessment that things had fundamentally altered for those women because of the war. They became less willing to accept their old roles and more willing to challenge the truths of society by which the aristocracy had always lived. Looking at their marriages after the war, something had altered the centuries-old patterns.

It is undeniable that something had changed in rank-consciousness of aristocratic women following 1920. This change did not occur quickly, but rather over a period of several decades, beginning in earnest after 1880¹²⁴ and escalating in the years immediately after the war. Following the argument of this study, that change in marriage patterns signals a change in consciousness of rank identity for the British nobility after 1920. What is also undeniable is that until that point, there was remarkable consistency evidenced in the marriage patterns and thus in the conception of rank identity. Despite great turmoil and change in British society as a whole, the understanding of what it meant to be an aristocrat remained essentially stable from 1485 until the shift began in 1880.

III. Elite Women’s reactions to Male Hypogamy and Exogamy

In the eighteenth century, concern arose about the perceived increase in exogamous marriages by aristocratic men. Commentators feared that marriages were becoming too mercenary.¹²⁵ While society¹²⁶ seemed to accept elite men marrying for money, it considered it inappropriate for elite women to do the same. The comments

¹²⁴ The date that both Cannadine and the statistics indicate that things began to change.

¹²⁵ Ingrid H. Tague, “Love, Honour, and Obedience: Fashionable Women and the Discourse of Marriage in the Early Eighteenth Century” *The Journal of British Studies* 40:1 (Jan. 2001), 79.

¹²⁶ Society in general may have accepted such marriages, but there is ample evidence that aristocratic women were at best ambivalent about the practice.

made by aristocratic women concerning the overtly financial reasons that some noble men had for making their marriage choices illustrates that their attitudes toward marriage outside of their rank had not appreciably altered. These women understood that if the men of their rank married outside of the rank, that left fewer suitable spouses for themselves.

There is no question but that nineteenth-century aristocratic women understood the importance of money. There existed, however, real limits to what they would do in order to get money and they drew the line firmly at marrying only for money. When a young woman was thought to be marrying a man who was not of an appropriate rank simply for his money, the comments were scathing. Maria Holyroyd, Lady Stanley wrote in November 1857 to her daughter-in-law Henrietta Dillon-Lee, “We saw Mr. West who told us that at the Wrexham Ball Arthur [Davenport] got beastly drunk and was carried out of the room after having insulted the Duke of Montrose,¹²⁷ -- and yet he will give him his daughter! I never knew a more dreadful sacrifice at the Altar of Mammon. How difficult to congratulate Lady Hatherton¹²⁸ [Davenport’s mother] properly,¹²⁹ yet I am glad on her account that the last and most likely disgrace of a low marriage has not taken place.”¹³⁰ This disinclination to marry for money did not restrict noble men actively involved in the pursuit of eligible heiresses. Aristocratic women may have had to endure this situation, but they did not have to approve of it. Comments from the period indicate that they did not endorse the idea of men marrying solely for money. Harriet Cavendish,

¹²⁷ James Graham (1799-1874), 4th Duke of Montrose.

¹²⁸ Caroline Hurt.

¹²⁹ Presumably because people knew that he was an unworthy match for Montrose’s daughter.

¹³⁰ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly: Their Letters Between 1851-1865* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1968), 157-158. This proposed marriage is discussed more fully in Chapter Two.

Countess of Granville, writing to her sister in 1832 said, “I hear Lord Yarmouth¹³¹ is fitting up his house and furnishing it in London, where he means to live. When this Lord left Paris he said he was going to look for a wife... He deprecated violently marrying a pretty or young thing, says what he wants is ‘something nearer thirty, somebody he could not have a jealous feeling about.’ Well, one is also told, that odd as it is, money is his great object, being his idol.”¹³²

Nineteenth-century aristocratic men married outside of their rank more frequently than did their sisters.¹³³ The women did not always accept the situation with good grace. They could be scathing about female interlopers. In 1844, the misalliance of a grandson upset the elder Lady Stanley of Alderly.¹³⁴ She referred to the prospective bride and her family as the “coachmaker’s granddaughter and her vulgar relations...”¹³⁵ In October 1844, she wrote to her daughter-in-law Henrietta¹³⁶ concerning the marriage of the son of Maria’s brother-in-law, the Bishop of Norwich to a Miss Clayton:

I do not think Charley’s marriage is a subject of congratulation for any of the family and I do wonder they did not put an end to it as soon as they knew anything of the matter being serious. No money at all I believe, no connection or rather a very inferior one and marriage, under the most favourable auspices must act as a blight and a clog to him in his career. . . I am rather surprised that her father listened favourably – but to him the connection would be flattering and his daughter would have enough to live on.¹³⁷

¹³¹ Richard Seymour-Conway, later 4th Marquess of Hertford (1800-1870). He died in Paris, unmarried.

¹³² Levison-Gower, ed. *Letters of Harriet, Countess of Granville*, II:132.

¹³³ Presumably because a man kept his rank but a woman lost hers.

¹³⁴ Maria Holyroyd.

¹³⁵ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 214.

¹³⁶ Henrietta Maria Dillon-Lee.

¹³⁷ Nancy Mitford, ed. *The Ladies of Alderly: Being the Letters Between Maria-Josephina, Lady Stanley of Alderly and her Daughter-in-Law, Henrietta Maria Stanley, During the Years 1841-1850* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1967), 101.

An early, and infamous, example of this type of match occurred in 1827, when Harriet Mellon, an actress and widow of the wealthy (and older) banker Thomas Coutts,¹³⁸ paid substantially for the privilege of marrying William de Vere Beauclerk, the 9th Duke of St. Albans.¹³⁹ Elizabeth Vassal, Lady Holland recorded in her journal that Harriet “has given the Duke £30,000 of her savings, and an estate valued at £26,000 in Essex. In return all his unsettled property is answerable to the Bank for any claims on it.”¹⁴⁰ This match gave Harriet a title to go along with the wealth from her first husband and it gave the Duke the money he desperately needed. Title and wealth, however, did not give Harriet the acceptance of aristocratic women in Society.

Even if men married outside of their rank for love rather than money, women could be ruthless. In 1888 Herbrand Russell, the 11th Duke of Bedford,¹⁴¹ married Mary Tribe, the daughter of the Archdeacon of Lahore¹⁴² upsetting his female relatives. The family attempted to prevent the match but when that failed his mother¹⁴³ left the family estate¹⁴⁴ before the newlyweds arrived and she never returned.¹⁴⁵ James Brudenell, 7th Earl of Cardigan¹⁴⁶ rode unchaperoned in Hyde Park with Miss Adeline de Horsey causing a great scandal in the 1850s. The Earl, who was married but formally separated at the time,¹⁴⁷ eventually married Miss de Horsey after his wife’s death in 1858. On July 20,

¹³⁸ Thomas Coutts (1735-1822).

¹³⁹ 1801-1849.

¹⁴⁰ Ilchester, *Journal of Elizabeth Lady Holland*, 65.

¹⁴¹ Herbrand Russell (1858-1940).

¹⁴² The Venerable Walter Tribe.

¹⁴³ Elizabeth Sackville-West.

¹⁴⁴ Woburn Abby.

¹⁴⁵ John Duke of Bedford, *A Silver-Plated Spoon* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), 27-28.

¹⁴⁶ James Brudenell (1797-1868). He is famous as the leader of the ill-fated charge of the Light Brigade.

¹⁴⁷ Cardigan’s first wife was Elizabeth Tollemache. Her first marriage to Lt. Col. Christian Johnstone ended in divorce in 1826.

1858, Lord Stanley¹⁴⁸ wrote to his wife¹⁴⁹ about the situation, “Lord Cardigan has been asking all his family if they will receive Miss de Donkey if he marries her, they say no, but notwithstanding they think he will marry her, but I don’t believe he will.”¹⁵⁰ In a bid for social acceptance, the couple gave a grand ball at the Earl’s residence, Deene Hall, but no one deigned to attend.¹⁵¹ The Earl’s sporting circles accepted the new Countess, but polite society and the court never welcomed her. In her memoirs published in 1909 Adeline wrote, “If Lord Cardigan and I had met in 1909 instead of 1857 no particular comment would have been made on our friendship, but in 1857 Society was scandalized because I had the courage to ride and drive with a married man who had an unfaithful wife.”¹⁵²

By the late nineteenth century, a market in wealthy brides led to the era of the Dollar Princesses.¹⁵³ This influx of rich American women concerned British aristocratic ladies. The trend really became widespread in the decades following the American Civil War when the fortunes amassed in North America began to outpace the commercial wealth of Europe.¹⁵⁴ According to David Cannadine, in the period between 1870 and 1914, 10 percent of aristocratic marriages were with Americans. In 1880, there were only four American peeresses, but by the outbreak of the First World War there were more than fifty.¹⁵⁵ Dorothy Walpole wrote “It was in the seventies that two new and powerful forces began to make their influence felt in society, for about that time the Americans . . .

¹⁴⁸ Edward Stanley, 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderly (1802-1869).

¹⁴⁹ Henrietta Maria Dillon-Lee.

¹⁵⁰ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 185.

¹⁵¹ Neville, *Life and Letters*, 192-193.

¹⁵² Countess of Cardigan and Lancastre, *My Recollections* (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1909) , 97.

¹⁵³ Dollar Princess is the term used to refer to the wealthy American heiresses, often the daughters of the Robber-Barons, who were marrying into the aristocracies of Europe in the period following the American Civil War.

¹⁵⁴ Wasson, *Aristocracy and the Modern World*, 109.

¹⁵⁵ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 347.

began to come to London in considerable numbers and then began those Anglo-American marriages which are quite common.” [The second force was wealth gained from the stock exchange.]¹⁵⁶ Dorothy’s biggest complaint about the Americans was their tendency toward unpunctuality.¹⁵⁷ Both Jennie Jerome and Consuelo Vanderbilt wrote of the disapproval that they received from the British aristocratic women in their Churchill husbands’ social circle.¹⁵⁸ In December 1824, Harriet Cavendish, Countess of Granville wrote from Paris to her sister Georgiana Cavendish, Lady Morpeth, about the Duke of Wellington’s American friend:

I called yesterday in obedience to the Duke of Wellington’s¹⁵⁹ entreaties, upon Mrs. Patterson.¹⁶⁰ She seems a very charming person, very handsome, with l’air noble and not a shade of her mother country. She shook all over when I went into the room, but if for grief at the loss of Mr. Patterson, sentiment at the recollection of the Duke, or the coldness of the room she received me in, I do not presume to judge.¹⁶¹

Mrs. Patterson continued to cause comment in the circle around the 1st Duke of Wellington. In October 1825, Harriet Fane wrote of the announcement by Richard Wellesley, 2nd Earl of Mornington, that he intended to make Mrs. Patterson his second wife,¹⁶² “I told him [Wellington] I was not the least surprised for that she had come to

¹⁵⁶ Lady Dorothy Nevill, *Leaves from the Notebooks of Lady Dorothy Nevill* (Lodon: Macmillan, 1907), 30-31. She goes on to add, “On the whole, I think the influx of the American element into English society has done good rather than harm, whilst there are many old families, which, both in mind and pocket, have been completely revived by prudent marriages with American brides.” In this view, Dorothy appears to be the exception that proves the rule as most elite women did not wholly approve of the influx of Americans.

¹⁵⁷ Lady Dorothy Nevill, *My Own Times*, ed. Ralph Nevill (London: Methuen, 1912), 153.

¹⁵⁸ Mrs. George Cornwallis-West (Lady Randolph Churchill), *The Reminiscences of Lady Randolph Churchill* (London: George Arnold, 1908), passim; Consuelo Balsam, *All that Glitters*, passim.

¹⁵⁹ Arthur Wellesley (1769-1852), 1st Duke of Wellington.

¹⁶⁰ Mrs. Patterson was an American who married Richard Wellesley, 1st Marquess Wellesley in 1825. Her maiden name was Marianne Caton, daughter of Richard Caton., a wealthy Baltimore businessman. Her first husband was Robert Patterson. One of her sisters, Louisa, married Francis Darcy-Osborne, the 7th Duke of Leeds, the other, Elizabeth, married George Jerningham, the 8th Baron Stafford of Cessey Hall. Mr. Patterson’s sister married Jerome Bonaparte.

¹⁶¹ Leveson-Gower, *Letters of Harriet, Countess of Granville*, I:323-324.

¹⁶² An announcement all the more shocking by the general belief that the proposed bride had been the Duke of Wellington’s mistress.

this country on a matrimonial speculation; that it was pretty well for the widow of an American shopkeeper to marry a Marquis.”¹⁶³

Female aristocratic disapproval of the mercenary marriages of some aristocratic men stemmed from their strong sense of rank identity. As wealthy women of no birth became Duchesses and Countesses, women born into those ranks could see the threat to their understanding of Society and their own place in it. The influx of wealthy women into aristocratic families carried with it the very real possibility of an alteration in the conception of rank identity among the nobility.

IV. National Trends

The picture concerning the on-going trend toward endogamy is somewhat altered when the data is separated by nation rather than by time frame. The marital patterns of the British nations over the period from 1485-2000 differed from one another. Tables 13 through 21 illustrate these patterns. These differences show the attitudes toward rank in England, Ireland, and Scotland. England had a relatively low rate of endogamous marriage in the sixteenth century and then it rose and held quite steady from the seventeenth through the nineteenth century¹⁶⁴ with a significant drop (though still not back down to sixteenth century levels) in the first two decades of the twentieth century.¹⁶⁵ English levels of exogamy steadily increased, except for a drop in the seventeenth century, through the twentieth century. The Scottish pattern was essentially the same as the English. The Irish followed a path of their own, which likely was due to their

¹⁶³ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:421.

¹⁶⁴ The differences between these centuries were not statistically significant while the sixteenth century differed significantly from all centuries with the exception of the first two decades of the twentieth.

¹⁶⁵ The difference between the sixteenth century and the period of 1901-1920 is not statistically significant.

experiences with English domination and the imposition of a largely foreign aristocracy. All statistics, except the specifically Irish data set, show that the seventeenth century was the most rank conscious as evidenced by the higher endogamy rate. In Ireland, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries show a proportionally lower rate of endogamy and higher rate of exogamy. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Ireland was subject to English rule and this situation had a profound impact on the make up of the Irish aristocracy. The crown gave Irish titles to many English that, while certainly noble, were not seen as the equivalent of English or Scottish peerages. It was then, more difficult for the Irish peerage to marry within rank. The fact that the Irish peerage was smaller than either the English or the Scottish groups further complicated the situation for them.¹⁶⁶ In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the daughters of the nobilities of the various nations tended to marry within their own nations.¹⁶⁷ Given the small size of the Irish aristocracy, marrying endogamously was that much more difficult for them than it was for English or Scottish aristocrats.

Tables 13, 14, and 15 break down the patterns first by nationality and then by century, while Tables 16 through 21 give the patterns first by century then by nationality. They use the same numbers but offer different means of comparison. These tables give the figures for marriages; unmarried women are not included in the sample. Their inclusion does change the percentages somewhat, and these figures can be found in Chapter Seven.

¹⁶⁶ This assertion is based on the number of marriages undertaken by the women of each group as shown in Tables 13, 14, and 15.

¹⁶⁷ See Appendix II, Table 53.

Table 13: English Marriage Pattern by Century

Century	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
16th	232/549	42.26%	169/549	30.78%	148/549	26.96%
17th	314/520	60.39%	107/520	20.58%	99/520	19.03%
18th	306/510	60.00%	53/510	10.39%	151/510	29.61%
19th	497/893	55.66%	90/893	10.07%	306/893	34.27%
20th	209/818	25.55%	56/818	6.85%	553/818	67.60%
1901-1920	88/201	43.78%	17/201	8.46%	96/201	47.76%

Table 14: Irish Marriage Pattern by Century

Century	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
16th	51/81	62.96%	9/81	10.98%	21/81	26.06%
17th	125/259	48.26%	46/259	17.76%	88/259	33.98%
18th	101/261	38.70%	36/261	13.79%	124/261	47.51%
19th	202/443	45.60%	43/443	9.97%	198/443	44.70%
20th	64/262	24.43%	27/262	10.30%	171/262	65.27%
1901-1920	31/92	33.70%	11/92	11.95%	50/92	54.35%

Table 15: Scottish Marriage Pattern by Century

Century	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
16th	195/361	54.02%	63/361	17.45%	103/361	28.53%
17th	255/402	63.43%	67/402	17.48%	80/402	19.90%
18th	148/307	48.21%	43/307	14.08%	116/307	37.71%
19th	143/339	42.18%	47/339	13.87%	149/339	43.95%
20th	74/271	27.31%	23/271	8.48%	174/271	64.21%
1901-1920	36/75	48.00%	9/75	12.00%	30/75	40.00%

Table 16: Sixteenth Century: Marriage Pattern by Nationality

Nationality	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
English	232/549	42.26%	169/549	30.78%	148/549	26.96%
Irish	51/81	62.96%	9/81	10.98%	21/81	26.06%
Scottish	195/361	54.02%	63/361	17.45%	103/361	28.53%
Welsh	8/11	72.73%	2/11	18.18%	1/11	9.09%

Table 17: Seventeenth Century: Marriage Pattern by Nationality

Nationality	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
English	314/520 60.39%	107/520 20.58%	99/520 19.03%
Irish	125/259 48.26%	46/259 17.76%	88/259 33.98%
Scottish	255/402 63.43%	67/402 17.48%	80/402 19.90%
Welsh	5/12 41.67%	4/12 33.33%	3/12 25.00%

Table 18: Eighteenth Century: Marriage Pattern by Nationality

Nationality	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
English	306/510 60.00%	53/510 10.39%	151/510 29.61%
Irish	101/261 38.70%	36/261 13.79%	124/261 47.51%
Scottish	148/307 48.21%	43/307 14.08%	116/307 37.779%
Welsh	8/14 57.14%	4/14 28.57%	2/14 14.29%

Table 19: Nineteenth Century: Marriage Pattern by Nationality

Nationality	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
English	497/893 55.66%	90/893 10.07%	306/893 34.27%
Irish	202/443 45.60%	43/443 9.97%	198/443 44.70%
Scottish	143/339 42.18%	47/339 13.87%	149/339 43.95%
Welsh	23/45 51.11%	5/45 11.11%	17/45 37.78%

Table 20: Twentieth Century: Marriage Pattern by Nationality

Nationality	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
English	209/818 25.55%	56/818 6.85%	553/818 67.60%
Irish	64/262 24.43%	27/262 10.30%	171/262 65.27%
Scottish	74/271 27.31%	23/271 8.48%	174/271 64.21%
Welsh	10/34 29.41%	5/34 14.71%	19/34 55.88%

Table 21: 1901-1920: Marriage Pattern by Nationality

Nationality	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
English	88/201 43.78%	17/201 8.46%	96/201 47.76%
Irish	31/92 33.70%	11/92 11.95%	50/92 54.35%
Scottish	36/75 48%	9/75 12%	30/75 40%
Welsh	5/11 45.45%	4/11 36.36%	2/11 18.19%

These tables illustrate that for the English and the Scottish the seventeenth century was the most rank-conscious of all centuries, while this was not true for the Irish. It seems most likely that this anomalous downward trend in the Irish patterns had a great deal to do with the heavy depredations suffered by that country during the War of the Three Kingdoms. Unlike the other nations, the Irish were far more likely to marry endogamously in the sixteenth century than at any other time. This is likely due to the fact that it was in the latter part of the sixteenth century that the English began to replace the native aristocracy with their own appointees. As is discussed in Appendix II, Society saw those Irish titles as being less desirable than were their English and Scottish counterparts. Being an Irish aristocrat was simply less prestigious.

The consistent attitudes toward rank are apparent on the smaller scale as well. Some elite families, like the Howards, had a centuries-long tradition of endogamous marriage indicating a strongly held conception of their place within the hierarchy. On November 22, 1877, *The Times* reported the marriage of Henry FitzAlan Howard, 15th Duke of Norfolk to Lady Flora Abney-Hastings, the daughter of the Countess of Loudoun.¹⁶⁸ “The union of the Duke with a lady who thus belongs at once to the noble

¹⁶⁸ Edith Rawdon-Hastings

houses of Hastings and Loudoun adds yet another to the series of brilliant alliances which for nearly five centuries have fallen to the lot of the heads of the Ducal house of Howard.”¹⁶⁹ From the period of the sixteenth through the twentieth century, information has been collected on 123 Howard¹⁷⁰ marriages and instances of non-marriage. The results, in Table 22, indicate their persistent tendency to marry within the elite and thus a persistent valuation of rank.

Table 22: Howard Marriages

Endogamous ¹⁷¹	Hypogamous ¹⁷²	Exogamous ¹⁷³	Unmarried ¹⁷⁴
65/113 57.52%	17/113 15.05%	31/113 27.43%	10/111 9.09%

It is not surprising that a family as exalted as the Howards should consistently marry well. Families of a less lofty status also show this pattern, for example, the Gordons of Scotland. Records exist for 72 marriages and instances of non-marriage from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries.

¹⁶⁹ “Marriage of the Duke of Norfolk,” *The London Times*, November 22, 1877, #29106, p. 6.

¹⁷⁰ This includes the larger family encompassing the FitzAlans and the FitzAlan-Howards.

¹⁷¹ This figure is generated by dividing the number of endogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Howard family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Howard family.

¹⁷² This figure is generated by dividing the number of hypogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Howard family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Howard family.

¹⁷³ This figure is generated by dividing the number of exogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Howard family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Howard family.

¹⁷⁴ This figure is generated by dividing the number of daughters within the Howard family who remained unmarried by the total number of daughters within the Howard family.

Table 23: Gordon Marriages

Endogamous ¹⁷⁵	Hypogamous ¹⁷⁶	Exogamous ¹⁷⁷	Unmarried ¹⁷⁸
36/67 53.73%	4/67 5.97%	27/67 40.30%	5/57 8.77%

Even for Irish nobles, the trend toward endogamy holds true. An examination of the Butlers indicates a pattern that is substantially the same as that of the Howards and the Gordons.

Table 24: Butler Marriages

Endogamous ¹⁷⁹	Hypogamous ¹⁸⁰	Exogamous ¹⁸¹	Unmarried ¹⁸²
40/70 57.14%	9/70 12.86%	21/70 30.00%	6/58 10.35%

There are, of course, families who do not have this strong bent toward endogamy, but among those families who have held elite status over the full five centuries under consideration nearly all practice in-marriage at well over the rate of 50 percent.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁵ This figure is generated by dividing the number of endogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Gordon family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Gordon family.

¹⁷⁶ This figure is generated by dividing the number of hypogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Gordon family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Gordon family.

¹⁷⁷ This figure is generated by dividing the number of exogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Gordon family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Gordon family.

¹⁷⁸ This figure is generated by dividing the number of daughters within the Gordon family who remained unmarried by the total number of daughters within the Gordon family.

¹⁷⁹ This figure is generated by dividing the number of endogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Butler family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Butler family.

¹⁸⁰ This figure is generated by dividing the number of hypogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Butler family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Butler family.

¹⁸¹ This figure is generated by dividing the number of exogamous marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Butler family by the total number of marriages, 1485-2000, of daughters within the Butler family.

¹⁸² This figure is generated by dividing the number of daughters within the Butler family who remained unmarried by the total number of daughters within the Butler family.

¹⁸³ Among these families are the Douglasses, including the Douglas-Pennants, Douglas-Hamiltons, and the Douglas-Scott-Montagus married in at the rate of 56 percent. The Elphinstones at 67 percent, the Erskines

V. Conclusion

There is no question that endogamy was something that aristocratic families, especially aristocratic mothers, desired for their daughters. The evidence in documents such as letters, wills, and diaries is obvious on that score. The statistics indicate that marriage within rank was more an ideal than a firm practice as the endogamy rate hovered at only about 50 percent for most of the period. It may well have been that it was prohibitively expensive to marry all daughters into the titled ranks.¹⁸⁴ It may have been something as simple as there not being enough available men of high rank for all of the well-born daughters to marry. It was not, however, only the impersonal forces of the rank that attempted to enforce proper marriages. Aristocratic women also attempted to protect the principle of endogamy through their control of their social sphere. This insistence on the desirability of endogamy remained quite constant at least from 1485 to 1920, even as the rates began to fall after 1880.

at 60 percent, the FitzGeraldts at 61 percent, the Grahams at 53 percent, the Hamiltons at 64 percent, the Hays at 52 percent, the Hepburns at 79 percent, the Kerrs at 55 percent, the Manners at 67 percent, the Murrays at 54 percent, the O'Briens at 89 percent, the Percys at 60 percent, the Roches at 80 percent, the Russells at 70 percent, the Sackvilles at 60 percent, the Somersets at 65 percent, the Stanleys at 60 percent, the Stewarts at 67 percent, the Thynnes at 88 percent, the Willoughbys at 50 percent. Exceptions to the pattern included the Frasers who have married endogamously at only 39 percent, the Lindsays at 40 percent, the Lyons (including the Boyes-Lyons) at 48 percent, the Montgomeries at 36 percent, the Nevills at 27 percent (interestingly, the Nevills are quite unusual in their tendency to marry hypogamously 34 percent of the time), the Plunketts at the very low rate 19 percent, and the Seymours at 40 percent.

¹⁸⁴ A discussion of the financial arrangements attendant upon these marriages is found in Chapter Two.

Chapter Two: The Practical Considerations of Marriage

I. Introduction

Throughout this study the point is made that unmarried aristocratic women were often little more than cogs in the prestige-enhancing plans of their natal families and that across the centuries this resulted in a consistent push toward endogamy. The letters and journals of the women themselves repeatedly underscore the perceived need to marry in conformity with the expectations of their families. Very frequently, they indicated that high rank was among the most important attributes for a potential spouse.¹ It was very critical in the lives of aristocratic British women that they marry order to benefit their natal families, which meant an endogamous union.² Initially, following the dictates of duty, most elite women married husbands chosen by their families. However, that level of overt parental control became less acceptable as the centuries progressed. A convincing discourse about the desirability of marrying well intensified in the eighteenth century, likely to take the place of the outright coercion of previous centuries. Through the years between 1485 and 2000, the financial settlements that families negotiated prior to a marriage bear testament to the importance of monetary and rank considerations in these unions. Those settlements demonstrate the centrality of money to the aristocracy's conception of rank identity. The outward signs of rank -- the country house, an elaborate wardrobe, participation in the London Season -- depended upon the possession of sufficient wealth. Aristocratic families pursued marriages that facilitated the creation and

¹ The expectations of the women and their families are discussed more fully in Chapter Six.

² The pattern began to shift toward more exogamous marriages between 1880 and 1920, but there is still evidence that the ideal persists among aristocratic families. Liza Campbell, the daughter of the 6th Earl of Cawdor (Hugh Campbell, 1932-1993) recounts her father's desire that his daughters take good care of their looks so that they could marry into the aristocracy. Liza Campbell, *A Charmed Life: Growing Up in Macbeth's Castle* (New York: St. Martin's, 2006), 182-183.

preservation of family alliances. The British aristocracy tended to form blocs designed to further their collective interests and to preserve their sense of rank identity. Marriage among and between the families of these blocs helped to preserve those factional alliances. Noble women utilized those kinship groups to further the interests of both themselves and their families. Marriage for noble British women was often an arrangement that necessitated a very practical approach to a very personal relationship.

II. Family Expectations and the Question of Arranged Marriage

For nearly five centuries, Society expected that aristocratic women would subjugate their own personal desires to the needs of their family. One of the primary ways in which this requirement made itself felt in their lives was in the matter of their marriages. These women were to marry a man either of their own rank or from ranks above them and thus bring honour and even financial gain to their natal family. Statistics shown in Table 25 indicate that roughly half of these women did fulfill those expectations:

Table 25: Rates of Endogamous Marriage³

Century	Overall	1st Marriage	Subsequent
16	486/1,003 48.46%	408/822 49.64%	78/181 43.09%
17	699/1,193 58.59%	601/997 60.34%	98/196 50.00%
18	564/1,095 51.51%	523/991 52.78%	41/104 39.42%
19	869/1,722 50.46%	832/1626 51.17%	37/96 38.54%
20	358/1,386 25.83%	329/1171 28.10%	29/215 13.50%
20th to 1920	162/381 42.52%	159/356 44.66%	3/25 ⁴ 12.00%
1485-2000	2976/6399 46.51%	2693/5607 48.03%	283/792 35.73%
1485-1920	2780/5394 51.54%	2523/4792 52.65%	257/602 42.69%

³ These percentages are only of marriages, the numbers of unmarried women do not influence these figures.

⁴ These numbers are a bit misleading since many subsequent marriages would have taken place after 1920.

Socialization encouraged endogamy. The values inculcated in aristocratic women by their parents resulted in an understanding, at least in the period from 1485 to 1880-1920, that it was their role to marry a man of suitable rank. Many factors ensured that most women did not resist the demands of their parents. Financial dependence, recognition of the obvious advantages to marrying well, and belief that disobedience constituted a grievous sin all influenced young women into compliance.⁵ This emphasis on the will of the family existed across Britain in all periods, until it fell off sharply after the First World War.

Early-modern noble parents were frequently ruthless in their control of their daughters' lives, including (perhaps especially) as regards to their marriages.⁶ Aristocratic women learned the duty of filial obedience at a very young age and certainly, that emphasis on obedience included acceding to parental choices concerning marriage.⁷

⁵ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 59.

⁶ Since the hypogamous marriage had not yet been devalued by the creation of the baronet, the table below indicates that women married well, in accordance with the needs of their natal family, nearly 73 percent of the time.

Table 26: Sixteenth Century: Percentage of 1st and Subsequent Marriage by Type

	1st Marriage		Subsequent Marriage	
Endogamous	408/822	49.64%	78/181	43.09%
Hypogamous	203/822	24.70%	40/181	22.10%
Exogamous	211/822	25.67%	63/181	34.81%

⁷ There were, however, some early modern parents who did not approve of arranged marriages. In the last half of the sixteenth century, Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk, very forcefully opposed arranged marriages. She allowed her children to choose their own spouses. When the Duke of Somerset proposed a match between his daughter and Katherine's son, she declined the offer, "[I] cannot tell what unkindness one of us might show the other than to bring our children into so miserable a state as not to choose by their own liking. I have said this for his daughter as well as my son. . . It is best that we keep our friendship and let our children follow our example, to begin their love of themselves without forcing them." In another letter on the subject she wrote, "The loss of free choice is enough to break the greatest love." (Judith Mackin, "The Life of Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk" (PhD dissertation, Utah State University, 2000), 29).

Katherine's disapproval of forced marriage is hardly shocking. Her own background as a highly sought after heiress who married a much older man probably contributed in a personal way to her antipathy. This attitude toward marriage did not always generate a happy outcome. In 1577, her son Peregrine Bertie decided, against his mother's wishes, to marry Mary de Vere, the sister of the 17th Earl of Oxford (Edward de Vere, 1516-1562). Katherine wrote to William Cecil that Peregrine was determined to

A famous case of the bullied bride was Lady Jane Grey, who by her own account was beaten into agreeing to marry the Duke of Northumberland's son, Guildford Dudley.⁸ Perhaps the only story to rival that of Lady Jane for parental brutality is the one told of Sir Edward Coke,⁹ the early seventeenth-century ex-Chief Justice. Contemporary gossips alleged that he forcibly removed his daughter Frances from her mother's household and then had the young woman tied to the bedpost and cruelly whipped to force her to consent to a marriage to the brother of the King's favourite, the Duke of Buckingham,¹⁰ so as to ensure his own return to favour at court. The groom in question was mentally unstable and homosexual and, not surprisingly, the marriage failed as the bride soon eloped with a lover¹¹ more to her liking.¹² Less violent, but equally as unwelcome to the bride, was the marriage of Elizabeth Stafford, the daughter of the 3rd Duke of Buckingham¹³ to Thomas Howard, the future 3rd Duke of Norfolk. Initially her father

have his way in this matter. Katherine expressed misgivings based on an incident in which the Earl of Oxford, Mary herself and her friends had snubbed Katherine and her family (likely due to Katherine's second marriage to Richard Bertie, a man far below her in rank). Katherine, a staunch Protestant, also feared that Mary was not religiously sound (Mackin, "The Life of Katherine Willoughby," 46). Despite these misgivings, there is no evidence that Katherine did anything substantial to hinder her son in his choice. Katherine was unusual, but not unique, in her attitude toward arranged marriages. In 1584, Sir Francis Willoughby wrote of his disinclination to force his daughters into marriage. (Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 597).

⁸ This marriage ended tragically for both Jane and Guildford. She is most famous as the ill-fated Nine Days' Queen. The Duke of Northumberland, who was regent for Edward VI in the final years of the reign persuaded the young king to alter his will in order to disinherit both of his sisters and to leave the throne to his cousin Jane (who happened to be Northumberland's daughter-in-law). When Edward died in 1553, Jane was duly proclaimed Queen, but in nine days the attempt to alter the succession had failed and Mary I was Queen. Many of those involved in the conspiracy were executed including the teenage couple Jane and Guildford.

⁹ 1549-1633

¹⁰ John Villiers, 1st Viscount Purbeck (1591-1658).

¹¹ Sir Robert Howard with whom she had a son. She was found guilty of adultery and sentenced to stand in the Savoy church in a white sheet and ordered to pay a fine. She eventually fled to the Channel Islands.

¹² Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 182.

¹³ Edward Stafford (1478-1521). Buckingham was the leading nobleman in the early years of Henry VIII's reign so marriage with his daughter was a real coup for Thomas Howard. Buckingham was executed on charges of treason.

betrothed her to his ward, the future Earl of Westmorland.¹⁴ When Howard expressed an interest in her, that betrothal was broken. Despite her objections, the fifteen year-old Elizabeth married the thirty-five year-old Norfolk.¹⁵ It was not a happy marriage and the couple separated and fought bitterly for much of their lives.¹⁶

Elizabeth's experience supports Lawrence Stone's argument that daughters were more subject to parental control than were sons as they had little means to support themselves.¹⁷ Similarly, Barbara Harris contends that arranged marriages often posed greater difficulties for the women involved than for the men. Both the culture of early modern Britain with its emphasis on female submissiveness and the dependence of young women on their families for dowries made it much more difficult for daughters to defy the wishes of their families.¹⁸ Parents had a moral obligation to see their daughters suitably married, and furthermore, that they raised their daughters in such a way that the girls were both unable and unwilling to resist this social dictate.¹⁹

In the seventeenth century, Society began to disapprove of overtly forced marriages. In her biography of Cassandra Brydges, the Duchess of Chandos, Rosemary O'Day writes that at that time both aristocratic sons and daughters were increasingly able to make an actual choice of a spouse rather than to just exercise a veto.²⁰ Lenore Davidoff asserts that by the nineteenth century, blatantly arranged marriages were not acceptable

¹⁴ Ralph Nevill, 4th Earl of Westmorland (1498-1549). He married Elizabeth's younger sister Katherine in 1520 and they had eighteen children.

¹⁵ Barbara Harris, "Marriage Sixteenth Century Style: Elizabeth Stafford and the Third Duke of Norfolk," *Journal of Family History* 15 (1982), 372.

¹⁶ Linda Pollock, *With Faith and Physic: The Life of a Tudor Gentlewoman, Lady Grace Mildmay, 1552-1620* (New York: St. Martin's, 1995), 8.

¹⁷ Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 594.

¹⁸ Harris, "Power, Profit and Passion," 61.

¹⁹ Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 594-95.

²⁰ Rosemary O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges Duchess of Chandos, 1670-1735: Life and Letters* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), 69.

and families allowed daughters to make their own choices. This relative freedom of choice²¹ did not mean that families accepted any man their daughters might select. A perceived lack of sufficient income often meant that parents would not consent to the union.²² The need to balance emotion with practical considerations was obviously at play in the 1850s when Edward Stanley, the 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderly discussed the marriage of his daughter Alice. Augustus Lane-Fox²³ had made an offer for her hand, but Lord Stanley had some doubts about the suitability of the match. Lady Stanley²⁴ wrote to her husband in September 1852, “I am very sorry you do not take Alice’s affair more kindly. I am sure now it will break her heart if you refuse, Blanche²⁵ says she is so very anxious and nervous. All I know is that Lady Caroline²⁶ says her son will have 1000 now and 1500 at her death. They were hurt at the short way they were refused.”²⁷ Lord Stanley reconsidered, writing to his wife later that same month:

Alice is in very good spirits and seems to amuse herself greatly with the young Major.²⁸ I have said nothing positively as yet except that I must hear more positive particulars before I can definitely consent. If Major Fox has 2500 besides his commission it is probably not a case to refuse one’s consent, ie. supposing they are both really earnestly and sincerely in love and know their own minds, which by this time they ought to do.²⁹

²¹ Which was somewhat constrained by the social circle in which these women moved. Great care was taken to ensure that they did not attend events where they might meet undesirable men. See Chapter Six for a fuller discussion of the Season and Society.

²² Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 49.

²³ Later Fox-Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900)

²⁴ Henrietta Dillon-Lee

²⁵ Henrietta Blanche Stanley, the younger sister of Alice.

²⁶ Caroline Douglas.

²⁷ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 48-49.

²⁸ Fox-Lane

²⁹ The couple, married in February of 1853, enjoyed a long and happy marriage and produced nine children. Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 49-50.

The mothers of the couple in this case advocated for the match and in their communication with one another and with Baron Stanley they indicated their wish to balance the emotional desires of the couple with the practical concerns of the families.

In the nineteenth century, the highest levels of society emphasized the need for paternal approval of proposed marriages. On August 7, 1860, Lord Clarendon³⁰ wrote to his friend the Duchess of Manchester,³¹ about the marital drama in the household of their mutual acquaintance Edward Smith-Stanley, the 14th Earl of Derby:³²

Miladi had a letter this morning from Lord Derby announcing that Derby had at last given his consent to Lady Emma's³³ marriage with Talbot.³⁴ I am glad of this as she would marry no one else and neither her spirits or her health being the better for what seemed to be hopeless expectation as D: was very positive and she would not marry against his consent. Lady D:³⁵ seems very happy about it though she says it is a bad marriage in a worldly point of view but that will be D's fault, as with his enormous fortune and an eldest son who ignores womankind and is a sort of political mark he might make his daughter perfectly comfortable.³⁶

The dangers of a poor marriage and the unhappiness that came from one were on the minds of many nineteenth-century aristocratic parents. The Dowager Lady Lyttelton³⁷ wrote to her daughter-in-law, Sarah Spencer: "I advise you and all such of you who are wishing for pretty daughters to lay in a great stock of good nerves and calm temper against [the time when] they are grown up. So many chances against a happy marriage or a peaceful old maidenhood! So much to be encountered on the road to either! And such frequent failures half-way. . ."³⁸ The expectation to please parents caused many young

³⁰ George Villiers, 4th Earl of Clarendon (1800-1870).

³¹ Luise von Alten

³² 1799-1869

³³ Emma Stanley.

³⁴ Hon. Wellington Chetwynd-Talbot, a younger son of the 2nd Earl Talbot.

³⁵ Emma Bootle-Wilbraham.

³⁶ Kennedy, "*My Dear Duchess:*" *Social and Political Letters to the Duchess of Manchester, 1858-1869* (London: John Murray, 1956), 112.

³⁷ Caroline Bristow.

³⁸ Wyndham, *Correspondence*, 397-398.

women anxiety. Many feared having to marry someone they did not love in order to conform to parental wishes. This was certainly the concern of Elizabeth Berkeley, later Margravine of Anspach, who recalled that when she was fourteen she confessed to her uncle that her great fear was that her mother would force her to marry against her will. She then offered a deal, "... on the condition that my mother would cease forever to tease me to marry a man I might dislike, I would marry any one my mother chose whom I myself might not dislike."³⁹ It would seem that young women had cause for concern. In 1814, Lady Caroline Paget wrote to her mother-in-law,⁴⁰ "I believe the Duchess of Richmond⁴¹ intends to have Lord Hotham⁴² for Lady Georgiana,⁴³ she has taken him with her to the Hague and is always giving parties to bring them together, he is quite young, in the Guard, hideously ugly, very stingy, and has £20,000 per year."⁴⁴ The Duchess of Richmond was quite busy with her daughters at this time. In November 1815, Caroline Paget's daughter Georgiana⁴⁵ continued with the sad story, writing to her grandmother:

You have, I conclude, heard of Lady Sarah Lennox's marriage with General Maitland⁴⁶ which was effected not in the most reputable manner. The return of the Duchess of Richmond is now post-poned in consequence of the approaching nuptials of Lady Mary [Lennox] and Sir Henry Bradford, an almost penniless

³⁹ Elizabeth Berkeley Craven Anspach, *Memoirs of the Margravine of Anspach Written by Herself* (London: Henry Colburn, 1826): I:41.

⁴⁰ Harriet Bladen.

⁴¹ Charlotte Gordon.

⁴² Beaumont Hotham, 3rd Baron Hotham. He succeeded his grandfather to the baronage in 1814. He never married.

⁴³ Georgiana Lennox.

⁴⁴ Marquess of Anglesey, ed., *The Capel Letters: Being the Correspondence of Lady Caroline Capel and Her Daughters with the Dowager Countess of Uxbridge from Brussels and Switzerland, 1814-1817* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1955), 78. In this case the match did not come off, Beaumont, 3rd Baron Hotham (1794-1870) died unmarried while Georgiana Lennox married the 22nd Baron de Ros in 1824. That marriage excited some comment: "What an odd marriage William de Ros's is! Such an odd match for the girl, matchmaking and manoeuvre in the days of her youth going off in romance at eight and twenty." Levison-Gower, *Letters of Harriet Countess Granville*, I: 292.

⁴⁵ Georgiana Capel.

⁴⁶ General Sir Peregrine Maitland (d. 1854).

Colonel in the Guards. The Duchess's high-flown hopes are dashed to the ground and will not I fear improve her *gentle* temper...⁴⁷

Disappointed hopes challenged the "gentle" temper of many aristocratic mothers. A generation later the marital concerns of the Lennox family continued, "They say Lady C Lennox⁴⁸ is to marry Lord Bingham⁴⁹ as no one else who was expected will propose. The Duchess does not like it and wants something better."⁵⁰

Aristocratic women frequently discussed the vicissitudes created by familial requirements, sometimes a bit sharply. Harriett Fane wrote in 1826 about

...the failure of a marriage between Mr. Fox, Lord Holland's eldest son and Miss Villiers. She is a very clever, pretty girl, and he fell in love with her two years ago; his parents objected on the score of poverty and he went abroad. He has remained faithful to his love and returned a few weeks ago only to renew his offers and protestations of constancy. Lord, and especially Lady, Holland are inexorable.... There is no objection possibly to be made to Miss Villiers, except that her father was a government defaulter. It happens, however, that the same stigma attaches to the Holland family; and, when one remembers that Lady Holland was divorced from her first husband, has a natural son going about the world..., it is a little to bad that she should presume to object to a young lady more highly born than herself and of irreproachable manners and character. It will serve them quite right if Mr. Fox marries a dancer.⁵¹

It was not just parental expectations that could spoil a proposed marriage. The extended family, including children, could stand in the way of a desired second match. Rumours circulated that Lady Chesterfield⁵² did not marry Benjamin Disraeli because her daughter⁵³ objected to the match.⁵⁴ Being the former Prime Minister could not offset the deficiencies caused by being Jewish and middle-class.

⁴⁷ Anglesey, *The Capel Letters*, 149. Her gentle temper may have been improved by the fact that this union did not occur. Instead Mary married Sir Charles Fitzroy in 1820.

⁴⁸ Cecilia Gordon-Lennox.

⁴⁹ Charles Bingham (1830-1914).

⁵⁰ Just why the Duchess was unhappy is a bit unclear, Lord Bingham was the eldest son of the Earl of Lucan. Mitford, ed., *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 185 & n.

⁵¹ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, II:36-37.

⁵² Anne Weld-Forester.

⁵³ Evelyn Stanhope.

British aristocratic women consistently lived with the pressure to marry in accordance with parental wishes. Though over the centuries, that pressure perhaps lessened, it never wholly went away. The emphasis on endogamy discussed in Chapter One was, at least in large part, due to the duty to fulfill parental expectations. Aristocratic women grew to adulthood with the knowledge that their lives were to be lived in such a way as to bring honour to their natal families.

III. Financial Arrangements

Between 1485 and 1920, money constituted a driving force⁵⁵ in the marriage decisions of the aristocracy.⁵⁶ A man of rank, but no means, did not represent a desirable marriage prospect. Families recognized that sufficient wealth was necessary in order for a couple to live in the style that rank required. For noble women, the lack of money in a

⁵⁴ Nevill, *Life and Letters*, 178.

⁵⁵ For much of the period under consideration here it was second to rank, though the two were not easily separated. Men who were of appropriate rank most often also had appropriate fortunes (though the reverse was not always true).

⁵⁶ The importance of the marriage settlement and the financial arrangements attendant on those negotiations can be seen in a tangible way by looking at the formal documents. In the British Library there are a large number of these manuscripts, which in their elaborate nature indicate the seriousness with which these matters were taken. These include: BL Add. MSS 2747 f. 274 Inscribed on the outside in a later hand: "Lady Catherine Bertie, dtr of Rbt Earl of Lindsey marriage articles. He to settle an estate of 1,000£ per annum and to receive for her fortune 1,000£. 22 June 1629"; BL Add. Ch. 55589: License for Hon. Benedict Calvert, (later 5th Baron Baltimore) to marry Lady Charlotte Lee, daughter of the Earl of Lichfield., 1699 This is a lovely parchment document with pen illustrations of exotic men, birds, and fanciful flying fish in the margin. In Latin. It is headed in huge script "Thomas." BL Add. MSS 40631 f. 33. Articles for proposed marriage between Lady Anne Cecil (later m. Algernon, 4th Earl of Northumberland) with A. Capell. Before 1627. Far less elaborate than later examples. In Latin. Lists the properties concerned. Add. 3871. Indenture of marriage of Catherine Dashwood, 1718. It is longer and more elaborate than the earlier ones. It sets out her portion, £10,000. Lists lands in great detail. BL Add. MSS 33579 ff. 1-8. Covenant of marriage between Katherine Clinton (daughter of Edward Baron Clinton, later 1st Earl of Lincoln) and Lord Burgh. 1552.

potential mate could scuttle an otherwise good match. Parents felt that they had a duty to ensure the financial security of their daughters.⁵⁷

Financial Aspects of Marriage Negotiations

Money was an important factor in decisions concerning aristocratic women. The tendency for commentators to refer to marriageable women as the sum of their fortune indicates the importance of money in marital considerations.⁵⁸ The aristocracy consistently saw marriage as a relationship entered into to improve the status and material well-being of the natal families of the couple involved (not necessarily the emotional well-being of the couple themselves).⁵⁹ Aristocratic families and their legal advisors took a great deal of care in crafting the financial considerations attendant upon these matches. The sums involved were often substantial. The emphasis on the financial aspects of the proposed unions remained quite constant from 1485-2000. The letters and diaries of elite women make it apparent that they were as concerned with the monetary elements of the marriages within their families as were the men. Sufficient means ensured that the trappings of rank identity were possible.

An important part of the marriage negotiations consisted of setting the amount of the dowry that a woman would bring with her and the monetary settlement that would ensure the family's security in the event of the husband/father's death. The dowry, or portion, was the property that she brought to the marriage. It came under the control of her husband immediately upon marriage. If some of her portion came in the form of land,

⁵⁷ This can be seen in the context of a culture of reciprocal duty. It was the duty of daughters to marry well according to their parents' will and it was the duty of parents to ensure that their daughter was financially secure following that marriage.

⁵⁸ For example, Lady Katherine £20,000 is a very lovely young woman.

⁵⁹ Slater, "The Weightiest Business," 26.

she might possibly recover control of it if she outlived than her spouse. Common law dower rights stipulated that a widow had a lifetime right to a third of the freehold land her husband had owned.⁶⁰ In the negotiations of marriage contracts, the ratio between a woman's portion and her widow's jointure⁶¹ commanded a great deal of attention. For the nobility in the first half of the seventeenth century that ratio was generally about five-to-one. This proportion rose to ten-to-one in the last half of the century.⁶² Since most jointures took the form of annuities, the actual amount a woman received in her lifetime depended wholly on how long she outlived her husband. The important consideration was then the number of years a woman had to live beyond her husband's death in order to gain full value for her portion. The ratio of ten-to-one that was prevalent in the second half of the seventeenth century meant that a woman who lived more than a decade longer than her husband, received more in jointure than she invested in portion.⁶³ From the beginning of the seventeenth into the early eighteenth centuries jointures increased in value approximately 250 percent. The average jointure rose from about £3,700 to about £9,600. Inflation in the price of land caused some of this increase, since commonly noble families used jointure money to purchase land.⁶⁴ Because the jointure represented a woman's only guarantee of financial solvency in widowhood, parents took great care in determining them. In 1524, Maud Green ended negotiations for a marriage between her daughter Katherine (the future sixth wife of Henry VIII) and Henry, Lord Scrope's heir⁶⁵

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁶¹ The jointure was the money and property that was to come to the woman if she were to be widowed. It was intended to be her support.

⁶² This means that at the ratio of five to one, the dowry was five times the size of the widow's yearly jointure. So, if her dowry was £5,000 she received £1,000 per year as a widow.

⁶³ Erickson, "Common Law vs. Common Practice," 30.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 30-31.

⁶⁵ John Scrope, later 8th Lord Scrope of Bolton (d. 1549). He married Katherine Clifford, daughter of the 1st Earl of Cumberland c. 1530.

because of Lord Scrope's⁶⁶ insufficient offer concerning the jointure.⁶⁷ Amy Erickson argues that "the primary purpose of a marriage settlement in early modern England was to preserve the wife's property rights..."⁶⁸ Beginning in the seventeenth century there occurred a rise in the use of separate estate for married women. Perhaps this came about due to the increased emphasis on personal rather than real property and to the greatly expanding size of marriage portions, which made fathers more concerned with protecting their daughters' rights from spendthrift sons-in-law. A married woman's separate estate protected her independent ownership of a specified property during the marriage, thus avoiding coverture. This practice ultimately was the basis for reform of nineteenth century property law in regards to married women.⁶⁹

At the time of the marriage negotiations, the parties determined the financial rights of daughters and younger sons. Very often, the agreements mandated the use of strict settlement. Strict settlement followed primogeniture in entailing property through the eldest son to his eldest son and so on. Generally, only the nobility practiced strict settlement, as it primarily protected their property interests. However, it was only one of

⁶⁶ Henry, 7th Lord Scrope of Bolton (c. 1480-c.1533).

⁶⁷ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 46. This concern for widows' rights was present at the gentry level as well. In 1693 Sir Francis Fane married Dorothy Heron, daughter of Sir Henry Heron. Their marriage settlement is in the British Library, Add. MSS 38579 ff. 33-38. Among other agreements it states: "A jointure being otherwise provided for and settled by and out of ___ lands " "So intended to be had should happen to survive and outlive Francis Fane, her intended husband." In 1718, negotiations were completed for the marriage of Catherine Dashwood, daughter of Sir Robert Dashwood, 1st Bart. and Sir Robert Jenkinson, 4th Bart. "That (for and in consideration of the said intended marriage and also for and in consideration of the sum of £10,000... the portion of the said Catherine Dashwood by the said Sir Robert Dashwood paid or ___ to be paid in the proportioned manner, viz £2,000 part ___ Robert Bauks Jenkinson and £8,000 residue thereof in to the hands of the said Robert Dashwood." "For the purposes ___ aforementioned which the said Sir Robert Bauks Jenkinson doth hereby acknowledge and for making a provision and settlement to, for, and upon the said Catherine Dashwood (in case this marriage take effect and she shall happen to survive the said Sir Robert Bauks Jenkinson) and also ___ the issue of the said intended marriage.." BL Add. MSS 38579 ff. 51-77

⁶⁸ Amy L Erickson, "Common Law vs. Common Practice: the Use of Marriage Settlements in Early Modern England," *Economic History Review* 2nd ser 43 (1990): 22.

⁶⁹ Erickson, "Common Law vs. Common Practice," 21 & 37.

a number of types of marriage settlement practiced at the time. Strict settlement became more widely practiced in the mid seventeenth century, a fact often attributed to the changes engendered by the War of the Three Kingdoms and the need to protect property from sequestration.

In the sixteenth century, daughters of aristocratic families understood the need for both a large dowry and the assistance of their parents in order to secure an advantageous match. When problems of access to dowry funds arose, they sometimes sought justice in the courts of Chancery and Requests. This most often happened in the cases of single adult daughters with deceased fathers. Their statements in court records illustrate a hardheaded realism about the financial aspects of marriage.⁷⁰ Dorothy, the daughter of Thomas Grey, 1st Marquess of Dorset,⁷¹ sued his executors over her dowry rights. She stated that without access to her dowry she was “like to lose her preferment” despite the fact that a match had been arranged for her⁷² by her mother⁷³ and stepfather.⁷⁴ In November 1594, Anne Vaux went to court to get her dowry, though she did not have a particular marriage in mind at the time.⁷⁵ She argued that the court should grant her the money because she was thirty years old “and unmarried, by reason, she hath not her marriage money in her own custody...”⁷⁶ These women understood that in order to be viable on the marriage market they needed to have reasonable dowries commensurate

⁷⁰ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 57-58.

⁷¹ 1451-1501

⁷² She married Robert Willoughby, 2nd Lord Willoughby de Broke.

⁷³ Cecilia Bonville; she married Henry Stafford, Earl of Wiltshire following Dorset’s death.

⁷⁴ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 58.

⁷⁵ She never married and devoted herself to the Catholic cause, activities that resulted in her arrest on two occasions.

⁷⁶ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1913), III:86.

with their rank. In the absence of their fathers, they had to look out for their own interests.

Generally, it was the duty of the father to provide for the dowries of his daughters, but sometimes he did not have enough money. In those cases, it was often the mother, if she had her own means, who provided the needed funds. In 1599, Grace Sharrington, Lady Mildmay wrote in her journal: "... our daughter⁷⁷ was to be given in marriage and her father had no portion to give her. Whereupon I gave her all my own inheritance."⁷⁸ This arrangement on the part of Lady Mildmay meant that she would have little to live on in widowhood. In this case, the investment certainly paid off. Her daughter Mary married Francis Fane,⁷⁹ the son of Sir Thomas Fane, the royal administrator and Mary Neville, Baroness Despenser. He was raised to the peerage as 1st Earl of Westmorland in 1624. Grace's sacrifice indicates the value that aristocratic women placed on securing a good match for their daughters.

Correspondence both by and to aristocratic women in the eighteenth century provides numerous examples of this concern with finances. In 1707, Martha Temple, Lady Giffard, wrote to her niece Jane Temple, the Countess of Portland that her kinsman John "has married a very pretty young woman with 400 year nobody can keep from her and prospects of a great deal more if she had behaved herself better."⁸⁰ On August 30, 1708, it was reported to Bridget Hyde, 2nd Duchess of Leeds, Aug. 30, 1708 "... Sir Robert Marsham⁸¹ was married to [the daughter of]⁸² Sir Cloudesley Shovell⁸³ who . . .

⁷⁷ Mary Mildmay.

⁷⁸ Pollock, *With Faith and Physic*, 35.

⁷⁹ Francis Fane (1580-1628).

⁸⁰ BL Egerton MSS 1705, ff. 29-30.

⁸¹ Later 1st Baron Romney (1685-1724).

⁸² Elizabeth Shovell.

is worth £40,000 and my Lord Scarsdale⁸⁴ is in treaty for pretty Mrs. Squier who will be worth above £30,000 and tis believed it will be a match.”⁸⁵ On March 10, 1773, Anne Robinson wrote to her brother Frederick, “Mr. Bainster [Bannister] has left his Daughters 25000£ a piece and 1000£ a year clear to Mrs. Bainster [Bannister] with all the Plate and furniture. I think Lord Guildford⁸⁶ will propose to her⁸⁷ – as he has no objection to a good jointure.”⁸⁸ Then, writing on April 27, 1773, she reported “Mr. Robert Conway is to be married to Miss Delme who has 20,000£ and lives with a rich Uncle who can give her twice as much.”⁸⁹ There was a tendency in the eighteenth century to refer to women as the personifications of their fortunes.⁹⁰ Two examples from the Leeds family illustrate the point. In the early part of the century Bridget Hyde, 2nd Duchess of Leeds wrote to her son Lord Danby⁹¹ “The Duke of Grafton⁹² is going to be married to an Indian fortune that is worth a hundred thousand pounds there is another great fortune I hope to get for your brother.”⁹³ Mary Osborne, Duchess of Beaufort wrote to her mother Bridget, 2nd Duchess of Leeds on October 8, 1718, “Sir Constantine Phipp’s son being married to

⁸³ Cloudesley Shovell (1650-1707). Shovell was an admiral in the British navy. He served in both the Nine Years War and the War of the Spanish Succession. He was involved in an attack on some merchantmen from Smyrna under questionable circumstances and was removed from his command for a time. John B. Hattendorf, “Shovell, Sir Cloudesley (*bap.* 1650, *d.* 1707)” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25470>, accessed 26 Aug 2010]

⁸⁴ Nicholas Leke, 4th Earl of Scarsdale. He died in 1736 unmarried.

⁸⁵ BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 110.

⁸⁶ Presumably Rev. Hon. Brownlow North (1741-1820), son of the 1st Earl of Guilford.

⁸⁷ Presumably Henrietta Bannister.

⁸⁸ BL Add. 48318 MSS ff. 36-37.

⁸⁹ BL Add. 48218 MSS f. 34.

⁹⁰ Often it was the women whose incomes subsumed their identities; sometimes, however, men were referred to in a similar fashion. Around 1680, Frances Savile, Lady Brudenell wrote to Frances Yelverton, Lady Hatton, “I believe my sister Mary will be married within this month I hope very happily to one of 2000 pounds a year.” BL Add. Mss. 29558, ff. 45-46.

⁹¹ Peregrine Osborne (1691-1731), later 3rd Duke of Leeds.

⁹² Presumably, Charles Fitzroy, 2nd Duke of Grafton (1683-1757). He did not marry an Indian fortune, but rather Henrietta Somerset, daughter of the Marquess of Worcester in 1713.

⁹³ BL Add. MSS 78915, f. 67.

Lady Katherine Annesley who they say will be a vast fortune if Lord Anglesey⁹⁴ dies without children. She says she has 16,000 pounds now and will have 100000 more if that happens.”⁹⁵ These letters make it quite apparent that the most important characteristic of these women was their fortune. It was in the eighteenth century when it became more acceptable for aristocratic men, such as those in the examples above, to marry with money foremost in mind. Even the women such as Bridget Hyde who arranged marriages for their sons focused more on the financial prospects of the proposed bride rather than her rank or her character. This is a very different discourse than that surrounding the marriages of noble women. Certainly, the fiscal well-being of the putative groom was important, but it did not trump rank.⁹⁶

Women had an acute awareness of the need for money for their children to marry well in the world. In a letter, written in September 1713, to be given to her husband⁹⁷ after her death, Anne Churchill, Countess of Sunderland, was explicit about the need for the children to have sufficient funds and the importance of adequate money to the making of an adequate marriage:

...Pray take care to see the children married with a prospect of happiness, for in that you will show your kindness to me; and never let them want education or money while they are young. My Father has been so kind as to give my children fortunes, so that I hope they won't miss the opportunity of being settled in the world for want of portions. But your own Daughter may want your help, which I

⁹⁴ Katherine was the only child of the 3rd Earl of Anglesey who died in 1702. He was succeeded in turn by both of his younger brothers. John Annesley, the 4th Earl died in 1710, leaving as his heir only one daughter who died in 1718. In 1718, the title was held by Arthur Annesley, 5th Earl of Anglesey. He died in 1737 with no children and the fortune did pass to Katherine.

⁹⁵ BL Add. MSS 28050. f. 149.

⁹⁶ The over-riding emphasis on endogamy for aristocratic women broke down during the period from 1880-1920. Further research on the identity of non-titled grooms after 1920 is needed in order to determine if these women had shifted from marrying for rank to marrying for money.

⁹⁷ Charles Spencer (1674-1722), 3rd Earl of Sunderland. Anne was his second wife, his first wife was Arabella Cavendish, who died in 1722. Following Anne's death, he then married Judith Tichborn in December 1717.

hope you will think to give her, tho it should straighten your income, or to any of mine, if they want it.

... You have had five thousand pounds of the money you know was mine, which my mother gave me yearly. Whenever you can, let him [her eldest son] have the income of that for his allowance, if he has none any other way.

And don't be as careless of the Dear children as when you relied upon me to take care of them, but let them be your care, tho you should marry again, for your wife may wrong them when you don't mind it.⁹⁸

For aristocratic women the balance between rank and wealth was a more complicated formula than it was for their male counterparts during the early modern and modern eras. Anne Churchill understood that her daughter would not make a good marriage if she did not have a generous portion. Aristocratic men married outside of the titled ranks more often than did their sisters, very often for money. Aristocratic women took financial security and advancement into account, but they and their families did not look downward on the social scale for a wealthy groom with the intent of filling the family coffers. Consistently from 1485 to 1880-1920, the issue of rank appropriateness was more pressing when arranging the marriages of elite women.

Money could either make or break a match. On July 14, 1604, Robert Lord Sidney⁹⁹ wrote to his wife Barbara Gamage, about the negotiations for the marriage of their daughter Mary to Sir Robert Wroth.¹⁰⁰ Sidney, who often found himself in financial difficulty, apparently was having trouble raising the funds needed for Mary's dowry. Barbara wrote to Hugh Samford (Sanford) the family's representative in the negotiations about the financial embarrassment. The letter came to the attention of the Earl of

⁹⁸ BL Add. MSS 61422 f. 76. The circumstances surrounding the composition of this letter are obscure, Anne may well have been ill, but she was not on her death bed. She died in April 1716.

⁹⁹ Robert Sidney (Sydney), later 1st Earl of Leicester (1563-1626).

¹⁰⁰ Wroth (c. 1576-1614) was a wealthy landowner.

Pembroke¹⁰¹ who offered to loan the family the funds if he could find sufficient in his own accounts. Lord Sidney told his wife that if they did not raise the money soon “then must the marriage be put off to Michelmas term, against which time I trust to have means to make the money.”¹⁰² This financial concern continued in the eighteenth century.

Therese Parker wrote to Lord Grantham on February 3, 1776: “One of the Lady Howards is married to W. Courtenay, and the other was to marry Captain Carleton’s Nephew. .

[but] they cannot scrape up sufficient to live.”¹⁰³ In November 1849, Caroline Bristow,

the Dowager Lady Lyttleton wrote to her daughter-in-law, Sarah Spencer, Lady

Lyttleton, “Poor Miss Devereux’s marriage is deferred for a year owing to the want of *means*, as money is now always called. The hitch threatened at first to be lasting, but it

has been healed over...”¹⁰⁴ This fiscal concern also appears in the correspondence of

noble women of the nineteenth century. Angela St. Clair-Erskine, the daughter of the 4th

Earl of Rosslyn,¹⁰⁵ wrote of her sister Sybil’s engagement to Anthony Fane, the heir to

the 12th Earl of Westmorland.¹⁰⁶ The couple had known each other for years “but the

question of marriage had met with stern opposition on both sides, for financial reasons.

The opposition had, through circumstances, broken down. Sibyl was nearly twenty-one

¹⁰¹ William Herbert (1580-1630), 3rd Earl of Pembroke. Pembroke’s interest was due to the fact that he was the maternal nephew of Lord Sidney.

¹⁰² Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L’Isle and Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1925), III:127; Margaret P. Hanny, Noel J. Kinnamon, and Michael G. Brennan, eds., *Domestic Politics and Family Absence: The Correspondence (1588-1621) of Robert Sidney, First Earl of Leicester, and Barbara Gamage Sidney, Countess of Leicester* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 115.

¹⁰³ BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 141-44.

¹⁰⁴ Wyndham, *The Correspondence*, 397.

¹⁰⁵ Robert St. Clair-Erskine (1833-1890).

¹⁰⁶ Francis Fane (1825-1891)

and the death of Tony's father¹⁰⁷ made him his own master."¹⁰⁸ The couple married in 1892.

Marrying for Money

Though money was certainly important and the lack of it could derail a potential marriage, aristocratic women tended to be scathing in regard to couples whom they believed to have married only for financial reasons. Lady Elizabeth Berkeley¹⁰⁹ wrote of a greedy groom in a letter to Henrietta Hobart, Lady Suffolk in 1748:

I have lately seen the person who inquired for another, what Lady Dorothy's fortune was to be and on expressing my wonder, that I had never heard of them since, I was told point blank, that nothing less than 20,000 pounds down would do for the gentleman. I could not help thinking that if so, the gentleman either had a small cumbered estate, or was not much in love with one I thought very desirable; but which is the case I could get no answer, only it would not do.¹¹⁰

This distaste for the overtly mercenary became much more pronounced in the nineteenth century. In 1895, Theresa Talbot, Lady Londonderry wrote snidely of a man who had "married the £10,000 as well as the lady."¹¹¹ "They say he married her for her money" is a recurring theme throughout the letters and diaries of the period and always the women make the observation with distaste.¹¹² If the women believed that a man married simply for money, even if the bride in question might be appropriate otherwise, they criticized

¹⁰⁷ Francis Fane, 12th Earl of Westmoreland died in August, 1891. If the opposition to the match was truly on both sides, the death of the bride's father the previous year would also have helped to smooth the way.

¹⁰⁸ The couple married in May 1892. Lady Angela Forbes, *Memoirs and Base Details* (London: Hutchinson, 1921), 55.

¹⁰⁹ Died 1769.

¹¹⁰ John Wilson Croker, ed., *Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk and Her Second Husband the Hon George Berkeley from 1712-1767* (London: J. Murray, 1824), 214.

¹¹¹ Horn, *Ladies of the Manor*, 79.

¹¹² This is one of the strongest phrases of disapproval that these women would utter in public.

Ingrid H. Tague writes of the 18th century, "Together these changes in economic practices, consumerism, and political theory fueled a growing cultural anxiety about the relationships among money, fashion, and women. No wonder, then, that mercenary marriages became the target of so much criticism – they embodied the convergence of a series of related threats to the social order." "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 80.

the marriage. A disapproving journal entry by Harriet Fane dated February 2, 1821, illustrates, “The Duke of Wellington spent the evening with us having previously been at the marriage of Lord Cranborne¹¹³ with Miss Gasgoine,¹¹⁴ a very pretty girl who has £12,000 per year. They say he has married her for her money.”¹¹⁵

By the nineteenth century, Society expected an aristocratic woman to have greater charms than simply a large bankbook and the marriage was supposed to be based on more than just rank and financial considerations. Sarah Lennox’s letter in June 1805 bears witness to this: Sir Edward Littlehales “is going to be married to Lady Elizabeth FitzGerald, my niece¹¹⁶. . . and we are delighted with the match, because the minds and characters are perfectly suited, and money very well, which neither are attached to; so it is very pleasant.”¹¹⁷ If the woman had nothing more than rank and money to recommend her, the union was certainly looked down upon. A letter to Lady Stanley in November 1861 made the point quite sharply, “The much coveted Lady Londesborough¹¹⁸ is to marry Lord Otho Fitzgerald¹¹⁹ who has very expeditiously got over his severe affliction for the loss of Mrs. Butler whom he wanted to marry on her deathbed. He is a mercenary little fortune hunter and has always been making up to everyone with a fortune.”¹²⁰ Women recognized the reality of the money-rank double standard (that is, it was all right for aristocratic men to marry for money, but not for aristocratic women) but they did not endorse it.

¹¹³ James Cecil, later Gascoyne-Cecil, 2nd Marquess of Salisbury (1791-1868).

¹¹⁴ Frances Gascoyne. This marriage resulted in the creation of the hyphenated name Gascoyne-Cecil.

¹¹⁵ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:68 & n.

¹¹⁶ Actually her great-niece, the daughter of her nephew the 2nd Duke of Leinster.

¹¹⁷ Countess of Ilchester and Lord Stavordale, eds., *Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox, 1745-1826* (London: John Murray, 1901), II:194.

¹¹⁸ Ursula Bridgeman.

¹¹⁹ Otho FitzGerald (1827-1882) was the son of the 3rd Duke of Leinster.

¹²⁰ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 269.

Sometimes a noble family's quest for a financially profitable marriage for its daughter led to an unsavory approach. Correspondence between Edward, 2nd Baron Stanley and his wife, Henrietta Dillon-Lee, reveal not only the occasionally questionable tactics of some aristocratic families, but also the criticism this invited. In 1857, the Duchess of Montrose¹²¹ was apparently planning to marry her daughter Agnes Graham to Arthur Davenport, despite the objections of her husband.¹²² Davenport was a hopeless alcoholic¹²³ and the Duchess apparently intended that the early widowhood of their daughter would rebound to the family's profit. On November 21, Lord Stanley wrote to his wife:

I saw Arthur Davenport last night, he is rather in a fright about his marriage – says he has not heard from Lady Agnes for two days and that people have been telling stories about him that he has been screwed in London. He says that the Duke is an old Beast. The fact is I believe the Duke does not above half like it, but A. Davenport says he has the Duchess on his side. I told him he should be more careful and live quietly before his marriage.¹²⁴

Henrietta continued the tale of Arthur's alcoholic excesses in a letter to the Baron on December 1:

Lady Hatherton¹²⁵ told me she had said to the Duchess that Arthur was not in a state to marry from the excitement he is in and that with care he ought in three months to be well, but the Duchess would not hear of it and has fixed the last day of this month for the marriage. Lady Hatherton is disgusted, she says it is evident all they want is a large settlement and the sooner Arthur drinks himself to death the better. . . What right has the Duchess to impose on a young girl the hopeless task of keeper to a drunken imbecile. Lady Hatherton thinks that when the Duke returns to London he will break it off, but I do not believe it, that wicked woman is beat on getting rid of the girl. . . I do not believe he [Arthur Davenport] cares a bit for Lady Agnes for if 'invinceritas' he never went near her all evening.¹²⁶

¹²¹ Caroline Horsley-Beresford.

¹²² James Graham, 4th Duke of Montrose (1799-1874).

¹²³ This was general knowledge.

¹²⁴ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 161.

¹²⁵ Arthur Davenport's mother, Caroline Hurt.

¹²⁶ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 163.

That same day Edward Stanley wrote “Your account of Davenport is I fear too true and the object of the Duchess is to force a marriage in the hopes of a large jointure which they will not have long to wait for. Lady Hatherton, if she can, should get him to make as small a settlement as possible.”¹²⁷ Three days later Baron Stanley reported a probable end to the match:

I saw the Duke of Montrose yesterday and from what he said I think they have decided to break off the marriage. It seems Davenport got drunk again the last day they were at Capesthorne¹²⁸ and even the Duchess seems to have thought it too much. They were all to have gone down there next week, but from what the Duke said I think he will go alone and break it off. He does not like the idea of putting him on probation and letting the engagement remain, as it would tie their hands as to any other offer. If however, he was to reform and amend, the engagement might be renewed.¹²⁹

On December 8, Henrietta Dillon-Lee’s mother-in-law¹³⁰ weighed in on the end of the engagement:

For the credit of human nature – parents and young ladies, I am glad to hear the marriage is broken off, and I am very glad also that Maud will not have such a friend at Capesthorne as Lady A. I really think worse of her than of him, it was no better than prostitution on her part, not even the excuse of a sinner in that way has for they begin with love at least, not with disgust and merely for the love of a good establishment. Of course he will now take the first wife who will have him, and what respectable woman of any rank will?¹³¹

Though there is no question that aristocratic marriage was generally a business arrangement and that financial concerns could make or break a union, there were sometimes attempts to make the process a bit more romantic. In 1767, Elizabeth Seymour, the Duchess of Northumberland wrote in her journal:

¹²⁷ Ibid., 164.

¹²⁸ Capesthorne Hall is the family seat of the Davenports. It was built in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. It is located at Siddington in East Cheshire. <http://www.capesthorne.com>.

¹²⁹ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 164-165.

¹³⁰ Maria Holyroyd.

¹³¹ Agnes Graham married John Murray in 1859. Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 165.

Lord Thanet¹³² was married to Miss Sackville.¹³³ Beauty without Art had in this case its reward; he had never spoken to her when he wrote to her Mother¹³⁴ the following proposals: 800£ a year pin money, 3000 jointure, and 50,000£ for younger children. He follow'd his letter so soon that he got to her Ladyship before her answer had reach'd his Lordship, and as may be supposed was favourably received by Mother and Daughter.¹³⁵

As Thanet had not met his intended bride before he made an offer, the implication is that the initial attraction was to her suitability, not due to any romantic plotting on the part of either Miss Sackville or her mother. His approach was business-like, emphasizing his own suitability.¹³⁶ Certainly, Thanet's tactic was successful as the couple married in July of that year.

Noble British women lived within a system that mandated that they marry in such a way as to protect the rank identity of their natal family. The groom needed to not only come from the right background, but also have sufficient means to enable the couple to live in the manner that Society expected. Rank had to be supported by wealth. Without wealth there was no country house, no liveried servants, no grand balls, no patronage of the arts. None of the outward trappings of rank identity existed without money. Aristocratic women understood the importance of the things that money could buy and their actions when arranging the marriages of their daughters or commenting on the marriages of their acquaintances illustrate that they were as invested in this system as were the aristocratic men.

¹³² Sackville Tufton, 8th Earl of Thanet (1733-1786).

¹³³ Mary Sackville.

¹³⁴ Frances Leveson Gower.

¹³⁵ James Grieg, ed., *Diaries of a Duchess, Extracts from the Diaries of the First Duchess of Northumberland, 1716-76* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926), 76-77.

¹³⁶ His title was known, the financial arrangements he offered made it clear that he was also a man of some means.

IV. Family Alliances

Noble families in Britain entered into marital relationships with the aim of expanding their alliance networks. The creation and maintenance of kinship groups was a very important undertaking among aristocratic families and the primary way that extended family ties, i.e. kinship groups, were created was through marriage. The more elite the family, the more importance they placed on these types of alliances.¹³⁷ Families of potential brides aimed to procure sons-in-law from families higher on the social ladder than they themselves. If they succeeded, the daughters' unions improved their birth families' status and potentially provided the family with important connections and access to patronage.¹³⁸

From 1485-2000, family and kinship groups played an important role in the lives of aristocratic women. The importance of kinship groups and extended households to the lives of women has been the subject of extensive historical scholarship. According to Susan Asmussen, "Subordination was expected to be learned within the family where each member had her or his responsibilities and obligations. Power relations were reciprocal; however, obedience and subordination were mirrored by care, protection, and wise leadership. Orderly households advanced an ordered society; either subordinates or the head could disrupt the order of households."¹³⁹ Barbara Harris writes that in the sixteenth century,

aristocratic women also gained space in which to pursue their own definitions of their interests by taking advantage of their membership in multiple families. Although land and noble titles descended according to the rules of primogeniture, in virtually every other area kinship among the English aristocracy was bi-lateral.

¹³⁷ David Cressy, "Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 113(November, 1986), 49; Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 85-86.

¹³⁸ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 44.

¹³⁹ Asmussen, "Being Stirred to Much Unquietness," 73.

. . [women] received support and retained resources from each of their families as they moved from one to another.¹⁴⁰

In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, marriage within aristocratic rank marked the entry of an individual into the community of the kin of the spouse more than it represented the creation of a relationship between individuals.¹⁴¹ Lenore Davidoff asserts that in the nineteenth century, “The whole basis of social relations was family (or pseudo-family) ties between equals in the elite, or patronage across well-defined hierarchal lines. The new formalized system of etiquette made it possible, for the first time, to *use* those kin alliances that were profitable and quietly drop those that were not.”¹⁴² Examining the mechanisms of marriage over the centuries shows that these kinship¹⁴³ groups functioned among the women as they dealt with family issues, certainly including but not limited to, marriage. Jane Guilford, the wife of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland,¹⁴⁴ utilized this sort of network both in good times and in bad. When arranging the marriage between her eldest son John and Anne Seymour, the daughter of the Duke of Somerset she called on the assistance of a circle of reformist court ladies. She attempted to utilize this same network eight years later in a desperate attempt to save her family.¹⁴⁵

People understood marriage at the aristocratic level to be a matter of concern beyond the immediate families involved. The nuclear family in sixteenth century Britain occupied the center of a large and complex network of kin and patronage relationships.

¹⁴⁰ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 10.

¹⁴¹ Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 86.

¹⁴² Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 27.

¹⁴³ And by extension friendship circles. The fact is that the peerage was so small that nearly everyone was related to everyone else in one way or another.

¹⁴⁴ John Dudley, 1st Duke of Northumberland (1502-1553) was a prominent member of the government under Edward VI (1547-1553). He engineered the fall and execution of Edward Seymour, the 1st Duke of Somerset and attempted to place his daughter-in-law Jane Grey on the throne in the place of Mary I in 1553. This attempt was unsuccessful and he and several of his sons were imprisoned. Ultimately, Northumberland and his son Guildford, the unfortunate husband of the deposed queen, were executed.

¹⁴⁵ Jane Grey and S.J. Gunn, “Letter,” 1268.

The higher in rank the family, the more power the kin group exercised over the workings of the nuclear family itself since the higher the rank, the more was at stake in terms of property and prestige.¹⁴⁶ Thus, marriage among the elite of sixteenth-century England involved more than an individual decision. This choice vitally concerned the larger kin group and was undertaken with the preservation and improvement (if possible) of landed interests and patronage connections in mind.¹⁴⁷ In the early modern period, marriage meant the entry into a community created by the kin group of the spouse.¹⁴⁸

Among elite Tudors, the nuclear family operated within a large web of kin relationships. When a family worked to procure a good marriage for one of its members, it did so with the interests of the whole of the network in mind. Families did not forget that these marriages served to transmit both the property and the lineage of the whole kinship group. The older, richer, and more influential the family the more important the needs of the entire group were.¹⁴⁹ In the words of Lawrence Stone, “Marriage among the property-owning classes in sixteenth-century England was, therefore, a collective decision of family and kin, not an individual one. Past lineage associations, political patronage, extension of lineage connections, and property preservation and accumulation were the principal considerations.”¹⁵⁰

The correspondence of aristocratic women across the centuries indicates the importance of these networks of kin or friends. Women turned to these groups for

¹⁴⁶ Stone, *Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 85-86.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁴⁹ Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 85-86.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 87.

assistance and to exercise their own influence.¹⁵¹ Anne Bouchier wrote to her aunt Lady Barrington¹⁵² in 1630 to thank her for favours rendered in the past and to garner goodwill for the future.¹⁵³ In 1683, Elizabeth Clifford, Countess of Burlington wrote to instruct her daughter Elizabeth Boyle, Countess of Thanet what to do in regard to other members of the family on behalf of her mother. Among other tasks as her mother's representative, she was to check on her nephews at Eton, to visit her cousins at Hatfield and to deliver a letter to Amelia de Nassau, Lady Ossory.¹⁵⁴ In the last half of the eighteenth century, Diana Spencer, Viscountess Bolingbroke, wrote to her mother the Duchess of Marlborough¹⁵⁵ asking her to intervene with Diana's brother to assist Viscount Bolingbroke in the acquisition of a court post. She was very straightforward about the importance of the kinship network as "without that assistance he will get nothing and with it he may get anything and whilst I every day see everybody obtaining what they wish for; I cannot but say that I shall think it hard if we for want of such assistance should in this year of plenty get nothing, who really and especially are in want of

¹⁵¹ Anne Tufton, Duchess of Salisbury, wrote to her future son-in-law John, Lord Perceval (later 2nd Earl of Egmont) in the 1740s, "I believe it may admit of a doubt, whether they will grant you a license without my appearing in person, if so, I will come to town to Morrow at the hour you shall appoint." BL Add. MSS 47013A f. 29. Mary Capell, Duchess of Beaufort wrote to her mother seeking assistance for an acquaintance. BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 150-151. A century later Susan Liddell, Countess of Hardwick received a letter from a slight acquaintance requesting her to intervene with the Earl of Hardwick on behalf of the writer's son. BL Add. MSS 35796 f. 5.

¹⁵² Joan Cromwell.

¹⁵³ Thanking her for her services, "Madame your favors from time to time heapt upon me makes me ____ which way to show my thankfulness to you if by a ____ token your an bounty further engage me and by writing I am altogether unable to express it only acknowledging it and wait for an opportunity to shew it in any kind that I am able. I much desire to hear of your health which I will always pray for. I bless God I am now well recovered but I was very weak of this last child a long while and the child two but now he grows very strong thus not troubling you any longer to read my scribbling lines and bad English with my best respects to yourself I ____ your truly loving niece to command til death." Egerton 2645 f. 175.

¹⁵⁴ BL Add. MSS 15892 f. 152.

¹⁵⁵ Sarah Jennings.

something.”¹⁵⁶ The wills left by aristocratic women give an indication of the importance of women’s roles in these groups. Frequently the bulk of their bequests left property to women.¹⁵⁷ These networks served a myriad of purposes,¹⁵⁸ and were vital to aristocratic women across the centuries as they negotiated terms in the marriage market and managed their lives after marriage.

The noble rank in Britain was quite small and therefore there existed a relatively small pool of potential appropriate mates for aristocratic women.¹⁵⁹ Throughout the sixteenth century, noble families tended to choose mates from a narrow geographical region surrounding their own estates.¹⁶⁰ Occasionally elite families arranged marriages for their daughters to heal rifts or to link politically powerful families and their lands. In about 1516, the 1st Earl of Cumberland¹⁶¹ took as his second wife, Margaret Percy, the eldest daughter of the 5th Earl of Northumberland,¹⁶² thus uniting the interests of two powerful Northern families. Cumberland greatly extended his holdings in Yorkshire,

¹⁵⁶ BL Add.MSS 61668 f. 131. She later regretted bringing her brother into the matter as she is afraid that he will resent having to write to George III on Bolingbroke’s behalf. BL Add. MSS 61668 f. 135.

¹⁵⁷ The 1541 will of Elizabeth Bryan, the widow of the courtier Nicholas Carew is a good example of this; the vast majority of the people named are women. BL Add.MSS 29605 f. 14. Catherine Cecil, Countess of Egmont left a will in which most of her personal bequests are to her granddaughters. She left £1,000 to her granddaughters Catherine and Helena Rawdon to be paid when they marry or turn 21. She gave them property as well. BL Add. MSS 47213 f. 117-121.

¹⁵⁸ Support for churches was a common request, In 1718 Mary Finch wrote to her daughter Lady Dorothy Saville asking her to request that the Duke of Roxburghe speak to the King about moving the organ from Whitehall Chapel to a cathedral. BL Add. MSS 28569 f. 130. This letter illustrates the complexity of some of the relationships. Dorothy was Mary’s daughter from her first marriage to the 2nd Marquess of Halifax, the Duke of Roxburghe was Mary’s second husband. Thus, it is a bit of a mystery why Mary is having the Duke’s step-daughter approach him, rather than writing to him herself unless she thought that a personal request might have more chance of success than a letter. In the sixteenth century Joane Berkeley wrote thanking an unknown addressee for “most pious and heroic actions for tending to so high an end as the edifice of God’s house.” BL Add. MSS 33588 f. 56.

¹⁵⁹ And quite intermarried, a consideration that could not be overlooked when choosing a mate.

¹⁶⁰ A good example of this was Elizabeth Hardwick, whose first marriage to Robert Barley/Barlow which took place when she was about 13. The lands of the two families were close together. Court families were sometimes, though certainly not always, exceptions to this rule. Their activities in London brought them into contact with elite families from throughout the realm.

¹⁶¹ Henry Clifford (1493-1542).

¹⁶² Henry Percy (c. 1477-1527).

beginning with this marriage. Margaret's parents settled a piece of property, the Percy Fee in Craven, on her as her dowry and her brother¹⁶³ ultimately willed the Fee to the future 2nd Earl of Cumberland.¹⁶⁴ This gave the Cliffords the entire western half of Craven.¹⁶⁵ In 1553, Anne Dacre¹⁶⁶ the daughter of the 3rd Lord Dacre, married Henry Clifford, the 2nd Earl, thus healing a long-standing feud between two powerful border families.¹⁶⁷ The Earls of Shrewsbury actively pursued these types of alliances as well. The 4th Earl¹⁶⁸ married his daughters to the future Earl of Cumberland,¹⁶⁹ the Earl of Northumberland,¹⁷⁰ and Lord Dacre¹⁷¹ as well matching his son and heir to Dacre's sister.¹⁷² The 5th Earl¹⁷³ married his son¹⁷⁴ to the Earl of Rutland's daughter¹⁷⁵ and his step-sister¹⁷⁶ to the Earl of Pembroke.¹⁷⁷ In the 1560s, the 6th Earl of Shrewsbury promoted the marriage of his sister¹⁷⁸ to Thomas Lord Wharton "as part of a general reconciliation between Wharton, the Earl of Cumberland, and Lord Dacre."¹⁷⁹ In early modern Ireland, marriages between rival families were a means of solidifying peace, as it

¹⁶³ Henry Percy, the 6th Earl of Northumberland (c. 1502-1537).

¹⁶⁴ His sister's son.

¹⁶⁵ Dickens, *Clifford Letters*, 23, 25-26.

¹⁶⁶ (1517-1570). Anne Dacre was his second wife. He had first been married to Eleanor Brandon, the daughter of Henry VIII's sister Mary and Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.

¹⁶⁷ Dickens, *Clifford Letters*, 26-27.

¹⁶⁸ George Talbot (1468-1538).

¹⁶⁹ Margaret Talbot married Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland.

¹⁷⁰ Mary Talbot married Henry Percy, 6th Earl of Northumberland in 1524.

¹⁷¹ Elizabeth Talbot married William 3rd Lord Dacre in 1517.

¹⁷² Mary Dacre married Francis Talbot. The 2nd Lord Dacre's importance is shown by the marriage of his heir to the Earl of Shrewsbury's daughter and his daughter to Shrewsbury's heir. Steven Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: the Making of the British State* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 154.

¹⁷³ Francis Talbot (c. 1500-1560).

¹⁷⁴ George Talbot, 6th Earl of Shrewsbury (1528-1590). Gertrude Manners was his first wife. He then famously married Elizabeth Hardwick and served as the jailer of Mary Queen of Scots.

¹⁷⁵ Gertrude Manners.

¹⁷⁶ Anne Talbot.

¹⁷⁷ Bernard, *The Power of the Early Tudor Nobility*, 153.

¹⁷⁸ Anne Talbot.

¹⁷⁹ These were all families contending for power in the unstable northern counties of England. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 54.

was in northern England.¹⁸⁰ The marriage in 1532 of Joan FitzGerald, daughter of the 11th Earl of Desmond, to James, Lord Butler¹⁸¹ linked two of the most influential Old English¹⁸² families in Ireland.¹⁸³ In this case, Joan functioned as a “peace offering” in the ongoing feud between the families.¹⁸⁴ Families utilized these regionalized unions as a means to solidify, expand, and maintain their local power. Such marriages played important roles in the overall quest for influence and control by the large family units. The marriages of the female members of the noble families were a significant part of the families’ strategies.

This type of alliance also operated at court where families linked themselves through marriage in order to facilitate their standing. On July 3, 1537, there was a grand triple wedding at the home of the 1st Earl of Rutland¹⁸⁵ at Holywell in Shoreditch, London. In a match that was notable for the youth of the couple, Henry Manners,¹⁸⁶ the ten-year-old heir to the Earl of Rutland¹⁸⁷ married Lady Margaret Neville the ten-year-old daughter of the 4th Earl of Westmorland.¹⁸⁸ Anne Manners, the eldest daughter of the Earl of Rutland married Lord Neville,¹⁸⁹ Westmorland’s heir. Dorothy Neville, the eldest daughter of Westmorland, married Lord Bulbeck,¹⁹⁰ the heir to the 15th Earl of

¹⁸⁰ Karen Anne Holland, “Joan Desmond, Ormond, and Ossory: The World of a Countess in Sixteenth Century Ireland.” (PhD diss., Providence College, 1995), 3.

¹⁸¹ Later 9th Earl of Ormonde.

¹⁸² The Old English refer to settlers from England, Wales, and Normandy who colonized Ireland in the wake of the Norman invasion of England in 1066.

¹⁸³ Holland, “Joan Desmond,” 23.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 23-24.

¹⁸⁵ Thomas Manners (1492-1543), 1st Earl of Rutland.

¹⁸⁶ Henry Manners, (d. 1563), later 2nd Earl of Rutland.

¹⁸⁷ Thomas Manners (d. 1543).

¹⁸⁸ Ralph Neville (1498-1549).

¹⁸⁹ Henry Neville, later the 5th Earl of Westmorland (c. 1524-1564)

¹⁹⁰ John de Vere, later 16th Earl of Oxford (1516-1562). Following Dorothy’s death he married Marjory Golding.

Oxford.¹⁹¹ Many of the most important people at court attended the ceremony.¹⁹² These marriages brought together families that shared both court and country connections and thus increased the overall power of them all in both venues. One of the great practitioners of this type of alliance was Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk. In the late 1520s, he planned marriages between his son Henry, Earl of Surrey and the King's daughter Mary,¹⁹³ and his daughter Mary with the King's illegitimate son Henry Fitzroy, the Duke of Richmond.¹⁹⁴ Only the second match came about.¹⁹⁵ Fitzroy's early death cut the marriage short and it is likely that the couple never consummated the union.¹⁹⁶ Two decades later the Duke was still scheming to marry his daughter in such a way as to increase his power at court. In June 1546, Norfolk proposed that Mary marry Thomas Seymour and that three of his (Norfolk's) grandchildren marry three children of Edward Seymour.¹⁹⁷ This alliance would link the Howards, the senior noble family in England in the sixteenth century with the parvenu Seymours. This match served Norfolk's needs because the Seymours were the family of Henry VIII's third wife Jane, mother of the king's only legitimate son Edward. As the reign of the old king came to an end, it was clear that the Seymours would be a major power in the reign of their nephew.¹⁹⁸ Some

¹⁹¹ John de Vere (c. 1488-1539).

¹⁹² *LL*, IV: 106-107.

¹⁹³ Later Mary I.

¹⁹⁴ F.R. Grace, "Life and Career of Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk," (M.A. Thesis, Nottingham University, 1961), 129.

¹⁹⁵ Grace, "Life and Career," 136. The couple was betrothed in 1531, but the union was not consummated until late 1533.

¹⁹⁶ The 3rd Duke was pardoned for Katherine's marriage in February 1530. Grace, "Life and Career," 137.

¹⁹⁷ Edwin Casady, *Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey* (New York: MLA, 1938), 179. The Seymours were the brothers of Henry VIII's third wife Jane, who would always have a special place in the King's heart because she succeeded in giving him his longed-for male heir and then promptly died. Both Edward and Thomas would play important roles in the reign of their nephew Edward VI – Edward as the Lord Protector and Thomas as the Lord Admiral. Ultimately both would be executed during that reign due to political missteps. These proposed unions do not appear to have taken place.

¹⁹⁸ The proposed marriage between Thomas Seymour and Mary Howard was to have profound repercussions within the Howard family. Initially, Mary's brother Henry Howard encouraged the match

sort of alliance with the Seymours would clearly be in Norfolk's best interest as he was associated with the religiously conservative opinions that were important around the aging Henry VIII. It was apparent, however, that with the accession of Edward VI things were going to change quite drastically as there was no question but that the Seymours would be important in the new government and they were far more Protestant in their attitudes. Norfolk had to realize that he was likely to find himself outside of the halls of power if he did not, in some manner, make peace with the incoming government.¹⁹⁹

Family alliances sealed by marriage often occurred between the same families generation after generation. Once a successful union occurred between two noble families, it was more likely that the same families would intermarry in subsequent generations. The Howards matched themselves with the Manners family across several centuries. Jane Howard, the daughter of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey,²⁰⁰ married Charles Neville, the 6th Earl of Westmorland²⁰¹ in about 1563. He was the son of Anne Manners, the daughter of the 1st Duke of Rutland.²⁰² In 1799, Elizabeth Howard, the daughter of the 5th Earl of Carlisle²⁰³ married John Manners, the 5th Duke of Rutland.²⁰⁴

because it would be a means to put Mary at court and he wanted her to become the aging Henry VIII's mistress; as she testified against Howard to investigators: "wishing her withal to endear herself so into the King's favour, [so] as she might the better rule here as others had done." When it became clear to Henry Howard that his sister had no intention of seducing her former father-in-law, he then opposed the marriage to Seymour as being below their status. Mary, who saw the marriage as her last chance to escape the rustication that had been imposed on her since the death of her first husband, was horribly embittered when Henry Howard's opposition served to ensure that the match did not and when her brother was arrested on charges of treason, took her opportunity to get even and was very vocal in providing evidence that ultimately led him to the scaffold. Casady, *Henry Howard*, 180, 198-99.

¹⁹⁹ As discussed above, the marriage did not take place. It would likely have been a moot point anyway as in the closing months of Henry VIII's reign, the 3rd Duke and his son the Earl of Surrey were arrested on charges of treason. Surrey was executed and Norfolk was saved only by the death of the King. He spent the entirety of Edward VI's reign in the Tower of London, certainly as far outside of the halls of power as he could be.

²⁰⁰ Son of the 3rd Duke of Norfolk.

²⁰¹ Charles Neville (c. 1542-1601).

²⁰² Thomas Mannerd (d. 1543).

²⁰³ Frederick Howard (1748-1825).

²⁰⁴ John Manners (1778-1857).

Adeliza FitzAlan-Howard, the daughter of the 13th Duke of Norfolk²⁰⁵ married George Manners,²⁰⁶ the son of the 5th Duke of Rutland in 1855. This intermarriage between the same families across the generations was not merely an English phenomenon as is illustrated by the repeated unions between the Frasers and the MacLeods in Scotland. Agnes Fraser, the daughter of the 3rd Lord Lovat²⁰⁷ married William MacLeod, the 9th Chief²⁰⁸ before 1541. Thomas Fraser,²⁰⁹ son of the 7th Lord Lovat²¹⁰ married Sibylla MacLeod the daughter of the 16th Chief²¹¹ in the seventeenth century. Anne Fraser, the daughter of the 9th Lord Lovat²¹² married Norman MacLeod the 20th Chief in 1703. Generation after generation, the ties of kinship group and the same fundamental needs led families to inter-marry repeatedly.

Frequently the identity of the actual woman who was the subject of these family alliances seemed to be a secondary consideration. The alliance between the larger families was the important factor. When John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford entered into an arrangement with Henry Hastings, the 3rd Earl of Huntingdon in 1562, he specified that either one of Huntingdon's two sisters would marry Oxford's son and heir within a month of his eighteenth birthday. It seems that Oxford was to be able to choose which of the sisters he preferred.²¹³ Similar patterns occurred outside of England as well. In sixteenth century Ireland, the Earl of Ormonde and the Earl of Desmond came to an

²⁰⁵ Henry Howard (1791-1856).

²⁰⁶ George Manners (1820-1874).

²⁰⁷ Hugh Fraser (1494-1544).

²⁰⁸ William MacLeod (d. 1551).

²⁰⁹ Thomas Fraser (d. 1699).

²¹⁰ Hugh Fraser (d. 1646).

²¹¹ Ian 'Mor' MacLeod (d. 1649).

²¹² Hugh Fraser (1666-1696).

²¹³ Daphne Pearson, *Edward de Vere, (1550-1604): the Crisis and Consequence of Wardship* (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2005), 28. Despite all of this wrangling and freedom of choice, the match did not come off with any of Huntingdon's sisters. Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford married first, Anne Cecil daughter of the Elizabethan minister William Cecil and second, Elizabeth Trentham.

agreement stating that Ormonde “covenants that Lord Thomas Butler²¹⁴ shall take to wife Margaret, Johan, or Ellyn, daughter of the Earl of Desmond.” If Thomas were to die before the marriage took place, whoever became the heir to the Ormonde title would undertake the union. Desmond pledged that his son “Gerald shall lawfully marry such a daughter as it shall please God to send Ormonde within the next six years.”²¹⁵

At times, the government in London became involved when marriages were being considered that might, through their linking of powerful families, create overmighty subjects north of the border. The troubled situation in Scotland in the wake of the death of James IV in 1513, led to jockeying for position among some of the great nobles.²¹⁶ This contending for position continued for many years during the new king’s minority. By the 1530s, James Stewart,²¹⁷ the late king’s illegitimate son and the 1st Earl of Moray intended to play a significant role in the government. One nearly incestuous way that he sought to bolster his position was to angle for a marriage to the daughter of the Dowager Queen²¹⁸ and the Earl of Angus,²¹⁹ Margaret Douglas.²²⁰ By the mid 1530s, Margaret’s marriage concerned Henry VIII’s ministers. They took an active role in the quest to find her an appropriate husband, and prevent her from making a match that might threaten English interests.²²¹ In the summer of 1547, Joan FitzGerald, the daughter of the 10th

²¹⁴ Later 10th Earl of Ormonde (1531-1614).

²¹⁵ Holland, “Joan Desmond,” 68 & n. Thomas Butler died in 1614, but never married a Desmond daughter. Gerald couldn’t marry a Butler daughter as there were none. Instead, he later married Butler’s mother Joand FitzGerald.

²¹⁶ The unexpected death of James IV at the battle of Flodden in 1513, left the government in some disarray. His heir was his year-old son James V. This extreme youth of the new king meant that there was a power vacuum and the leading nobles contented with one another to fill that void. Also contending for authority was the young king’s mother Margaret Tudor, the sister of Henry VIII.

²¹⁷ James Stewart (1501-1545).

²¹⁸ Margaret Tudor.

²¹⁹ Archibald Douglas (c. 1490-1557).

²²⁰ Margaret was born in 1515. Richard G. Eaves, *Henry VIII and James V’s Regency, 1524-1528: A Study in Anglo-Scottish Diplomacy.*, (Lanham: University Press of America, 1987), 79.

²²¹ Gerald Brenan and Edward Philips Statham. *The House of Howard* (London: Hutchinson, 1907), 191.

Earl of Desmond²²² and the widow of the 9th Earl of Ormonde,²²³ received a summons to England. According to Lord Chancellor Allen, it was because there were rumours that she intended to marry Gerald,²²⁴ the heir of the Earl of Desmond.²²⁵ The union would have created a possible juggernaut in South Ireland when her dower lands combined with his holdings.²²⁶ To prevent the Desmond union, the Lord Chancellor strongly encouraged Jane to marry the prominent courtier, and faithful subject of the English crown, Francis Bryan.²²⁷ She followed instructions.

Marriages within extended families sealed another form of family alliance practiced fairly regularly throughout the period between 1485 and 2000, that is, marriages to cousins or in-laws. These marriages often appear to have arisen out of the desire on the part of the families to solidify the relationship between them (this is especially true in the marriages between families related by marriage) as well as the proximity that the family relationships brought. In 1530, Anne Willoughby, daughter of 2nd Baron Willoughby de Broke, married Charles Blount, the son and heir of 4th Baron Mountjoy. Anne was the daughter of the fourth wife of Charles' father, Dorothy Grey. This marriage was apparently undertaken to solidify the link between the Blounts and the Mountjoys as the couple were very young.²²⁸ In 1665, Elizabeth Lyon the daughter of the 2nd Earl of

Margaret's rather convoluted marital history is discussed more fully in Chapters Four and Five.

²²² James FitzGerald (d. 1529).

²²³ James Butler (d. 1546).

²²⁴ Gerald FitzGerald (1533-1583), later 14th Earl of Desmond.

²²⁵ James FitzGerald, 13th Earl of Desmond (d. 1558).

²²⁶ Holland, "Joan Desmond," 133.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, 134. Francis Bryan (1490-1550). At this time Joan was in her early 30s while her new groom was in his upper 50s.

²²⁸ James P. Carley, 'Blount, Charles, fifth Baron Mountjoy (1516–1544)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2682, accessed 15 March 2011]

Kinghorne²²⁹ married Charles Gordon, 1st Earl of Aboyne.²³⁰ Their son Charles, 2nd Earl of Aboyne²³¹ married her niece Elizabeth Lyon, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Strathmore²³² in 1702. In 1777, Anne Duncombe the daughter of the 1st Lord Feversham and his third wife Anne Hales, married Jacob Bouverie, 2nd Earl Radnor. Radnor was the stepson of Anne Hales who had married the 1st Earl Radnor in 1765 following the death of Feversham. By the nineteenth century, society often questioned the propriety of these types of matches, but they happened nonetheless. In 1866, Lucy Lyttelton expressed her concerns about the upcoming marriage of her brother-in-law, Lord Edward Cavendish²³³ to his cousin Emma Lascelles:²³⁴ “Of course one is sorry for the first cousinship, but nothing has been done to lead up to it; and what can one say in such a case of real tried and genuine affection, and when everyone has behaved rightly.”²³⁵ Marriages between cousins had the advantage of keeping assets within the extended family.

Sometimes women married their deceased sisters’ widowers. These marriages appear to have been less about money, but more as a response to circumstances. Often when a woman with small children died, her unmarried sister would move into the household as a sort of surrogate. Frequently the sisters went from being surrogate mothers to actual wives. There was, however, some real question about the legality about these types of unions. In 1785 Betty Roper, the daughter of the 11th Baron Teynham²³⁶

²²⁹ John Lyon (1596-1646).

²³⁰ Charles Gordon (d. 1681).

²³¹ Charles Gordon (1670-1702).

²³² Patrick Lyon (1643-1695).

²³³ Lord Edward Cavendish (1838-1891), the youngest son of the 7th Duke of Devonshire.

²³⁴ Edward and Emma’s mothers, Blanche and Caroline Howard respectively, were sisters – the daughters of the 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish.

²³⁵ John Bailey, ed., *The Diary of Lady Frederick Cavendish* (New York: Stokes, 1927), I:266.

²³⁶ Henry Roper (17733-1786).

married Francis Tyler.²³⁷ The couple had three children²³⁸ before Betty died in 1788. Five years later Francis married Betty's younger sister Catherine.²³⁹ Under an English statute of 1533, marriages such as that of Catherine Roper and Francis Tyler were within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and thus the Ecclesiastical Court could annul these types of marriages at any time during the couple's life. In 1835, the English Lord Chancellor, Lord Lyndhurst, introduced a bill into the House of Commons reducing the time-frame in which the Court could annul such a union to two years after the marriage. The marriage of Henry Somerset,²⁴⁰ 7th Duke of Beaufort to his deceased wife's half-sister²⁴¹ in 1822 prompted the Lord Chancellor's act. The House of Commons quickly passed legislation declaring that all unions within the prohibited degrees contracted before 1835 were absolutely valid and non-voidable, thus protecting the Duke of Beaufort's second marriage. However, the legislation also stated that all marriages within the prohibited degrees that were contracted after August 31, 1835 were absolutely void. When the legislation passed people expected that further legislation would be passed that would exempt a dead wife's sister from the prohibited degrees; however, this did not occur until 1907.²⁴² Debate on this issue became a regular feature of the meetings of the House of Commons.²⁴³

²³⁷ Francis Tyler (1754-1815).

²³⁸ Catherine, Barbara, and Charles.

²³⁹ There were no children born to this union.

²⁴⁰ Henry Somerset (1792-1853).

²⁴¹ His first wife was Georgiana Fitzroy, daughter of Henry Fitzroy and Anne Wellesley. Following her death in 1821, he married Emily Smith the daughter of Anne Wellesley from her second marriage. Beaufort's first marriage produced only a daughter but the second produced several children, including a male heir.

²⁴² Nancy F. Anderson, "The "Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill" Controversy: Incest Anxiety and the Defense of Family Purity in Victorian England." *The Journal of British Studies* 21: 2 (Spring, 1982), 67.

²⁴³ *The London Times* gives testimony to the perennial nature of the debate; eg. May 15, 1841, pg. 2 #17671; Nov. 1, 1845, pg. 11 #19070; March 19, 1847, pg. 4, #19501; March 6, 1850, pg. 6 #20429; April

V. Conclusion

Despite the fact that only about 50 percent of aristocratic women married within titled ranks in the period between 1485 and 1920, societal opinion, family pressure, and sisterly example all ensured that these women understood that they should fulfill their duty and marry for the good of their natal family. In the sixteenth century, most women had little choice in the matter, as arranged marriage was an expected part of life. As the level of parental control that society deemed appropriate lessened, indoctrination became even more important. The obligations of duty appear far more in the discourse than in the statistics. As is discussed in Chapter Three, over the centuries love became the primary motivation for marriage, but duty was never utterly superseded. It became noble women's duty to fall in love with an appropriate mate. Across the centuries, a primary aspect of an aristocratic woman's identity was her membership within the larger family unit rather than as an individual. A woman's duty to marry in such a way as to further the interests of the family remained a consistent concern.

25, 1855, pg. 6 #22007; Aug. 16, 1860, pg. 7 #23700; March 7, 1866, pg. 8 #25439; Feb. 15. 1870, pg. 4 #26674; and the list goes on and on.

Chapter Three: The Romantic Considerations of Marriage

I. Introduction

The traditional view of marriage for aristocratic women was that the primary concern was union with a spouse of appropriate rank. Much of the literature produced on the subject since 1485¹ stressed the need for these women to marry endogamously and attached little importance to the issue of love. However, considerations of love or affection have played a more significant role than is often credited by historians. The statistics on the tendency of noble women to marry endogamously show that they only did so approximately half of the time,² a far lower rate than one would expect if the only consideration were rank. The fact that they married outside of their rank half of the time indicates the influence of other factors. The question then becomes, what were those considerations? This chapter argues that often one of them was love. What these women wrote, as well as the numerical analysis of their marriages, supports this contention. Scholarly literature points to the eighteenth century as the time when the desire for love and romance began to be important to couples. The evidence collected for this study indicates that romantic love was a significant motivating force for aristocratic women across the centuries. The language in which they expressed this desire and the acceptability of this desire as a reason to marry changed over the years, but the desire itself did not, that remained a constant. Love did not justify marrying a man of insufficient rank, but aristocratic women consistently expressed a wish to love the appropriate man they were to marry.

¹ This includes advice manuals, printed sermons, and novels.

² From 1485-1920, the endogamy rate was 50.82 percent. See Chapter One for a complete discussion of the issues surrounding endogamy.

II. Duty vs. Love: or, Why Marry?

In the period between the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries, the motivations for marriage among aristocratic women altered slightly in emphasis. Throughout the period, the primary characteristics of an appropriate spouse for an aristocratic woman were status and character, the latter including the ability to inspire love. Both of these factors were present over the centuries, but while in the beginning, status was the more important of the two, by the end of the seventeenth century the relationship began to change and certainly, in the period after 1920 the emotional factors became the dominant reason for an aristocratic woman to choose a spouse.

Individual choice did not play an important role in aristocratic marriage in the early modern era. Families had to take into account many considerations when determining who constituted an appropriate husband and they did not give great weight to the issue of the personal preference on the part of the couple. The younger the couple the less influence in the decision they had. Girls who married early nearly always did so at the behest of their families and they had little say at all in the choice of spouse. These young brides were just small parts in the patriarchal institution that comprised the early-modern noble family. According to Barbara Harris, “Taken as a whole, the arrangement of women’s marriages was probably the moment when the combined force of the patriarchal structures under which they lived subjugated them most effectively and with the most enduring results.”³ Early-modern British society did not see aristocratic women as truly individuals in their own right, but rather as parts of a larger whole, the family.⁴

³ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 59.

⁴ The nature of the early modern British family and the function of marriage within that group has been the subject of a great deal of scholarship. Karen Ann Holland in her unpublished dissertation on Joan FitzGerald writes “In medieval and early modern Ireland, noblewomen had very little say in the disposal of

This attitude emerged plainly in the planning of the marriages of the daughters of elite families. The family generally did not take the romantic inclinations of the couple into consideration when it set out to negotiate a union. Indeed, the accepted wisdom of the age held such an important decision should be made by more mature persons who understood the transitory nature of romantic love. However, this does not mean that the daughters were victims of oppression in this matter. Most aristocratic women of the era participated willingly in the marital system of their rank.⁵

William Cecil, Elizabeth I's primary minister, allowed his daughter Anne a great deal of say in the choice of her spouse, for no other reason than he was fond of her and inclined to be an indulgent father.⁶ Anne Cecil, though only fifteen, fulfilled her desire to marry Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford, whom she had met because he, like many young aristocratic men, resided in her father's household. Initially, her family proposed Philip Sidney as a possible husband.⁷ Anne had ideas of her own and expressed an interest in Oxford. Marriage into a family as exalted as the de Veres was very expensive.

their own persons. Rather daughters were viewed as marriageable items and granting his daughter's hand in marriage was a father's privilege and his chief opportunity to maintain, establish, or strengthen his political authority. (Holland, "Joan Desmond," 2-3.) Lawrence Stone asserts that the primary characteristic of the noble family in the sixteenth century was the subordination of the needs of the individual to the needs of the family (specifically to the needs of the male head of the family). (Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 181). Barbara Harris points out in *English Aristocratic Women*: "From an early age aristocratic women were almost certainly aware of the advantages they gained from their fathers' and husbands' wealth, status, and power. Thus, although individual aristocratic women might criticize or quarrel with their male relatives, there is no evidence that as a group they imagined an essential difference between their interests and those of their male kin or that they articulated ambitions for themselves that were incompatible with their duties in the family. Instead, they contributed to the social reproduction of their families and class by executing a wide range of tasks that perpetuated the existing patriarchal regime. In return they accumulated considerable power, resources, and personal prestige." (Harris, 9)

⁵ This willingness can be inferred from the fact that the vast majority of these women operated within this system when the time to find spouses for their own children. There are cases of women who very vocally refused to participate, perhaps most notably Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk.

⁶ She chose a man from the highest levels of the aristocracy, one wonders how understanding Cecil would have been if her choice had fallen upon his steward.

⁷ Philip Sidney (1554-1586) was the son of Sir Henry Sidney and Lady Mary Dudley (the daughter of John Dudley, 1st Duke of Northumberland). He was famous in his lifetime for his poetic achievements and his exploits on the field of battle. He died as a result of injuries sustained at the battle of Zutphen.

Cecil gave Oxford a lump sum payment of £3,000 and £800 worth of land. This compares to the £1,000 lump sum offered for the Sidney match.⁸ The marriage took place despite her father's misgivings as expressed in a letter dated August 15, 1571 to Edward Manners, the 3rd Earl of Rutland (who, like Oxford, had spent his youth in the Cecil household):⁹

I think it doth seem strange to your Lordship to hear of a purposed determination in my Lord of Oxford to marry with my daughter. And so, before his Lordship moved it to me I might have thought it, if any other had moved it to me but himself. For at his own motion I could not well imagine what to think, considering I had never meant to seek it nor hoped of it. And yet reason moved me to think well of my Lord and to acknowledge myself greatly beholden to him, as indeed I do. Truly, my Lord, after I was acquainted of the former intention of a marriage with Master Philip Sidney, whom I always loved and esteemed, I was fully determined to have of myself moved no marriage for my daughter until she should have been near 16, that with moving I might also conclude. And yet I thought it not inconvenient, in the meantime, being free to hearken to any motion made by such others as I should have cause to like. Truly, my Lord, my good will serves me to have moved such a matter as this in another direction than this, but having more occasion to doubt of the issue of the matter, I did forbear. And in mine own conceit I could have as well like there as in any other place in England. Per case your Lordship may guess where I mean, and so shall I, for I will name nobody.

Now that the matter is determined betwixt My Lord of Oxford and me, I confess to your Lordship I do honour him so dearly from my heart as I do my own son, and in any case that may touch him for his honour and weal I shall think him mine own interests therein. And surely, My Lord, by dealing with him I find that which I often heard of your Lordship, that there is much more in him of understanding than any stranger to him would think. And for mine own part I find that where I take comfort in his wit and knowledge grown by good conversation.¹⁰

This letter indicates that Cecil himself would have preferred another match for his daughter but was inclined to indulge his daughter's wishes. Despite his doubts about the wisdom of the match, Cecil saw the benefits of this marriage. He was aware of his relatively modest background and was determined to see to it that his children married

⁸ Pearson, *Edward de Vere*, 28.

⁹ William Cecil's household was an educational institution of sorts for the sons of the nobility.

¹⁰ Quoted in Conyers Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1960), 127-128.

into the upper ranks of the aristocracy. Thus, he did not oppose his daughter's desire to marry the Earl. In fact, Cecil had a large genealogical tree (literally, it was in the form of an oak tree) painted in the Great Hall of his country house, Theobalds. The Oxford line featured prominently in the tree.¹¹ In this way, the Cecils increased their prestige through the grafting on of the Oxford lineage. Others looked a bit askance at the marriage as well. Contemporaries saw the match as something of a misalliance.¹² Despite the very powerful political position held by the bride's father, members of the peerage looked down upon her marriage to the scion of one of the oldest families in the English aristocracy. On July 28, 1571, Oliver, 1st Lord St. John wrote to the Earl of Rutland about the match, "The Earl of Oxford hath gotten him a wife – or at the least a wife hath caught him; this is mistress Anne Cecil..."¹³ The fact that the marriage of a man of the rank of Oxford took place as a result of the romantic inclinations of a young girl caused some disquiet. Cecil himself was unusual in his willingness to indulge his daughter in such a way.¹⁴

Some historians have argued that in the seventeenth century parents loosened their grip on the marriage choices of their children, contenting themselves with merely exercising a veto on unsuitable matches, thus giving more scope for the emotional well-being of their children.¹⁵ An interesting test case for this assertion is the family life of Richard Boyle, 1st Earl of Cork. He was extraordinarily patriarchal, expecting his wife

¹¹ Pearson, *Edward de Vere*, 122.

¹² *Ibid.*, 158.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 183n.

¹⁴ One does wonder, however, how understanding he would have been if her choice had fallen on the stable boy.

¹⁵ For more on this see: O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges*, 86; Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 124; Stone *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*; Mary Lyndon Shanley in "Marriage Contract and Social Contract in Seventeenth Century English Political Thought," (*The Western Political Quarterly* 32:1 (March, 1979), 79-91) argues that the ideas of equality that came out of the Civil War found their way into conceptions about marriage and the roles of men and women within marriage.

and children to defer to his wishes in all things, including those that affected their own personal happiness far more than his. He claimed that he allowed his daughters the right to veto matches that they did not approve of, a right that his daughter Mary famously exercised.¹⁶ Cork undercut this right by arranging marriages for his daughters when they were very young and allowing them to take up residence with their prospective husbands' families well before they were adults.¹⁷ These arrangements gave his girls little opportunity to exercise their vetoes. The right to veto was of course not the same as the right to choose, a right that Cork's daughters never had.¹⁸

Sometimes experience was a bitter teacher for aristocratic mothers and prompted them to be more flexible in arranging the marriages of younger children. Her daughter's¹⁹ receipt of a valentine in 1655 prompted the following entry in Elizabeth Cecil, Lady Willoughby's journal: "... but I know not a more blessed relief to my concern for this dear child than that no marriage contract should be made for her, unsanctified by a sweet and holy affection. Custom hath led us wrong in this matter, in the disposal of one dearly loved daughter,²⁰ not so shall it again..."²¹ One daughter had been compelled to marry for duty and it had turned out badly, the other would seemingly be given more freedom.²²

¹⁶ This is discussed more fully below.

¹⁷ Nicholas Canny gives the ages of Cork's daughters at the time of their first marriage: Alice – 13.5, Sarah – 12.5, Lettice – 19.5, Joan – 19, Catherine – 15, Dorothy – 14, and Mary – 16. Sarah, who was married very young went to live with her husband when she was 14.5. He died two months later and it was thought possible that she might be pregnant. Cork seemed to accept 14.5 to 15 as a proper age for his daughters to begin co-habiting with their husbands; this is far younger than he would permit his sons to cohabit with their wives. Nicholas Canny, *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, First Earl of Cork, 1566-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 89-90.

¹⁸ Canny, *The Upstart Earl*, 85, 87, 91. It is worth noting that Cork began negotiations for his daughters' marriages at far younger ages than he did for his sons (he tended to wait until his sons were adult). While patriarchy does weigh heavily on children of both genders, in the Boyle household the bulk of it rested on the rights of the females.

¹⁹ It could either have been her daughter Frances or Elizabeth, neither was yet married in 1655.

²⁰ An unhappy arranged marriage between her daughter Diana and Heneage Finch, the 3rd Earl of Winchelsea in 1645.

Despite this possible liberalization on the part of parents, their focus remained the financial well-being and status of the extended family with little real concern for the feelings of the couple concerned.²³ In the eighteenth century, documents such as letters discussed the idea of the importance of free choice and love at more length. Historians are divided on the issue of the rise of companionate marriage and the reasons for the change, if indeed there was a change.²⁴ The language found in many of the letters and

²¹ Hannah Mary Reynolds Rathbone, *Lady Willoughby, or, Passages from the Diary of a Wife and Mother in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: A.S. Barnes, 1854). 155.

²² Elizabeth's two remaining daughters (it is unclear which was the recipient of the valentine) both married well. Elizabeth married Richard Jones, 1st Earl of Ranelagh in 1662 and Frances married William Brereton, 3rd Baron Brereton before 1659.

²³ Christine Peters writes that "Marriage was always as much an economic and social alliance as a religious one: property transfer was an integral part of the process of husband and wife becoming one flesh. The entire process of the making of marriage included elements of ritual expression, especially the ceremony of spousals or betrothal, which was outside the direct control of the author of the Prayer Book." (Christine Peters, "Gender, Sacrament and Ritual: the Making and Meaning of Marriage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 169 (2000): 64.)

²⁴ Though love was important to aristocratic women in the sixteenth and seventeenth century as well. It may well be that the actual desire for love and romance did not change all that much over the centuries, but that it was in the eighteenth century that women began to write a great deal more. Many more personal letters and journals survive from that period on and it is in those types of documents that historians have found evidence of the changing attitudes toward marriage. The change in attitude may well be more a change in the types of subjects women wrote about (in the sixteenth century they wrote primarily about religion) and the amount that women wrote.

A discussion of the emotional aspects of marriage in the eighteenth century can be found in Meriam Slater, "The Weightiest Business: Marriage in an Upper Gentry Family in Seventeenth Century England," *Past and Present* 72 (Aug. 1976): 25. Susan Dwyer Asmussen argues that a fundamental change in the nature of marriage and the family toward a more private, emotional bond occurred in the eighteenth century ("Being Stirred to Much Unquietness: Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England," *Journal of Women's History* 6:2 (1994): 83). According to Judith Schneid Lewis, between 1760 and 1860 young aristocratic women began to long for romantic love in their marriages. She adds somewhat cynically that it is likely that their hopes outstripped their experiences (*In the Family Way: Childbearing in the British Aristocracy, 1760-1860* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1986), 19). There is not, however, universal support for this contention; Joanne Bailey writes in *Unquiet Lives: Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) that there is little "evidence that supports the controversial theory that the emotional character of marriage was transformed during the second half of the eighteenth century. In *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), Amanda Vickery has argued that, although practice probably varied little, there was indeed a change in the way marriage was described, with an emphasis placed on the need for romantic love. Some scholars, notably Paul Langford in *Public Life and Propertied Englishmen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) and David Lemmings in "Marriage and the Law in Eighteenth Century: Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1753" (*Historical Journal* 39:2 (1996) emphasize the continued patriarchal and economic nature of eighteenth century marriages. Both Langford and Lemmings challenge Stone's contention that marriage was becoming increasingly companionate. The evidence collected for this study indicates that there was no great shift in the eighteenth

diaries of young women of the period reflects that of the popular novels of the era, such as Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*.²⁵ Its message of love trumping concerns of wealth and rank resonated with young women.²⁶ Eighteenth-century women caught in the dilemma, of following their parents' wishes or their own, did not find the choice an easy one. In 1712, Mary Pierrepont wrote to her lover Edward Wortley Montagu urging a quick elopement as her family was pressuring her to marry another man, "... for I own I cannot, nor dare not, resist my Father, and I know he has power over me to make me do whatever he pleases."²⁷ In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, many families loosened their control over the marriages of their children, while still taking the economic well-being and status of the family into consideration. In March 1848, Lady Stanley²⁸ wrote to her mother-in-law:²⁹ "Major Kaye has married a woman without family, fortune, or beauty, very much to the discomfiture of Lady Amelia – but she is too kindhearted not to make the best of it."³⁰ Lady Stanley apparently felt some measure of sympathy for Lady Amelia.

In the nineteenth century, people recognized that marriage within the ranks of the aristocracy concerned not only the private life of the couple but also their place within the larger context of Society.³¹ Noble women explored this duality at length in their letters, diaries, and memoirs. Marriages were intended to bring the couple involved happiness and comfort, but they were also to bring the families involved status and resources.

century. Aristocratic women as early as the sixteenth century desired love in their marriage but it was not usually a central concern.

²⁵ First published in 1740.

²⁶ Tague, "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 77.

²⁷ George Paston, *Mary Wortley Montagu and Her Times*, (London: Methuen, 1907), 145.

²⁸ Henrietta Maria Dillon-Lee.

²⁹ Maria Holyroyd.

³⁰ Mitford, *The Ladies of Alderly*, 186.

³¹ Lewis, *In the Family Way*, 17.

Leonore Davidoff asserts, “Marriage was considered not so much an alliance between the sexes as an important social definition: serious for a man but imperative for a girl. It was part of her social duty to enlarge her sphere of social influence through marriage.”³²

Davidoff also states that marriage “often provided status legitimacy through one partner and new capital through the other.”³³ Davidoff writes in a deliberately neutral tone of “one partner,” but the reality was not gender-neutral. Indeed, one could argue that females brought both “status legitimacy” and “new capital” to marriages. Aristocratic families were more reluctant to marry their daughters outside of their social rank, even for financial gain. Women embodied status legitimacy. Aristocratic men, on the other hand, married outside of rank for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was “new capital.” In this way, it can be argued that nineteenth-century women occupied both sides of Davidoff’s equation, just not the same women. Aristocratic men chose their partners based on what they most needed, status or capital. Wealthy families with unmarried daughters targeted impoverished noblemen.³⁴ No less often, aristocratic men in need of an injection of capital would make a point of looking for appropriate wealthy women. Lord Monson,³⁵ after inheriting his title in 1841, repeatedly urged his son to marry a woman with deep pockets. He once wrote encouraging the young man “to find a girl with a fortune to rescue the house of Monson from its predicaments... I should be very sorry for you to marry for money but a nice rich wife would not be bad.”³⁶ Two decades later Society was gossiping about the upcoming nuptials of the heir to the 5th Duke of

³² Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 50.

³³ *The Best Circles*, 49.

³⁴ Wasson, *Aristocracy and the Modern World*, 17.

³⁵ William Monson, 6th Baron Monson (1796-1862). He was the son of Col. William Monson (the son of 1st Baron Monson). He inherited the title from a rather distant cousin.

³⁶ Horn, *Ladies of the Manor*, 19-20.

Newcastle who had most certainly landed a “nice rich wife.” Lord Stanley wrote to his wife: “Lord Lincoln³⁷ is to marry Miss Hope,³⁸ the daughter of ugly little Henry Hope³⁹ with the big house in Piccadilly. She is illegitimate but pretty.... She will have all Hope’s fortune, 50,000 a year. At present, he pays Lincoln’s debts⁴⁰ and starts him fresh on the Turf, which however he promises to abjure. It is a great thing for the Dukedom of Newcastle and will put it on its legs again.”⁴¹ At times, the feeling seemed to be that women with means had, in a sense, squandered those means by not marrying a man who was needy enough. This attitude is shown in a letter dated August 7, 1858 from Johnny Stanley to his mother Lady Stanley of Alderly: “I do not care a pin for Lindsay,⁴² after all his professions of religiousness, it looks as if he can take good care of his worldly prospects too. Miss Lloyd⁴³ ought to have married a man with a large property wanting money to improve it.”⁴⁴ It would seem that women were not permitted to marry money, but Society often hoped for women with enough money to marry impoverished well-born men in order to preserve ancient families and estates.

Throughout the period between sixteenth and the twentieth century, the two factors of status and love were paramount in the choice of a spouse for an aristocratic

³⁷ Henry Pelham-Clinton (1834-1879), later 6th Duke of Newcastle.

³⁸ Henrietta Hope.

³⁹ Henry Hope (1808-1862), M.P. and a prominent patron of the arts. He was son of the Amsterdam banker Thomas Hope and Louisa Beresford, daughter of the 1st Baron Decies. He inherited a substantial fortune from his father and his uncle. Mary S. Millar, “Hope, Henry Thomas (1808–1862)” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42186>, accessed 4 Nov 2010].

⁴⁰ The debts amount to about £35,000 and Hope settled an allowance on Lincoln of between £10,000 and £12,000 per year. Millar, “Hope, Henry Thomas,” ODNB.

⁴¹ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 258.

⁴² Robert Lindsay-Lloyd (1832-1901), became 1st Baron Wantage in 1885. He was awarded the Victoria Cross for bravery in 1854 for his service during the Crimean War. His baronage became extinct upon his death as he had no children.

⁴³ Harriet Lloyd. Her father was Samuel Lloyd, 1st Baron Overstone. He was a wealthy banker and M.P. He gave the couple the estate of Lockinge and a considerable fortune when they married. She inherited £3 million on the death of her father in 1883.

⁴⁴ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 186.

woman. In the early-modern period, families controlled marriage and thus concerns about rank dominated selection. But by the eighteenth century families had begun to loosen their control and consideration of affection became more important. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, both status and love had importance. However, it appears that women desired men whom they could love who also had status rather than men who had status whom they could love.

III. Importance of Love and Romance for Marriage

As has been shown in the preceding section of this chapter, duty to family and station always⁴⁵ played a very important role in the marital decisions of aristocratic women. Scholars accept that women in early-modern England were willing, or at least passive, participants in institution of arranged marriage. Historians such as Susan Dwyer Asmussen argue that until the eighteenth century the aristocracy did not see romantic love as an essential aspect of elite marriage. The breakdown of Elizabeth Stafford's marriage to Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk in the 1530s⁴⁶ calls this claim into question. Elizabeth protested strenuously when her husband began openly to commit adultery, causing so many problems about this issue that eventually Norfolk sent her away. Her surviving correspondence speaks eloquently of her refusal to be quietly humiliated, no matter what Society might expect of her. She complained that the Duke had chosen her and thus he had a duty to love her. Using this case, Barbara Harris has called into

⁴⁵ At least until 1920.

⁴⁶ Elizabeth's unhappiness about entering into this union is discussed in Chapter One.

question the assumptions of scholars like Lawrence Stone and Peter Laslett who posit an emotional “coolness” in the arranged marriages of this group.⁴⁷

For many aristocratic women marriage was anything but an emotionally cool affair. There seems to have been a drive toward romance even in the most calculated of arranged marriages. Couples who were strangers frequently went out of their way to inject a bit of it into the proceedings. In 1544, negotiations were well underway for the marriage of Margaret Douglas, the daughter of Margaret Tudor the Dowager Queen of Scotland and Archibald Douglas the Earl of Angus, to Matthew Stuart, the Earl of Lennox. The couple had never met, but they did exchange letters and an infatuation appears to have arisen between them.⁴⁸ In March of that year Lennox sent his secretary to the English court to see Margaret “with whom, he saith, the said earl is so far in love, that if it so please your majesty, the matter is like to take effect.”⁴⁹ It is certain that Lennox became interested in the match due to Margaret’s status and the profit he could gain from the union, but the idea of it being an emotionless undertaking did not seem to sit well with him.⁵⁰ Both of these individuals from the highest levels of the Scottish aristocracy understood the importance of marrying a person of high rank, but a desire for love and romance motivated them as well.

Margaret Douglas herself appears to have been especially prone to romantic entanglements, having engaged herself twice to young men of the court in such a way as to get herself in serious trouble. In those connections, especially the first one to Thomas

⁴⁷ Harris, “Marriage Sixteenth Century Style,” *passim*.

⁴⁸ Anthony Martienson, *Queen Katherine Parr* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973), 159.

⁴⁹ *Hamilton Papers*, 1890, II:295; *LP* 19I:180.

⁵⁰ This attitude was present in the famously disastrous first meeting between Henry VIII and his soon-to-be fourth wife, Anne of Cleves. It was a traditional arranged marriage in which neither of the parties had even met; but Henry, who had married three times before for love and would do so twice more, was not content with the lack of romance. He staged a meeting designed to be romantic, but it was an utter failure and arguably scuttled any chance at success for the marriage that ended six months later in divorce.

Howard, there was a strong element of romance as the poems the couple exchanged demonstrate.⁵¹ In 1574 when Margaret once again found herself in trouble with the English government over the matter of a marriage (this time for conniving at the marriage of her son Charles⁵² with Elizabeth Cavendish, daughter of Elizabeth Hardwick) she wrote in her defense, “Thrice have I been sent into prison not for matters of treason, but for love matters. First when Thomas Howard, son of the Duke of Norfolk, was in love with me; then for the love of Henry Darnley, my son, to Queen Mary, lastly for the love of Charles, my younger son, to Elizabeth Cavendish.” Margaret was imprisoned for a short time in the Tower of London before being sent back to her home at Temple Newsam where she was joined by the young couple. This woman who was the grand daughter and niece of kings of England and the half-sister of a king of Scotland desired to marry someone she loved and inclined to facilitate the romantic matches of her family as well.

Sometimes considerations of rank required that marriage for love be postponed as in the case of Henry VIII’s final wife, Catherine Parr. When the King expressed his desire to make her his sixth queen, Catherine, who had been married twice previously, was romantically involved with Henry’s brother-in-law, the feckless and charming Thomas Seymour. The claim of the King trumped that of Seymour and Catherine married Henry. She married Seymour four months after Henry’s death. Another less well-known case of romance deferred is that of Joan FitzGerald, the daughter and heiress-general of

⁵¹ Kenneth Muir, “Unpublished Poems in the Devonshire MS,” *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society* 6:9 (1947): 254; H.A. Mason, *Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1959), 166.

⁵² Charles Stuart (1555-1576), Earl of Lennox. He was the younger brother of Henry, Lord Darnley the unfortunate husband of Mary, Queen of Scots. Upon his brother’s death he became the heir to his father Matthew. He is the father of the unfortunate Arabella Stuart. See Chapter Four for a discussion of her marital history.

the 10th Earl of Desmond. When her first husband, James Butler, 9th Earl of Ormonde died in 1546 she explored the possibility of marrying her kinsman, Gerald FitzGerald, the son and heir of the 14th Earl of Desmond. Henry VIII disapproved of the match as a potentially troublesome foundation for a new power-bloc in Ireland and so he insisted that she marry his loyal courtier Sir Francis Bryan. This she did despite a significant age difference (she was in her early thirties while he was in his late fifties). The government appointed Bryan Lord Chief Justice of Ireland on behalf of Edward VI. The marriage was nothing more than one of convenience and it seems that Joan never forgot about Gerald (though he was approximately twenty years her junior). When Bryan fell ill, rumours circulated that Joan had renewed her pursuit of Gerald even as her second husband lay dying. Joan was determined not to lose her chance again. Bryan died in February 1550. By May of that year, she and Gerald married, creating what proved to be a very happy union.⁵³

Attitudes shifted somewhat in following century. Preservation of rank remained an important concern for noble families, but no longer did Society approve of marriages arranged by families without consideration for the happiness of the couple. One of the contemporary complaints about arranged marriages in the seventeenth century was that parents did not place enough emphasis on the need for love or affection between the couple. Some scholars argue that both a trend toward allowing women some say in their marriages and a recognition of the importance of affection came between 1560 and 1640 perhaps as a result of the rise of Protestantism.⁵⁴ Sometimes, however, as with Margaret

⁵³ Holland, "Joan Desmond," 179-180, 188.

⁵⁴ Historians frequently argue that the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century was vital in the development of the companionate marriage. The contention is that Protestantism made marriage a high calling, especially for women, in contrast to the Catholic practice. In her article "Gender, Sacrament and

Douglas and Matthew Stuart in the sixteenth century, arranged marriages proved quite passionate. Anne Clifford and Richard Sackville⁵⁵ had an arranged marriage. Anne's status as her father's heiress created problems for the couple as they fought over money and the pursuit of her rights. Nevertheless their letters reveal an underlying affection.⁵⁶

Despite the continuing emphasis on rank in the seventeenth century as well as the ongoing patriarchal nature of family relationships in that century, some parents showed a great concern that their daughters at least have some affection for a prospective husband. In 1610, Sir Percival and Lady Bridget Willoughby arranged a marriage between their son Francis⁵⁷ and the Earl of Londonderry's⁵⁸ daughter, Cassandra Ridgeway, while keeping the young pair's happiness in mind. Commenting after the match, the Earl wrote, "Well, all's well that ends well. The best and truest news that I can tell you is that your Francis and my Cassandra are hail fellows well met already, that they like and love well as they both tell me or as we all may well enough tell them that they will be married for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and healthy, on what day it shall best please you and your lady."⁵⁹ The affectionate attachment between the couple pleased the Earl and he was sure that the groom's parents would be happy about it as well. In 1619,

Ritual: the Making and Meaning of Marriage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England" Christine Peters asserts that after the Reformation both the religious and secular literature began to stress the importance of companionate marriage with its emphasis on mutual support. (*Past and Present* 169 (2000): 63-64) Both Lawrence Stone and Sarah Hood assert that as the idea of the companionate marriage grew, people began increasingly to question the business-like aspects of the arranged marriage. It was not that money and prestige became less important, but they were softened a bit with a patina of love. Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 597; Sarah Hood, "The Impact of Protestantism on the Renaissance Ideal of Women in Tudor England" (PhD diss., University of Nebraska), 1977

⁵⁵ Richard Sackville was later the 3rd Earl of Dorset. He died in 1624.

⁵⁶ Katherine O. Acheson, ed., *The Memoir of 1603 and the Diary of 1616-1619* (Peterborough: Broadview, 2007), 23.

⁵⁷ Francis Willoughby (1590-1665).

⁵⁸ Thomas Ridgeway, 1st Earl of Londonderry.

⁵⁹ O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges*, 69.

Sir Sebastian Harvey⁶⁰ showed a willingness to irritate James I in order to safeguard his daughter's emotional well-being.⁶¹ The king was promoting a marriage between Harvey's daughter⁶² and Sir Christopher Villiers, younger brother of the royal favourite George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham. Christopher Villiers had visited the Harveys in order to meet the prospective bride and he complained to the King that Harvey had not treated him well. Harvey excused Villiers' reception writing "I thought it much for her good and mine honor if liking grow on both parties. . . I only left it to my daughter to make her own choice. . ."⁶³

For some young aristocratic women in early-modern Britain it was essential to them that they love their future husbands. Some ignored their families's more pragmatic wishes refusing to marry men for whom they felt no affection. Mary Boyle, the daughter of the 1st Earl of Cork and later the Countess of Warwick, wrote:

When I was about 13 or 14 years of age came down to me one Mr. Hamletone (Hamilton), son to my Lord Clandeboys, who was afterwards Earl of Clanbrassil, and would fain have had me for his wife. My father and his had, some years before, concluded a match between us, if we like when we saw one another, and that I was of years of consent; and now he being returned out of France was by his father's command to come to my father's, where he received from him a very kind and obliging welcome, looking upon him as his son-in-law and designing suddenly that we should be married, and gave him leave to make his address, with a command to me to receive him as one designed to be my husband. Mr. Hamletone (possibly to obey his father) did design gaining me by a very handsome address which he made to me and if he did not to a very high degree dissemble, I was not displeasing to him, for he professed a great passion for me. The professions he made me of his kindness were very unacceptable to me, and though I had by him very highly advantageous offers made me... yet by all his kindness to me nor that I could be brought to endure to think of having him,

⁶⁰ Sebastian Harvey (1572-1621). He was Lord Mayor of London. He was very wealthy.

⁶¹ The fact that she was only fourteen at this time might also have played a role.

⁶² Mary Harvey, she was Sebastian's only child and thus she was a substantial heiress, which explains why Villiers would be interested in marrying her.

⁶³ Apparently her choice did not fall on Villiers as both married elsewhere. Mary Harvey married Sir Francis Popham in 1622. Christopher Villiers (d. 1630) was created 1st Earl of Anglesey in 1623. He married Elizabeth Sheldon. G.M. Fortescue, *The Fortescue Papers*, New Series, Vol. I (London: Camden Society, 1871), 86-87.

though my father pressed me extremely to it; my aversion for him was extraordinary, though I could give my father no satisfactory account why it was so.⁶⁴

Mary's disinclination to marry continued for the next two years as she turned down every suitor her father suggested. She then horrified her father by falling for Charles Rich, the younger son of the 2nd Earl of Warwick.⁶⁵ Eventually Boyle gave way and allowed her to marry Rich.⁶⁶ Her own experience of not being able to love a man who had been chosen for her appears to have remained in Mary's mind. In 1674, she arranged a marriage between her niece Essex Rich and Daniel Finch.⁶⁷ She had previously turned down several offers for the girl on the grounds that the proposed grooms were not "viceless." She explained the advantages of the union to Essex and gave "her free choice to choose or not, to do as she liked or disliked." The Countess was pleased that ultimately Essex had "consented to have him."⁶⁸

In the eighteenth century, conduct writers began to insist upon the importance of love in marriage. This was likely due in part to the increasing concern among some that marriage was devolving into a business arrangement and becoming less desirable.⁶⁹ William Hogarth brutally illustrated the attitude that eighteenth-century marriage was becoming little more than the buying and selling of young women in his 1745 work "Marriage a la Mode." Many of the periodicals of the day, such as the *Spectator*, warned

⁶⁴ Mary Rich, *Autobiography of Mary, Countess of Warwick*, T. Crofton Crocker, ed. (London: Printed for the Percy Society, 1848), 2-3.

⁶⁵ Robert Rich (1587-1658), 2nd Earl of Warwick.

In the end she was proven right when Charles became the 4th Earl of Warwick on the death of his elder brother, Robert Rich, 3rd Earl of Warwick (1611-1659) who was survived only by daughters. His only son had predeceased him. Unfortunately for Mary, her father did not live to see her elevation as the 1st Earl of Cork died in 1643.

⁶⁶ O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges*, 87. It is interesting to note that later in life Mary stated that she had been wrong to oppose her father.

⁶⁷ Finch later became the 7th Earl of Winchelsea.

⁶⁸ O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges*, 86; Rich, *Autobiography*, 35-36.

⁶⁹ Tague, "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 76.

readers about the evils of mercenary marriages and to the joys of marrying for love rather than for money.⁷⁰ Mary Pierrepont wrote to her sister the Countess of Mar:⁷¹

To speak plainly, I am very sorry for the forlorn state of Matrimony, which is as much ridicul'd by our Young Ladys as it us'd to be by young fellows: in short, both Sexes have found the Inconveniences of it, and the Appellation of rake is as genteel in a Woman as a Man of Quality. . . You may imagine we married women look very silly; we have nothing to excuse ourselves but that twas done a great while ago and we were very young when we did it.⁷²

The love advocated by the behaviour manuals was not particularly an emotional state.

Society judged it by the state of the marriage that it facilitated. When the partners fulfilled their complimentary roles it resulted in a successful marriage.⁷³ A letter written in 1698 by Jane Temple, Duchess of Portland to her aunt Lady Berkeley illustrates this perception of love, "I did believe my Lord Berkeley would never fail of being what became him upon all occasions and this I fancy must make great kindness and confidence between you."⁷⁴ The contemporary wisdom held that love made the subordinate position of women within the couple a joy and not a burden. Conversely, women learned that if they married without love, they would essentially be entering into a tyrannical relationship.⁷⁵ The prediction that if a couple married for financial reasons rather than because they were in love, "They lie in one dire Scene of endless Strife/ She scorns her Tyrant, and he loathes his Wife:/ Abroad, at Home, they diff'rent Ends pursue,/ To all Heav'n's just and sacred Vows, untrue./ Thus their sad, wretched, miserable State,/

⁷⁰ Ibid., 77.

⁷¹ Frances Pierrepont.

⁷² Quoted in Tague, "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 76.

⁷³ When Lord (later Earl) Cowper proposed to Mary Clavering in 1706 he told her that he was "not so much . . . madly in Love" but he was convinced "from cool reason and judgement" that the marriage would be a success. However, he goes on to assure her that he was 'in Love' with her, underscoring that her admirable qualities made her deserving of his "passion." Tague, "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 90.

⁷⁴ BL Egerton MSS 1705 f. 21.

⁷⁵ Tague, "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 85-86.

Destroy Soul, Body, Credit, and Estate” is found in James Poole’s 1745 poem, “Advice to the Ladies.”⁷⁶

This attitude sheds light on the actions of a fearful Mary Pierrepont in 1712. Her father had refused to allow her to marry the man of her choice, Edward Wortley Montagu, insisting on another man instead. Most observers considered Montagu a good match, but he and Mary’s father had failed to come to an agreement (during marriage negotiations) about the terms of the settlement. Her father then forbade Mary from pursuing her relationship with Montagu and set out to find another husband for her. Despite this, Mary and Edward entered into a secret correspondence between 1710 and 1712 that ultimately resulted in her agreement to run away with him.⁷⁷ Her family suspected her ongoing correspondence with Edward and took steps to keep them apart. They watched her movements carefully and eventually sent her into the country. In 1712, she wrote to him with plans for their elopement:

My Father has been here today. He bid me prepare to go to Dean this day sennight. I am not to come from thence but to give myself to all I hate.⁷⁸ I shall never see you more. These considerations fright me to death. Tell me what you intend to do. If you can think of me for your companion at Naples, come next Sunday under this Garden wall, on the road some little distance from the summerhouse at 10 o’clock. It will be dark, and it is necessary it should be son. . . . I will not pretend to justify my proceeding. Everybody will object to me. . . . In short, as things have been managed, I shall never care to hear any more on’t. Tis an odd step, but something must be ventured when the happiness of a whole life is depending.⁷⁹

Her final line is telling. One of the primary motivations toward elopement was the desire to follow the dictates of romantic inclination. She wrote to Edward, “I hate the man they

⁷⁶ James Poole, *Advice to the Ladies. A poem: with an Elegiac Complaint on the Death of the Inimitable Alexander Pope Esq. By a Norfolk Gentleman*, (London: M. Cooper, 1745), 21.

⁷⁷ Paston, *Mary Wortley Montagu*, 30, 139,

⁷⁸ Her family had found a husband for her.

⁷⁹ Paston, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, 143-45.

propose for me. If I did not hate him, my reason would tell me he is not capable of either being my Friend or my Companion.”⁸⁰ Her insistence that she could not marry a man who could not be either her friend nor her companion, that is a man whom she could not love and who did not love her, led her to take the drastic step of eloping with Montagu. Mary did this knowing that, while Society might disapprove of her disobedience, there could be no objection to her choice based on rank (Montagu was the grandson of the 1st Earl of Sandwich).⁸¹

In the first half of the eighteenth century Catherine Cecil, Lady Egmont wrote to her mother Anne Tufton, 5th Countess of Salisbury. Catherine’s mother had reproached her for being rude to her (Catherine’s) brother-in-law. Catherine wrote protesting her innocence, though she said his behaviour has been troublesome. She justified her behaviour by citing the affection that she, rightly, held for her spouse, “And if my sister has reason to be affected with any manner of disregard shewn to her husband, because he is the person she most values and loves, I have a husband too whom I value and love and with as much reason as any woman can have, and whose affront I have the highest obligation to prevent.”⁸² In this case, at least, love for a spouse trumped other familial responsibilities.

This insistence on love in marriage sat uncomfortably with the ongoing belief that a young woman owed obedience to her parents. This could put her in an untenable position. This was the case in 1740 when Caroline Campbell, the daughter of the Duke of Argyll, resisted her father’s⁸³ wishes to marry her to Francis Scott, Earl of Dalkeith⁸⁴ as

⁸⁰ Ibid., 139.

⁸¹ This case is discussed more fully in Chapter Four.

⁸² BL Add. MSS 47213 f. 128.

⁸³ John Campbell (1680-1743), 2nd Duke of Argyll.

she was in love with George Lee, the son and heir of the 2nd Earl of Lichfield. Her younger sister Mary said of the situation, “I know sister Caroline must not marry Lord Quarendon⁸⁵ if papa disapproves of it; but to be sure, she cannot marry anybody else.”⁸⁶

Lady Louisa Stuart, Argyll’s great-niece, said of the situation:

[Quarendon] had been not only handsome, lively, and agreeable, but much more the most promising in point of parts amongst all the young men of the Tory (then the Opposition and Patriot) party a bud of genius fostered by its chiefs as likely to prove the future pride of their garland. The Duke of Argyll, in particular, caressed and extolled him, made him free of his house, and, one might say, taught his family to admire him. Blind, meanwhile, like many a man in the same case, to the glaring probability that a young lady would not admire long without admitting some warmer feeling, he never asked himself how he should relish so natural an occurrence. Lord Quarendon had a father alive, not inclined to part with his money; a mother and sisters to be provided for; in short, he was not by any means a great match. Therefore, since it was certain nothing but a great match would do for Lady Caroline Campbell, it never came into his Grace's head that either party could possibly think of the other. But they found it both possible and pleasant to think, and think on; and he remained almost the only person not apprised of their mutual attachment, until Lord Dalkeith's making her serious proposals brought about a partial discovery.⁸⁷

Caroline acquiesced to paternal pressure and married Dalkeith in 1742.⁸⁸

Other parents were more sympathetic to their children’s emotions. Just over fifty years later, negotiations for a grand match were under way. Gertrude Mason-Villiers was the only child and heiress of the 2nd Earl of Gandison⁸⁹ and thus a great catch on the marriage market.⁹⁰ Her parents intended her to marry George Osborne,⁹¹ the son and heir

⁸⁴ 1721-1750.

⁸⁵ The title Viscount Quarendon was a secondary title held by the Earl of Lichfield, and as was often the case, it was used by his heir.

⁸⁶ Lady Louisa Stuart, *Lady Louisa Stuart: Selections from Her Manuscripts* (New York: Harper, 1899), 33-34.

⁸⁷ Louisa Stuart, *Some Account of John, Duke of Argyll and His Family* (London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1863), 29.

⁸⁸ Dalkeith died in 1750 of small pox. Caroline then married Charles Townshend, son of the 3rd Viscount Townshend in 1755.

⁸⁹ George Mason-Villiers, 2nd Earl of Gandison (1751-1800).

⁹⁰ For a further discussion of the marriage patterns of heiresses, see Chapter Seven.

⁹¹ George Osborne, 6th Duke of Leeds (1775-1838).

of the 5th Duke of Leeds.⁹² Family representatives held extensive meetings to work out the complicated financial arrangements that were an inevitable part of such a match. When completed, the couple went to the sea-side at Weymouth to get to know one another. The plan, however, did not work, the two did not fall in love, and the marriage was called off.⁹³

By the end of the eighteenth century, many young women considered the lack of sufficient love to be an adequate cause to turn down what would ordinarily be considered a suitable match. Emily Lamb, the daughter of the First Viscount Melbourne, wrote to her brother Frederick⁹⁴ in 1803 about a proposal she had received from Lord Kinnaird.⁹⁵ She had turned down because

... on some occasions I can sacrifice [sic] my happiness to that of others – but this is too serious, and besides I should only sacrifice [sic] myself to make him unhappy – for I never could feign what I did not feel... [she told him] that I never would marry unless it was to a man whom I loved better than all the world besides... I wish I did love him for nobody ever appeared so sincere or so deserving – but somehow it is a feeling that cannot be commanded.⁹⁶

In 1864, Louisa Bowater recorded her own problems in this area:

Less to my delight were Sir R's attentions, from which I in vain endeavored to escape by flirting with that very safe cad, Major Paynter. . . But oh! I am not happy. When I came in yesterday I found Captain B____'s card, and with it a copy of verses saying that he had staked his all on this one chance. It is that not enough to make one miserable? He will propose, perhaps, at Lady Hoare's ball tomorrow, and my heart aches to think of it, for I love him as a sister does a brother, but not as he would have me. . . I wait till I find the right person.⁹⁷

⁹² Francis Osborne, 5th Duke of Leeds (1751-1799).

⁹³ Both married other people; Osborne married Charlotte Townshend, the daughter of the 1st Marquess of Townshend in 1797, while Gertrude married Lord Henry Stuart, the son of the 1st Marquess of Bute in 1802. A.P.W. Malcolmson, *The Pursuit of the Heiress: Aristocratic Marriage in Ireland, 1740-1840* (Ulster: Ulster Historical Society, 2006), 131.

⁹⁴ Later 3rd Viscount Melbourne. He died in 1853.

⁹⁵ Charles Kinnaird (1780-1826), son of the 7th Baron Kinnaird. He inherited his father's title in 1805.

⁹⁶ Mabel Countess of Airlie, *In Whig Society*, 77. Emily married Peter Cowper, 5th Earl Cowper, two years later.

⁹⁷ Julia Cartwright, ed., *The Journals of Lady Knightley of Fawsley, 1856-1881* (London: John Murray, 1915), 79.

That same year she wrote:

Three of my rejected suitors were in the Park this morning, but, to my relief, I steered clear of them all. After luncheon, at which Mr. H ____ appeared, we went down to a party at Pembroke Lodge, where I was surrounded by old friends, and Lord Amberly was as attentive as usual. All this is enough to turn my head, but it is no doubt much better for me to have it all out now than at 18. I shall soon have had my fling and hope it may please God to grant me a happy meeting with one whom I can truly love.⁹⁸

Louisa justified her behaviour, and the rejection of suitable matches, on the grounds of insufficient love.

Nineteenth-century fathers, while concerned about the social suitability of matches, frequently took great care to safeguard the feelings of their daughters. This can be seen in the letters of the 2nd Baron Stanley and the 4th Earl of Clarendon. In August 1851, Lord Stanley wrote to his wife about their daughter Blanche's⁹⁹ love life, "I, of course, would not wish her to do anything contrary to her feelings, if she really knows what they are, but I do not think she does, and if she was to reject him she would probably repent it before long."¹⁰⁰ On February 4, 1868, Clarendon wrote to Luise von Alten, the Duchess of Manchester:

I must however, inform you that Emily¹⁰¹ is to marry Odo Russell,¹⁰² and that the Madre¹⁰³ and I are much pleased because we feel sure that with him her happiness will be great and lasting, for he is really the kindest hearted and most amiable of men and so clever and accomplished, all which is worth more than the worldly goods with which he has to endow her and which certainly don't superabound. There is wealth enough in the family as the family as the poor D: of Bedford lays by only £100,000 a year but Odo won't benefit much by that – he is in a difficult position being neither flesh nor good salt herring in diplomacy and his wonderful

⁹⁸ Cartwright, *Journals*, 82.

⁹⁹ Henrietta Stanley was often referred to by her middle name of Blanche.

¹⁰⁰ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 8-9.

¹⁰¹ Emily Villiers.

¹⁰² Odo Russell (1829-1884), became 1st Baron Ampthill in 1881. He was the youngest son of Lord George Russell (son of the 6th Duke of Bedford).

¹⁰³ Katherine Grimston.

popularity with men and women of all classes and colors shews that he must have great tact and that he ought to get on [in] his stagnant profession.¹⁰⁴

In the nineteenth century, family approval of the marriage was not enough; the women of Society had come to expect that the couple would be in love as well.¹⁰⁵ The couple should be compatible on many levels. Harriet Fane recorded her misgivings about the match between the daughter of the 5th Earl of Cowper and the future 7th Earl of Shaftesbury: “Lord Ashley¹⁰⁶ is thinking of marrying Lady Emily Cowper, who belongs to one of the most profligate families in the kingdom, he being really as moral and religious a man as exists. I hope he will be able to give her good principals [sic] or she will make him very wretched.”¹⁰⁷ Lucy Lyttelton wrote in her journal on October 21, 1868, “Edith Campbell is to marry Lord Percy!¹⁰⁸ A nice, good, pleasant youth, just grown up; Presbyterian and Irvingite,¹⁰⁹ Whig and Tory, I wonder how it will do.”¹¹⁰ Throughout her letters between 1810 and 1845, Harriet Cavendish, Countess of Granville between 1810 and 1845, only wrote approvingly of marriages that were not only within the appropriate social rank, but also those where she perceived the couple as being in love.¹¹¹ On August 10, 1858, Constance Rothschild recorded in her journal:

After tea Evy, Annie and I sat alone together. E asked if I loved Wally. I said I did not know what being in love meant. Whereupon Evy gave me a long explanation not quite incorrect with (?) some _____ which I had. I said that I liked Wally very much but I did not say anything more I know I _____ wea _____ but believe that I

¹⁰⁴ Kennedy, “*My Dear Duchess*,” 243-244.

¹⁰⁵ This is much the same as in the previous centuries, but the language being used to express this expectation is becoming more forceful and common in the nineteenth century.

¹⁰⁶ Anthony Ashley-Cooper (1801-1885).

¹⁰⁷ September, 1829. Bamford, *Journal*, II:306.

¹⁰⁸ Henry Percy (1846-1918). Later 7th Duke of Northumberland.

¹⁰⁹ Followers of the deposed Presbyterian minister Edward Irving. They rejected the name Irvingite, preferring to call themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church. They claimed that they modeled their movement on the primitive apostolic church.

¹¹⁰ Bailey, *Diary*, II:63.

¹¹¹ Leveson-Gower, *Letters of Harriet Countess of Granville*, *passim*.

shall be able to love and I am sure that that love will take full possession of me and that it may be returned!!! Lord God help thy child.¹¹²

Throughout that month her journal contained entries pertaining to Wally: "... and with burning cheeks and flashing eyes I ran upstairs and went to bed where in reality I dreamed of Wally."¹¹³ She recorded her disappointment when "the bell rang at 8 o'clock and I was certain it was a letter from Wally" but it was not.¹¹⁴

Older women sometimes questioned the validity of romantic love as a precursor to marriage. In the 1830s, Mary Glynne irritated her aunt when she turned down a marriage proposal from Lord Gairlies because she did not love him. This caused her aunt to respond caustically, "Women are not like men, they cannot choose, nor is it creditable or lady-like to be what is called in love; I believe that few...well regulated minds have ever been and that romantic attachment is confined to novels and novel-readers, ye silly and numerous class of young persons ill-educated at home or brought up in boarding schools."¹¹⁵ In 1734, the Duchess of Queensberry¹¹⁶ wrote to Lady Suffolk,¹¹⁷ "... You say nothing of Mrs. Meadows [who] ran away with her brother and Lady Fanny she put me in mind of some play where the Lady cannot bare [sic] the thought of being married unless the man takes her out a window."¹¹⁸

The letters of Harriet Cavendish have quite a lot to say on the subject of love and marriage. Writing to her mother in September 1804 about the man she intended to marry she said, "Mr. Greville I now love for myself, and he is almost the only person I know that in so short a time I could like so much; so steadily would be a better expression. .

¹¹² BL Add. MSS 47913, f. 38.

¹¹³ BL Add. MSS 47913 MSS ff. 43-44.

¹¹⁴ BL Add. MSS 47913 f. 45.

¹¹⁵ Horn, *Ladies of the Manor*, 66-67.

¹¹⁶ Catherine Hyde.

¹¹⁷ Henrietta Hobart.

¹¹⁸ BL Add. MSS 22626, f. 65.

”¹¹⁹ Her future step-mother, Elizabeth Foster, wrote of Harriet: “She will never show or feel a preference for anybody who is not decided in their liking for her. . . .”¹²⁰ In 1817 writing to her sister Lady Morpeth¹²¹ from Paris concerning the marriage of an acquaintance, Harriet opined, “I do not think Susan desperately in love, but I am sure she must become quite enough so for happiness, and I think never marriage promised so brightly, they are both so delightful.”¹²² In 1824, Harriet wrote to her sister: “What an odd marriage William de Ros’s¹²³ is! Such an odd match for the girl,¹²⁴ matchmaking and manoeuvre in the days of her youth going off in romance at eight and twenty.”¹²⁵ Harriet appears to say that the bride, Georgiana Lennox, had been quite pragmatic as a young woman in her search for a husband (though the pragmatism apparently did not yield results) but then at the relatively advanced age of twenty-eight she threw over all practicality and followed her heart. The disparity in the status of the couple supports this inference. At the time of their marriage William was merely the younger son of the 20th Lord de Ros who had no real expectation of inheriting the title.¹²⁶ Georgiana, on the other hand, was the daughter of the Duke of Richmond, one of the premier nobles in Britain.

Nineteenth-century commentators approved whole-heartedly when romance was a part of a socially suitable courtship. In 1829, the Honorable James Stuart Wortley¹²⁷

¹¹⁹ Leveson-Gower, *Hary-O*, 101.

¹²⁰ Vere Foster, ed., *The Two Duchesses: Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire, Elizabeth Duchess of Devonshire. Family Correspondence of and Relating to Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire...* London: Blackie and Son, 1898), 242.

¹²¹ Georgiana Cavendish.

¹²² Leveson Gower, *Letters of Harriet*, I:101-102.

¹²³ William FitzGerald-de Ros (1797-1874), later 22nd Lord de Ros.

¹²⁴ Georgiana Lennox, daughter of the 4th Duke of Richmond.

¹²⁵ Leveson Gower, *Letters of Harriet*, I:292.

¹²⁶ He inherited in 1839 upon the death of his unmarried elder brother.

¹²⁷ Son of the 1st Baron Wharncliffe.

wrote to his mother Lady Wharncliffe¹²⁸ about the marriage of Lady Charlotte Thynne to the Duke of Buccleuch:¹²⁹ “There certainly never was anything so nice, and I quite long to see Lady Bath¹³⁰ to have an opportunity of wishing her joy. Nothing could have been more perfect than the conduct of the whole family and particularly Lady Bath. There never was for a moment the appearance of eagerness¹³¹ to catch him and it seems to be entirely a marriage *d’inclination* on both sides...”¹³² Mabel, Countess of Airlie¹³³ wrote that her mother Edith Jocelyn

could have fulfilled her grandmother’s hopes and made a splendid marriage in her first season, but instead she fell romantically and desperately in love with the twenty-six year old Lord Sudley,¹³⁴ eldest son of the Earl of Arran,¹³⁵ who was only at the beginning of his career in the Diplomatic Service and had practically no money. Lady Palmerston¹³⁶ was disappointed but she accepted the situation philosophically. Lord Sudley was a likeable young man and his politics were sound... It was not a good match for a girl as beautiful as Edith, but at least it was not unsuitable.¹³⁷

Lucy Lyttelton, who had a wide romantic streak, wrote in November 1875, “Another marriage – lovely Lilah Grosvenor¹³⁸ to Lord Ormonde:¹³⁹ a case of falling headlong in love on both sides. It sounds very nice and promising; but the poor D[uke] of Westminster was away at the time and complains much of his daughter of 19 getting engaged in a week’s time to an Irishman behind his back! He ought; however, to be glad

¹²⁸ Caroline Crichton.

¹²⁹ Walter Montague Douglas Scott, 5th Duke of Buccleuch.

¹³⁰ Isabella Byng.

¹³¹ He seems to mean here that the bride’s family did not engage in overt scheming to bring about the marriage, rather that the couple were able to follow their own inclinations.

¹³² Caroline Grosvenor and Charles Beilby (eds). *The First Lady Wharncliffe and Her Family, 1779-1856* (London: Heinemann, 1927), 2:25-26.

¹³³ Mabel Gore.

¹³⁴ Arthur Gore, later 5th Earl of Arran (1839-1901).

¹³⁵ Philip Gore, 4th Earl of Arran.

¹³⁶ Elizabeth Milbanke. She was Edith’s grandmother.

¹³⁷ Mabel Countess of Airlie, *Thatched With Gold: The Memoirs of Mabel Countess of Arlie* (London: Hutchinson, 1962), 20.

¹³⁸ Elizabeth Grosvenor.

¹³⁹ James Butler (1844-1919), 3rd Marquess of Ormonde.

of her marrying happily, for she has been beset by lovers all the season; and poor young Stafford, her cousin over and over again, wanted to marry her, which would be a dreadful pity.”¹⁴⁰

The women expected that love would continue after marriage as well. In their writings, they commented approvingly when that was the case. Lucy Lyttelton described her married life to Lord Frederick Cavendish¹⁴¹ in wholly romantic terms in her diary.¹⁴² Harriet Cavendish¹⁴³ wrote approvingly, “I hear the Earl¹⁴⁴ calls his wife ‘my dear sweet darling’ whenever he speaks to her and that they are the happiest of human beings.¹⁴⁵ Many of these women expected that marital love would be enduring and if it faltered, there was criticism. In the mid-eighteenth century, the Countess of Hertford¹⁴⁶ wrote to Lady Luxborough:¹⁴⁷ “I own Sir Peter Soame’s . . . affliction surprises me and the passion you say he retained for my Lady and still more that she had outlived hers for him, which I thought sincere and therefore believed must be constant. But you very rightly observe that most human hearts are the real riddles in Nature.”¹⁴⁸ Later the same year she wrote of her own marriage, “I am sure my affection for my Lord Hartford and solicitude for his welfare are sincere since if I have my own heart it would not [hesitate] a moment to lay down my life for his service.”¹⁴⁹ On July 17, 1748, Lady Mary Pierrepont wrote to

¹⁴⁰ Bailey, *Diary*, II:198.

¹⁴¹ Lord Frederick Cavendish (1836-1882), son of the 7th Duke of Devonshire. He was Chief Secretary for Ireland when he was murdered there.

¹⁴² Bailey, *Diary*, *passim*.

¹⁴³ Later Countess of Granville.

¹⁴⁴ Of Derby.

¹⁴⁵ Levison-Gower, *Hary-O*, 178.

¹⁴⁶ Frances Thynne.

¹⁴⁷ Henrietta St. John.

¹⁴⁸ BL Add. MSS 23728, f. 17.

¹⁴⁹ BL Add. MSS 23728 MSS f. 18.

her husband¹⁵⁰ concerning the state of their daughter Mary's¹⁵¹ marriage with John Stuart, the 3rd Earl of Bute, "What I think extraordinary is my daughter's continuing so agreeable to Lord Bute; Mr. Mackenzie telling me... that his brother frequently said among his companions that he was still as much in love with his wife as before he married her."¹⁵² When Mabel Gore's husband¹⁵³ died in the Boer War she wrote that she was "utterly lost – a nonentity."¹⁵⁴ These aristocratic women obviously had a great deal of affection for their husbands and valued the importance of that emotion in the making of a successful noble marriage.

When the Earl of Derby's daughter Emma fell in love with his secretary, she appealed to her father's romantic streak when trying to get him to approve of the match. Her father objected that the young man in question was not of sufficient rank to be a suitable husband. Emma persuaded the Earl to agree to the match by telling him that their friends the Clarendons had "expressed their willingness to have their daughter marry a poor curate if it would make her happy."¹⁵⁵ Though it is questionable if the Clarendons would really have been so sanguine in the face of a penniless clergyman for a son-in-law; nevertheless, the appeal had the desired effect. Indeed, parents who put the happiness of their children, especially daughters, ahead of other considerations frequently received high praise from aristocratic women. Harriet Cavendish, Countess of Granville wrote in 1817 to her sister of the proposed marriage of a relative, "I think it does Lord and Lady

¹⁵⁰ Edward Wortley-Montagu.

¹⁵¹ Mary Wortley-Montagu.

¹⁵² Montague, Lady Mary Wortley, *The Works of the Right Honourable Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Including her Correspondence, Poems, and Essays* (London: R. Philips, 1803), 322-323.

¹⁵³ Stanley Ogilvy (1856-1900), 6th Earl of Airlie.

¹⁵⁴ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, 94.

¹⁵⁵ Quoted in Lewis, *In the Family Way*, 29.

Harrowby¹⁵⁶ so much honor to let money and politics never cross minds in the notion of happiness.”¹⁵⁷ Of course, the Countess did not advocate the setting aside of considerations of rank as the young woman¹⁵⁸ in question was marrying the heir to Earl Fortescue.¹⁵⁹

IV. Conclusion

Despite the ongoing discourse that aristocratic women should marry for reasons of preferment and rank, the desire for love (or at least affection) played a significant role in the attitudes toward marriage evidenced by these women during all of the centuries under examination in this study. There are indications from across the period that noble women took their own feelings, and those of their children, into consideration when thinking about marriage. The emphasis placed on emotional considerations shifted in relation to the emphasis placed on rank, but it was always a factor in the decision-making concerning the marriages of aristocratic women. Rank remained an important factor throughout the period under examination, but by the eighteenth century women increasingly hoped for both rank suitability and emotional fulfillment. Rank identity was preserved when an aristocratic woman married a man of high status whom she also loved. In the nineteenth century, Society expected aristocratic marriage to have both, although it did accept the appropriateness of noble men marrying for money in order to preserve their status and estates. This chapter discussed the desire for love within suitable matches,

¹⁵⁶ Dudley Ryder, 1st Earl of Harrowby (1762-1847) and Susan Leveson-Gower, daughter of the 1st Marquess of Stafford.

¹⁵⁷ Levison-Gower, *The Letters of Harriet Countess of Granville*, I:101-102. This is most likely in reference to the marriage of Susan Ryder who was marrying Hugh Fortescue, heir to the 1st Earl of Fortescue, so it is not like this was a wildly inappropriate match in terms of rank.

¹⁵⁸ Susan Ryder.

¹⁵⁹ Hugh Fortescue (1783-1861), later 2nd Earl Fortescue. He was the son and heir of Hugh Fortescue (1753-1841), 1st Earl Fortescue.

most frequently matches that had familial approval. Chapter Four continues the discussion of the pursuit of love, but within marriages that did not have parental sanction.

Chapter Four: Elopement and Defiant Matches: Marrying Outside the Bounds of Propriety

I. Introduction

Throughout the early modern and modern periods, society assumed that aristocratic women would marry in such a way as to further the interests of their natal families and preserve aristocratic rank identity. Some women, however, did not conform to these societal strictures and chose to pursue their desire for love in their marital relationship.¹ In some instances, they defied their families and married according to their own will on their first marriage -- that is, they eloped.² More often, they entered into what are termed defiant matches. That is, they exercised their agency when entering into subsequent unions, choosing a mate considered by their family to be unsuitable. Frequently both elopements and defiant matches resulted in hypogamy or exogamy (which explains why the couple's families often opposed the marriages). This chapter focuses on elopements and defiant matches and the light that such matches shed on conceptions of rank. The relatively small number of elopements and defiant matches indicates that it was possible, though frequently difficult, for aristocratic women to exercise agency in the matter of their marriages. Society nearly always disapproved of these matches, seeing them as violating deeply held strictures about appropriate marriages. The marriages of aristocratic women were controlled so firmly because those

¹ See Chapter Three.

² This is one meaning of the term as used in the letters, etc. of the women; the other is when a person who is already married runs off with another person who is not their spouse. The latter meaning is more frequently found in the press. For example, the London Times carried many advertisements such as the following: "Whereas Martha Porter, wife of Thomas Porter, late of Crown-Street. . . . having sometime ago eloped from her said Husband, this is to caution any person from trusting the said Martha Porter, as I will not pay any Debts she might contract." Untitled, *The London Times*, June 2, 1785, #135, p. 4. A more general meaning that was also in use simply meant to run away. This meaning was used without particular reference to marriage, very often reporting that a child had run away from school or work or that a suspected criminal had absconded with ill-gotten gains.

marriages were vital to the preservation of noble rank identity. Simply the fact that the unions were so controlled was an important part of that rank identity. Women who chose to marry without the permission of their families posed a threat to the cohesion of the group and thus Society rarely was sympathetic to these women.

II. Defiant Matches and Elopements Under the Tudors

Aristocratic widows in the sixteenth century generally had more freedom of choice in the selection of a subsequent husband than they had in the choice of their first spouse. Even then, however, society assumed that they would marry a man who fitted familial and social requirements. Some women decided not to follow the expected path. They entered into defiant matches, marrying men beneath them in rank. Entering into secret or defiant matches provided a means for widows to exercise independence. The ease with which a couple could enter into a marriage at this time made this relatively simple to undertake. If an elite widow braved the consequences, she could exercise some freedom in the contracting of her subsequent marriages.

Many of the elite women who married hypogamously or exogamously on their subsequent marriages³ chose much younger and less financially stable partners than themselves. Status and wealth permitted noble widows to make marital choices that fulfilled their own personal needs and desires rather than conforming to the expectations of society. In truth, the subsequent marriages that many of these women made had no practical purpose. For example, Marjory Golding's deceased husband, John de Vere, the

³ For most of the period under consideration, these women were widows as divorce was quite rare before the latter part of the twentieth century.

16th Earl of Oxford⁴ left her certain estates with the statement that they were “in part of recompense for all such dowry as she may demand out of my lands.” Exactly what this meant is somewhat unclear since as his widow the law entitled her to one-third of his estates as her dower.⁵ However, as the widow of a nobleman, she was under the nominal power of the Court of Wards and that court could revoke her right to dower had she married without the consent of the monarch and the payment of a fine (the purchase price for remarriage). Quite soon after the Earl died in 1562, Marjory married Charles Tyrell a member of her husband’s household. Possibly, she did not claim her dower rights, instead choosing to live on the estates left to her by Oxford’s will. This would have freed her to marry as she chose with no legal ramifications. It is also possible that she did claim her dower and married without permission braving the possible repercussions from the Court of Wards. Her will has not survived and that of Tyrell (who outlived her) does not clarify the status of her property. Marjory experienced a loss of social status due to her second marriage, but she did not suffer financially. She had a house as part of her jointure and her re-marriage had no effect on her annual income of about £400. Despite this, she was reluctant to appear at court, uncertain perhaps of the welcome that she and her second husband would receive.⁶ In this case, Marjory did not profit either financially or socially by this marriage. Indeed, it seems very likely that the marriage to Tyrell adversely affected her in both of these areas. The fact that she likely had to waive certain of her financial rights to enter into this union is an indication of the use of money to try to control these elite women. It is also telling that she feared that she and her husband would

⁴ 1516-1562.

⁵ See the more extensive discussion of property law as it related to aristocratic women in Chapter Seven.

⁶ Pearson, *Edward de Vere*, 22-24.

not be welcome at court. What she had done was outside the bounds of acceptable behaviour, thus it seems likely that she made her own choice.

Frances Brandon, herself the daughter of the scandalous defiant match between Princess Mary Tudor, Dowager Queen of France and the upstart Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, made a perfectly respectable first marriage to Henry Grey, the Marquis of Dorset.⁷ They are most famous as the parents of the ill-fated Nine-Days' Queen, Lady Jane Grey. The government arrested both Frances and Henry for complicity in the plots and risings surrounding the bid to put Jane on the throne in the place of her Catholic cousin Mary I in 1553. Grey was executed for his part in the matter (as was Jane), while Frances worked to salvage what she could for herself and her remaining two daughters.⁸ Roughly a year later, at age thirty-eight, she married her handsome, twenty-two year old equerry or master of the horse, Adrian Stokes. Their age difference, coupled with the disparity in social position, elicited a lot of salacious comment among contemporaries (especially since Frances was reputed to be a difficult woman). In his *Annales*, William Camden charged her with "forgetting her lineage" when she married this "mean gentleman."⁹ Despite this, the marriage appears to have been a success. Surprisingly, the Duchess remained on good terms with Queen Mary I and managed to place her daughters

⁷ When Frances' father died, Henry Grey was later named Duke of Suffolk by right of his marriage to her, the previous Duke's eldest daughter. Frances' elder half-sister Anne also married a Grey: Edward, 3rd Baron Grey of Haworth. As was very often the case, he had been her father's ward. The marriage was unhappy and she eloped with a man of no title, Randall Haworth, eventually marrying him after her husband's death. S. J. Gunn, 'Brandon, Charles, first duke of Suffolk (c.1484–1545)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/3260>, accessed 26 March 2011]

⁸ Katherine and Mary Grey.

⁹ Quoted in Retha M. Warnicke, "Grey, Frances, duchess of Suffolk (1517–1559)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/65987>, accessed 26 Sept 2010]; Alison Plowden, *Lady Jane Grey and the House of Suffolk* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1985), 129.

from her first marriage at court.¹⁰ In the sixth year of marriage, Frances died, having made her will which left Stokes all of her goods, a life interest in most of her lands, and most importantly, an acknowledged social position that he used to make a profitable second marriage and to gain election to the House of Commons.¹¹

The marital histories of Marjory Golding and Frances Brandon, while certainly not typical for Tudor widows, were not unique. As one looks at the marriage patterns of these women, it is difficult not to notice the relatively large number who, upon their subsequent marriage, chose mates outside of their social rank. While the reasons for these choices are likely to be as numerous as the women who made them, it is possible to make some generalizations. These generalizations provide a means by which to examine attitudes toward social rank and female roles during the sixteenth century.

Ideally, Society wished for widows either to remain single or to make another profitable marriage. Concerns about family status and patriarchy remained in place when elite women and their families considered the issue of subsequent marriage. However, the statistics show that aristocratic women made less socially advantageous subsequent matches. The distinction between first and subsequent marriages was the exercise of agency on the part of these elite women made possible by the relative freedom afforded widows in sixteenth-century England. The number of women marrying within their own rank or up the social hierarchy changes significantly when one looks at subsequent

¹⁰ Katherine married Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford without permission in 1560, a crime for which both were incarcerated. Her sister Mary married Thomas Keyes, a royal gatekeeper in 1565, perhaps hoping to avoid the problems attendant on her sister's marriage. If that was the intention, she miscalculated, as Elizabeth looked no more favourably on this union.

¹¹ Hasler, *The House of Commons*, III:449; Warnicke, "Grey, Frances."

marriages, here the number of women marrying hypogamously or exogamously rises markedly.¹²

Some of the very elite women were in a position of real crisis at the time of their husbands' deaths, due to the fact that their husband had been executed and the full punitive weight of the Tudor treason law fell on the entire family. When a court convicted a person of treason in sixteenth-century England, not only did the convicted person suffer. Society considered the entire blood family tainted by his or her wrongdoing. The government confiscated lands and property, and rescinded titles. Families had to undergo a long legal struggle to reverse these effects.¹³ The wives and widows of men imprisoned or executed by the state often found themselves fighting for the rights of their children and for enough property to support themselves. The number of married elite men executed during the Tudor era was actually quite small. In the group of twenty-eight such men identified for this study, twenty¹⁴ of their widows did not remarry. Of those who did remarry following the execution of their husband, 11 percent¹⁵ married within the elite ranks, while 18 percent¹⁶ married hypogamously or exogamously.¹⁷ Perhaps these numbers indicate that society expected a woman who became a widow under such extreme circumstances would not remarry. Thus, it may well be that the 29 percent who chose to marry again violated social norms. The 18 percent who married outside of their social rank violated expectations on two fronts.

¹² See Table 26 in Chapter Two.

¹³ Stanford E. Lehmborg "Parliamentary Attainder in the Reign of Henry VIII" *Historical Journal* 18 (1975), 678.

¹⁴ 71 percent

¹⁵ Three

¹⁶ Five

¹⁷ This group was drawn largely from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; it seems likely that a more thorough sampling from the peerages and other genealogical sources would certainly expand the numbers of men who were executed leaving widows. It is at this time uncertain whether that expansion would alter the proportions in any meaningful way.

Among the group of women who married down or out following the execution of their husbands were Frances de Vere, Frances Brandon, and Anne Stanhope, three women from the highest ranks of the Tudor elite, if not by birth, then certainly by virtue of their first marriages. Frances de Vere was the daughter of the 15th Earl of Oxford and the widow of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Anne Stanhope was the widow of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, who had been Lord Protector during the first years of Edward VI's reign, thus making her the leading lady of the realm. All of these women lost their husbands to the executioner during the political machinations of the years 1547-59. Howard, the eldest son of the 3rd Duke of Norfolk, was executed for allegedly plotting to claim the throne when Henry VIII died. Seymour was executed in 1552 in a palace coup that brought John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland to power. Suffolk was executed in 1559 as a result of his plots to put his eldest daughter, Jane, on the throne instead of Mary I. All of their widows married men well below them on the social scale shortly after the deaths of their first husbands.

Frances de Vere, the daughter of one of the oldest families in the Tudor peerage, married Henry Howard suddenly in February 1532 when both were quite young. It is likely that politics lay behind the speed of these negotiations. At this time, Henry VIII loved Anne Boleyn and as a result, he lavished political preferment on her faction. A leading figure in the faction was Howard's father, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk, who was also Anne's uncle. Relations within the group were sometimes fraught, as Anne felt that her uncle Norfolk overstepped his bounds on occasion. In early 1532, rumours circulated there that Norfolk intended to marry his son Henry Howard to Henry VIII's daughter Mary. Anne disapproved of this move and it may well be that the match with Frances de

Vere took place in order to appease her. The couple married in the spring of 1532, though they were young enough¹⁸ that they did not immediately cohabit.¹⁹ Certainly, no one took the wishes of Frances and Henry into account in the planning of this union. Frances and Henry did, of course, eventually live together as man and wife. The union was perhaps not wholly satisfactory to either partner. He spent most of his time at the court and she apparently preferred to live a quiet life in the country. In 1546, a factional struggle within the dying Henry VIII's court resulted in the arrest on charges of treason of both Frances' husband, now Earl of Surrey, and her father-in-law, the Duke of Norfolk. Their assumption that as the highest nobles in the land they should play a leading role in whatever government followed the death of Henry VIII led political rivals to move decisively against them. Their trials resulted in guilty verdicts and death sentences for both. In the waning days of the King's life, Surrey went to the scaffold (the death of the King spared the Duke). As a convicted traitor, all of Surrey's property and titles were forfeit and Frances and her children left destitute. Not unusually, after some time the government (now of the boy-king Edward VI) returned some of the property (and eventually the rights to the family titles as well) including the manor of Earl Soham to Frances. By 1553 she remarried, choosing to wed the younger son of a west-country gentleman, Thomas Steyning. It is not clear how the couple came to meet and marry, but they retired to a relatively quiet life at Earl Soham, living on the proceeds of that manor as well as the nine other manors (worth an annual rent of £353) given to them by her former father-in-law the Duke of Norfolk. Living quietly in the country apparently contented Frances, she only went to court for important events like marriages or

¹⁸ Both were about fifteen years old.

¹⁹ Sessions, *Henry Howard*, 81-82.

christenings. Steyning, on the other hand, began to live in a manner appropriate to his newly elevated status, taking on a political role in the countryside that eventually brought him a seat in the House of Commons. Frances had two children with her second husband and died in 1577 (after seeing her eldest son, the 4th Duke of Norfolk, beheaded for plotting with Mary Queen of Scots). Upon her death, the Howard family reclaimed her and buried her in their church of St Michael Framlingham.²⁰

Anne Stanhope was the daughter of minor gentry, but through her marriage to the brother of Jane Seymour, Henry VIII's third wife, she rose to the highest levels in Tudor society. In 1547, upon Henry's death, Edward Seymour became the head of the government²¹ under his nephew, the minor King Edward VI, thereby making Anne the first lady of the realm, a position she reputedly enjoyed. This great position did not last long as John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland (Lady Jane Grey's father-in-law), outmaneuvered Seymour who ultimately ended up on the scaffold. The Seymours' steward, Francis Newdigate, was associated closely enough with the family to have his property confiscated when the Protector fell (the government returned it nine months after the execution).²² Anne suffered imprisonment for a short time during her husband's trial and execution leaving Newdigate to protect as much of her property as possible. Perhaps this loyalty in her service attracted her to him. The couple married by 1558 and lived on her manor of Haworth. Anne worked hard to secure preferment for her new husband. Within a few months of the marriage, she procured a seat in the House of Commons for him.

²⁰ Jessie Childs, *Henry VIII's Last Victim: The Life and Times of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2006), 316; Sessions, *Henry Howard*, 210-11; P.W. Hasler, *The House of Commons, 1558-1603* (London: Published for the History of Parliament Trust by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1981), III; 448.

²¹ He was generally known as Lord Protector, but that title was not officially conferred upon him.

²² Many of these widows married their stewards, which is perhaps not surprising. Barbara Harris points out that the office of steward was usually occupied by a man of gentle birth. Harris, "Marriage Sixteenth Century Style," 373.

Throughout his political career, she used her position and wealth to his benefit, a situation he acknowledged in his will (made May 31, 1580) in which he stated that he owed all of his position in the world to her so it was only fitting that he leave her all of his (her) property, making her his sole executrix.²³

Despite social expectations of widows, in the cases of these three elite women, it seems their decisions to remarry, even exogamously, did not place these women outside of the bounds of polite society. However, William Camden's rather pointed comment about Frances Brandon "forgetting her lineage" does indicate that concerns about rank remained. In the case of Frances de Vere, perhaps the most interesting aspect of her remarriage is the fact that her former father-in-law provided manors for her support following her subsequent union (and his own release from the Tower of London). This indicates a level of acceptance of this exogamous marriage by the head of one of the most important families in England. Her burial in the Howard family church is also a sign that she had not placed herself outside of the bounds of appropriate behaviour with her remarriage.

Frances de Vere, Frances Brandon, and Anne Stanhope all made socially scandalous subsequent marriages to men they chose for themselves, apparently without thought for the usual characteristics that women of their rank were to seek in a spouse. They did so, however, in the wake of traumatic personal experiences. These powerful women, who stood to lose everything, sought male companions and chose men whom they trusted – specifically men who had done them good service in their time of trouble. Because these women were the more powerful partners, they had greater control over the circumstances of their lives which might not have been the case had they married within

²³ Hasler, *The House of Commons*, III:125.

their own rank. The behaviour of other women in similar circumstances underscores the fact that widows often had greater agency. In 1536, George Boleyn, Viscount Rochford, was executed as part of the plot that destroyed his sister Queen Anne Boleyn. His widow, Jane Parker, did not remarry, retaining her position at court as an attendant upon Henry VIII's subsequent queens until her own execution in 1541 for her complicity in the bad behaviour of Henry's fifth wife Katherine Howard. In Elizabeth's reign, Frances Walsingham, the widow of Robert Devereux, the 2nd Earl of Essex²⁴ married Richard Bourke, the 4^h Earl of Clanricard²⁵ soon after her husband's execution. The scandal that tainted the families of convicted traitors did not render their widows damaged goods. Many of them, such as Jane Parker, continued to serve in prominent positions at court and several made advantageous marriages. It seems that the extremity of the circumstances granted the widows of attainted traitors a significant measure of freedom of choice. Stanhope, Brandon, and de Vere each exercised that freedom and chose to marry well outside of their social rank. The fact that they did not pay a heavy price is likely a reflection of the privileges of being an elite widow.

Crises of other sorts also seem to have encouraged aristocratic widows to marry hypogamously. A classic example of this is Katherine Willoughby, the widow of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.²⁶ A great heiress in her own right, she had come to the Suffolk household when her father died. At fourteen, she married the aging Duke and following Brandon's death in 1545 she controlled a great deal of wealth. Katherine was also a firm Protestant, which made her situation difficult in 1553 when the Catholic Mary I took the

²⁴ He was executed for treason when he led an abortive rebellion against Elizabeth I in 1601.

²⁵ 1572-1635.

²⁶ He married her following the death of his previous wife (his marital history is so convoluted that it is difficult to assign ordinal numbers to his wives), Henry VIII's sister Mary Tudor.

throne. Like many others, Katherine decided to leave England for safer shores on the Continent. A family account records, “When this lady went beyond the sea [in the reign of Mary I], her chief servant of trust that went with her was Richard Bertie, esq. who, by tradition in our family, was her Gentleman of the Horse. He had the character of being a gentleman of merit, and I believe he was very serviceable to her in those troublesome times, and that he thereby rendered himself so pleasing to her that she took him to be her second husband. . .”²⁷ Bertie was of good, though not exalted, birth and well educated.²⁸ Though Katherine’s social inferior (a fact that he was very aware of, he once signed a letter “husband to the Lady Katherine Suffolk”),²⁹ Bertie attempted to claim the title Willoughby de Eresby in right of his wife. The legal wrangling surrounding this claim exposed his family background to scrutiny, so that even his wife, who supported his suit, admitted that he was “meanly born.”³⁰ Persisting in their suit, Katherine wrote to Elizabeth I on July 29, 1570, to try to convince the Queen to summon Bertie to Parliament as Lord Willoughby de Eresby stating, “It is to God to rule all, and by His good means [those] as meanly born as [my] husband have been advanced by prince’s gifts to greater honour than [we] challenge as [our] due.”³¹ Eventually Bertie received his summons, and the couple’s son Peregrine Bertie³² became one of the leading members of the peerage in the last years of Elizabeth’s reign, a sure sign of the family’s inclusion in the elite ranks.³³ Katherine worked hard to ensure that the children from her second

²⁷ Chandos, 1958, 18.

²⁸ Mackin, “The Life of Katherine Willoughby,” 36.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 42.

³⁰ J. Horace Round, *Peerage and Pedigree: Studies in Peerage Law and Family History* (London: James Nisbet, 1910), I:1-2.

³¹ Round, *Peerage and Pedigree*, I:28.

³² 12th Baron Willoughby de Eresby (1555-1601).

³³ As was his marriage to Mary de Vere, the daughter of the 16th Earl of Oxford.

marriage enjoyed as many of the same privileges as her sons from her first union.³⁴ For women of the status of Katherine Willoughby, a hypogamous marriage might cause a bit of a scandal but it was not social suicide and her exalted status and wealth could be transferred to the children of her less-than-exalted husband.

Sometimes a legal challenge to property rights drove elite women into hypogamous or exogamous subsequent marriages. This was the case for Lettice Knollys, the widow of Elizabeth I's favourite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. When Dudley died, his illegitimate son sued for rights of inheritance claiming that his parents had in fact been married. Had his suit succeeded it would have invalidated Lettice's marriage to Dudley (which took place when the young man's mother was still alive), thus voiding her jointure rights. The uncertainty and fear brought on by this suit apparently propelled her into marriage in 1589 with a young man in her son's³⁵ household, Sir Christopher Blount.³⁶ Despite the fact that Blount was his close associate, even Essex said that it was an "unhappy choice" on the part of his mother.³⁷ Lettice countered saying that as a defenseless widow she needed protection. Blount spent a good portion of the marriage traveling with the Earl of Essex on his various military adventures. In 1601, when Essex rose in open armed rebellion against Elizabeth I, Blount was by his side. Like Essex, he suffered trial and execution for treason. As a convicted traitor, Blount's property, which had been Lettice's, was in legal jeopardy. During the legal wrangling surrounding her attempts to safeguard her substantial wealth, she alleged that Blount, penniless at the time

³⁴ Mackay, "The Life of Katherine Willoughby," 45. Both her sons, Henry and Charles, died on the same day in July 1551.

³⁵ From her first marriage to the Earl of Essex, Lettice was the mother of Robert Devereux, the ill-fated Earl of Essex; the favourite executed by Elizabeth in 1601.

³⁶ He had previously been Dudley's Master of the Horse.

³⁷ Paul Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 34.

of their marriage, swindled her out of all of her property.³⁸ In this case, the practical benefit Lettice derived from the subsequent hypogamous marriage is not apparent (though by all accounts Blount was a handsome and charming young man).

For other elite widows the impetus toward a hypogamous remarriage appears to have been more personal, even romantic. They married endogamously initially, as society expected them to, but seized the opportunity afforded by their widowhood to make an emotionally satisfying subsequent match. Those who did so acted against the accepted wisdom of the age which held that marriages based on romance or love were not likely to succeed.³⁹ Despite this conventional wisdom, some Tudor women did associate romantic love with marriage.⁴⁰

³⁸ Simon Adams, "Dudley, Lettice, Countess of Essex and Countess of Leicester (1543–1634)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/8159>, accessed 26 Sept 2010].

³⁹ Stone, *Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 181. See a more extensive discussion of this in Chapter Three.

⁴⁰ The case of Mary Tudor also supports this contention, but since she was a royal princess she is outside of the parameters of this study. Despite that, the story is worth recounting for the light that it sheds on the issue of romantic love. In 1515, Henry VIII's beautiful younger sister Mary Tudor married for love and caused a horrific scandal. In January of that year, the young princess (about eighteen or nineteen) was the widowed Queen of France, who had married the much older Louis XII for diplomatic reasons the previous year. When she departed for France she extracted a promise from her brother that she would be able to marry whomever she chose when she was widowed. (It seemed quite certain that she would be a widow as Louis was 55 and in poor health at the time of the marriage). It was common knowledge that Mary was very fond of Henry's good friend Charles Brandon, the Duke of Suffolk, and it was not difficult to ascertain whom her choice would be. When Louis died (in January 1515 after his marriage in November 1514), Mary was concerned that her brother would not keep his word about her next union. Thus, when Suffolk arrived in France to assist in diplomatic matters concerning the death of the king and her own status as royal widow, she took her opportunity. From the letters of both Charles and Mary it is clear that she emotionally blackmailed him into marrying her (he writes of her crying such tears as he had never seen before) and then consummated the marriage as quickly as possible so that it could not be undone. When she wrote to England to explain her behaviour she did so in romantic and individualistic terms. Writing to her brother she reminded him that she had been "contented to conform myself to your said motion" and marry Louis XII "though he was very aged and sickly" on the condition that "if I should fortune to survive the late king I might with your good will marry myself at my liberty without your displeasure. Whereunto, good brother, you condescended and granted, as you well know, promising unto me but as mine own heart and mind should be best pleased; and that wheresoever I should dispose myself, you would be wholly contented with the same. And upon that, your good comfort and faithful promise, I assented to the said marriage. . . ." Now that Louis was dead, she had decided to marry Brandon and had consummated the marriage: "I have so bound myself unto him that for no cause earthly I will or may vary or change from the same." (Wood, *Letters*, I:204)

Henry was not happy about the situation and it took several more letters, both from Mary and from Brandon, before they were permitted to return to England (though even then they had to pay a heavy

The second marriage of Mary Boleyn, the elder sister of Henry's second wife Anne, and the King's former mistress is a good example of a defiant match. Her first husband, William Carey, died of the sweating sickness in 1529 leaving Mary a lonely and neglected widow. As her family rose to dizzying heights on her sister's skirts, they left Mary behind and she resented this marginalization. In 1534/35, Mary contracted a secret marriage with a minor court functionary, William Stafford. The union came to light when she became pregnant. The fact that her somewhat scandalous sister had married so far below the family's hard-won dignity annoyed Anne greatly and she banished the couple from court. Mary wrote to the King's Secretary Thomas Cromwell asking him to intercede with the King and Queen on her behalf.⁴¹ Her poignant letter puts a human face on the position of people surrounding the high court politics of the 1530s, revealing that emotion sometimes overruled all other concerns:

I am sure it is not unknown to you the high displeasure both he [her husband, William Stafford] and I have, both of the king's highness and the queen's grace, by reason of our marriage without their knowledge, wherein we both do yield ourselves faulty and do acknowledge that we did not well to be so hasty nor so bold. But one thing, good master secretary, consider, that he was young, and love overcame reason; and for my part I saw so much honesty in him, that I loved him as well as he did me, and was in bondage and glad I was to be at liberty: so that, for my part, I saw that all the world did set so little by me, and he so much, that I thought I could take no better way but to take him and to forsake all other ways, and live a poor, honest life with him. . . For well I might have had a greater man of birth and a higher, but I assure you I could never have had one that should have loved me so well, nor a more honest man; and besides that, he is both come of an

financial price for their marriage). Generally, in the letters, Mary was somewhat wheedling, playing on the affection of her brother, but she could turn defiant as well:

Sire, your grace knoweth well that I did marry for your pl[easure a]t this time, and now I trust that you will suffer me to [marry as] me l[iketh fo]r to do. Wherefore I beseech your grace for to be good lord and brother to me; for sire, an if your grace will have granted me married in any place [sav]ing wheras my mind is, I will be there, whereas your grace nor no other shall have any joy of me: for, I promise your grace, you shall hear that I will be in some religious house, the which I think your grace would be very sorry of, and all your realm. . . (M.A.E. Wood Green, *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain* (London: Colburn, 1846), I: 188.

⁴¹ Green, *Letters*, II:194-97.

ancient stock, and again as meet. . . to do the king's service as any young gentleman in his court.

She then asked Cromwell to plead with Henry and to have him speak to Anne because “her grace is so highly displeased with us both that . . . we are never like to recover her grace's favour; which is too heavy to bear.” Mary indicates that the marriage is several months old so the union is binding, “But if I were at my liberty and might choose. . . I had rather beg my bread with him than to be the greatest Queen in Christendom. And I believe verily he is in the same case with me: for I believe verily he would not forsake me to be a king.”⁴² Her last statement about preferring to be the wife of William Stafford than the “greatest Queen in Christendom;” is quite ironic. In less than a year, the Boleyns fell from their exalted state as Henry executed Anne for alleged adultery (their brother George faced trial and execution on charges of incest). Only Mary, still rusticated on orders of her now disgraced sister, survived the debacle relatively unscathed. During her time in favour, Anne Boleyn was in the unusual position as a woman of being the head of her family due to her relationship with the King. Her harsh reaction to Mary's defiant, hypogamous marriage can be attributed not only to pride or anger, but also to the fact that Mary, in contracting such a union without her permission, had undercut Anne's authority as head of the family.⁴³ Mary had not acted in the best interests of the family such a

⁴²Green, *Letters*, II:194-97.

⁴³ Eric Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: “The Most Happy”* (London: Blackwell, 2004), 210. [Pascual de Gayangos, ed., *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere: Henry VIII* (London: published by authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, 1877; reprint ed., Vaduz, Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1969), 1534-35, 344. Henceforth cited as Cal. SP Span.; James Gairdner, ed., *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England*, 21 vols. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1862-1910; reprint ed., Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1965), 7:1554, 1655 Henceforth cited as LP.]

socially questionable match could have provided the Boleyn's rivals with additional ammunition.

Parental wills provide one of the best contemporary sources in which to find attitudes toward the need to contract a "fitting match." For example, Sir Robert Lee's will instructed his executors "to prefer every of my said daughters to convenable marriages without dispareagement."⁴⁴ Henry Clifford, the 1st Earl of Cumberland⁴⁵ stipulated in his 1541 will that if his daughter married an Earl or his heir she would receive £1,000 for her dowry. If she married a Baron or his heir, she would received 1,000 marks, and if a knight only 800 marks.⁴⁶ John Shirley's will⁴⁷ revoked his daughters' dowries if they married down in rank. Sir John Shelton's will of about 1550 made his daughter Mary's dowry conditional on her marriage to a man with an income of at least £200-£300. The Earl of Sussex stipulated in his 1556 testament that his daughter lose her dowry entirely if she married below the rank of knight or his heir apparent.⁴⁸

While it was relatively rare, in some instances, aristocratic daughters chose to marry in the face of familial opposition on their first marriage by eloping. Nearly always, these marriages were clandestine in nature. In 1535 Henry VIII's niece, Margaret Douglas, entered into a secret marriage with Thomas Howard, half-brother of the 3rd Duke of Norfolk.⁴⁹ This case differs from that of Mary Boleyn as Margaret had never been married. The couple's circle of friends at court facilitated the romance and secret

⁴⁴ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 54.

⁴⁵ 1493-1542.

⁴⁶ His daughter Maud married John, 3rd Lord Conyers. His father died just after his fifteenth birthday, but the agreemet for the marriage had already been drawn up. Dickens, *Clifford Letters*, 53.

⁴⁷ Written in 1485. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 266 n77.

⁴⁸ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 53-54.

⁴⁹ This case is also discussed in Chapter Two.

marriage.⁵⁰ Thomas' half-niece, Mary Howard, the Duchess of Richmond⁵¹ frequently helped.⁵² Margaret lived at the English court for many years. Thomas came to court in 1533 when his niece Anne Boleyn became Henry's second Queen. He was in his early to mid twenties and Margaret was a few years younger.⁵³ They conducted much of their romance through love poems that each of them wrote and entered into a book, later known as the Devonshire Manuscript,⁵⁴ that the younger members of Henry's court circulated among themselves. The poems, written both before and after the romance came to light, show the affection between them.⁵⁵ Thomas and Margaret exchanged traditional love gifts. He gave her a cramp ring⁵⁶ and she gave him a miniature.⁵⁷ When the authorities discovered the marriage, they separated the couple and imprisoned them.⁵⁸ He went to the Tower of London where he died while she served her punishment in Syon Abbey.⁵⁹ During their imprisonment, they continued to write poems. He wrote, "My love truly shall not decay/ for thretnyng nor for punishment." To which she replied, "great

⁵⁰ At the time that the relationship began, the match was quite suitable for both parties and it all must have seemed like an exciting romantic game to those involved. This air of romance was most likely exacerbated by the fact that neither had parents who were on the scene.

⁵¹ Mary Howard was the daughter of Thomas Howard, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk, and the wife of Henry VIII's illegitimate son Henry Fitzroy, the Duke of Richmond.

⁵² Retha Warnicke, *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood, Press, 1983), 39.

⁵³ Head, "Beying Ledde and Seduced by the Devyll," 6.

⁵⁴ The Devonshire Manuscript was an anthology of poetry that was compiled, and sometimes written, by many of the younger members of Henry's court in the 1530s. The volume itself belonged to Mary Howard, Duchess of Richmond who received it as a gift from her husband Henry Fitzroy. It seems to have passed through various hands and poems were copied into it. The poems were both original compositions by members of the circle, adaptations of older pieces such as Chaucer, and transcriptions of works by contemporary poets such as Thomas Wyatt. Schutte, *A Biography of Margaret Douglas*, 239-240.

⁵⁵ Muir, 1947, 254; Mason, 1959, 166.

⁵⁶ A cramp ring was a ring of relatively little value (often of silver) that had been blessed and was thought to be effective in warding off sickness.

⁵⁷ Maria Perry, *The Word of a Prince: A Life of Elizabeth I from Contemporary Documents* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), 23.

⁵⁸ Thomas's half-brother, the 3rd Duke of Norfolk had several years earlier easily received a pardon for an illegal marriage between his half-sister and the Earl of Derby, but this case was too close to the royal family for Norfolk to be able to help. David Head, *The Ebbs and Flows of Fortune: The Life of Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1978), 310.

⁵⁹ Several years later, Margaret entered into another illicit romance with a Howard and was again incarcerated when it was discovered.

poynes he suffereth for my sake/ contynnually both nyght and day.”⁶⁰ The couple garnered widespread sympathy because many people at court felt that Henry had neglected his duty by failing to arrange a suitable marriage for Margaret. The Imperial ambassador, Eustace Chapuys, commented that since Margaret had been of an age to marry for more than eight years and considering the immorality of the court around her, the King should pardon her for entering into a marriage.⁶¹ This union can be classified as an elopement since Margaret simply decided that the time had come for her to marry. She made an ill-advised choice, as the niece of the King of England and the daughter of the Queen of Scotland, marriage with a younger son of the nobility did not constitute an adequate match.⁶² She did not marry in a way deemed appropriate by Society and thus the union was a threat to her family’s rank identity.

When an elite Tudor woman indulged in a clandestine or defiant match, the penalties could be daunting. She faced disinheritance, familial disapproval, or, as in the case of Margaret Douglas, legal ramifications.⁶³ Parliament passed a bill of attainder against Thomas, sentencing him to death (he died in the Tower before the sentence could be carried out). He wrote movingly in a poem about the cruel end of his romance “My love truly shall not decay/ For threatnyng nor for punishment;/ For let them thnyk and let them say...” “My lytle w/ch is good and stronge/ That I am yours and yow are myne.../ Now fayre ye well, myn one swete wife,/ Trustyng that shortely I shall here/ From yow

⁶⁰ Southall, *The Courtly Maker*, 19.

⁶¹ Byrne, *LL*, 3:32.

⁶² Harris, “Marriage Sixteenth-Century Style,” 62.

⁶³ The ramifications of the case are discussed in Kim Schutte, “Not for Matters of Treason, but for Love Matters’: Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox and Tudor Marriage Law,” in *In Laudem Caroli: for Charles Nauert*. James V. Mehl ed. (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1988), pp. 171-187.

the stay off all my lyfe.”⁶⁴ Years later, a better poet, Thomas’s nephew Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, wrote “it is not long agoe/ Sins that, for love, one of the race end his life in woe/ In towre both strong and highe, for his assured truth”⁶⁵ In order to forestall such inappropriate matches within the royal family, Parliament included a provision in the Bill of Attainder making marriage to a member of the royal family without permission of the monarch punishable by death.⁶⁶ Thus, the government used this match to serve as a lesson to all those who sought to better themselves through marriage into the royal family.⁶⁷ A lesson, but not one that Margaret necessarily took to heart: in 1541, at the age of twenty-six, she became involved with the brother of Henry’s fifth wife, Catherine Howard. This liaison did not progress as far as her first, but again, when the Queen fell, word of the romance got out and Margaret found herself in Syon Abbey.⁶⁸ The King’s council sent Archbishop Thomas Cranmer to talk to her with orders about what to say:

His Majesty’s pleasure is, also, that tomorrow . . . you shall call apart to you my Lady Margaret Douglas; and first declare unto her, how indiscreetly she hath demeaned herself towards the King’s Majesty, first with Lord Thomas and secondly with Charles Howard; in which parts, you shall by discretion, charge her with overmuch lightness and finally give her advice to beware the third time, and wholly apply herself to please the King’s Majesty.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ John Stevens, *Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court* (London: Methuen, 1961), 205; David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (Totowa, N.J.: Barnes and Noble, 1987), 98-99.

⁶⁵ Southall, *The Courtly Maker*, 20; Muir, “Unpublished Poems in the Devonshire MS,” 281.

⁶⁶ The bill went before the Parliament of July 18, 1536 and included a new legal restriction concerning marriage within the royal family: “that if any man, of what estate, degree, or condition so ever he be, at any time hereafter take upon him to espouse, marry, or take to his wife any of the King’s children [being lawfully born or otherwise commonly reputed or taken for his children] or any the King’s sisters or aunts of the part of the father, [or any of the lawful children] of the King’s brothers or sisters [not being married] or contracted marriage with any of them, without the special license, assent, and agreement first thereunto had and obtained of the King’s highness in writing under his great seal, [or defile or deflower any of them not being married,] shall be deemed and adjudged a traitor to the King and his realm. . . .” *Statutes of the Realm*, ed. Al Luders, et al. (London: Record Commission, 1810-28), 28 Hen. VIII. c. 24.

⁶⁷ *SP Span*, 1888, 5,2:214; *LP* 11:147; Brenan, *The House of Howard*, 193; Roger Merriman, *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902; reprint ed. 1968), I:145.

⁶⁸ Brenan, *The House of Howard*, 305-06.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 306; *LP* 16:1333.

Ultimately, Margaret married the Scottish nobleman Matthew Stewart, the Earl of Lennox. In this case, the marriage negotiations followed the accepted paths except that Henry VIII insisted that no marriage contract be signed until the couple met and approved of the match. In the period before that meeting, they exchanged several letters of increasingly romantic tone. By the time they met, Lennox and Margaret were infatuated with one another and enjoyed a happy marriage.⁷⁰ In this case, Margaret married in accordance with the wishes of her extended family and contracted a union that served the needs of that family. She behaved in a way that ensured her and her family's place in the rank hierarchy.

III. Defiant Matches and Elopements after the Tudors

Instances of defiant matches and elopements increased in subsequent centuries and officials passed several measures in an attempt to ameliorate the problem. No matter what steps the government and Society took to try to compel aristocratic women to marry in accordance with accepted strictures, these unacceptable matches continued to occur. The government recognized the potential problems attendant upon clandestine unions⁷¹ and attempted to curb the practice. Clergy who performed clandestine marriages faced significant penalties. After 1597, if a clergyman conducted a clandestine wedding the ecclesiastical court could prosecute and remove him from his clerical duties for a period up to three years. The penalty this law levied against the couple or their witnesses was

⁷⁰ Martienssen, *Queen Katherine Parr*, 159-60; *The Hamilton Papers*, II:295; *LP* 19 I:180.

⁷¹ Both elopements and defiant matches were very frequently undertaken in secrecy.

excommunication. In reality, this did not seem to frighten many and it was rarely imposed.⁷²

The proximity to the throne that made Margaret Douglas's clandestine unions problematic also caused problems for her granddaughter. In the reign of James I, his cousin Arabella Stuart⁷³ found herself in the unenviable position of being too close to the throne to be permitted to marry. James had not allowed her to contract a proper union, so at the rather advanced age of thirty-five she eloped with William Seymour, the twenty-two year old son of Catherine Grey and the Earl of Hertford.⁷⁴ When James heard of the plan, he summoned the couple to him and both denied any intention to wed each other. Despite that denial, they married not long afterward and James ordered their imprisonment, William in the Tower and Arabella at Lambeth Palace. In 1610, James wrote a letter to the Bishop of Durham committing Arabella to his custody, "Whereas our Cousin, the Lady Arabella hath highly offended us in seeking to marry herself without our knowledge (to whom she had the honour to be near in blood) and in proceeding afterwards to a full conclusion of a marriage with the same person whom (for many just causes) we had expressly forbidden her to marry."⁷⁵ Arabella wrote to her cousin the King explaining her actions:

And though your Majesty's neglect of me, my good liking of this gentleman that is my husband, and my fortune drew me to a contract before I acquainted your Majesty, I humbly beseech your Majesty to consider how impossible it was for me to imagine it could be offensive unto your Majesty, having few days before

⁷² Lawrence Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 97.

⁷³ James and Arabella shared paternal grandparents – Margaret Douglas and Matthew Stuart. James was the product of the marriage between their son Henry Darnley and Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, while Arabella's parents were the Lennox's second son Charles and the daughter of Bes of Hardwick, Elizabeth Cavendish.

⁷⁴ This was a highly ironic choice, since William's parents had also married without royal approval and had been incarcerated for their presumption.

⁷⁵ Elizabeth Cooper, *Life and Letters of Lady Arabella Stuart, Including Numerous Original and Unpublished Documents*, 2 vols. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1866), II:137.

given me your royal consent to bestow myself on any subject of your Majesty's. . . Besides, never having been either prohibited any or spoken for any in this land by your Majesty these seven years that I have lived in your Majesty's house, I could not conceive that your Majesty regarded my marriage at all; whereas, if your Majesty had vouchsafed to tell me your mind and accept the freewill offering of my obedience, I could not have offended your Majesty...⁷⁶

This letter did not move James to mercy and Arabella spent the rest of her life in the Tower of London.

The late seventeenth century apparently witnessed an increase in the number of clandestine and defiant marriages.⁷⁷ That this occurred at the same time that historians have asserted that parents were loosening their control of their children's marriages⁷⁸ calls the arguments of those historians into question. If aristocratic offspring could truly make their own choices more freely, it seems odd that the number of them defying their parents would have grown, as they would not have had to do so. The comments on these matches found in the writings of elite women do not appear to indicate that noble daughters should be utterly free to make their own decisions. On February 1, 1637, Dorothy Percy, the Countess of Leicester wrote disapprovingly to her husband, "I have only heard of your sister Strangford's⁷⁹ marriage, who hath bestowed herself on a Colonel whose name is Culpepper. It is said that on two days acquaintance she contracted herself to him and after a few more was married and given by Lord Craven."⁸⁰ In April of that same year, she reported an elopement, "My lord Andevor⁸¹ and Ms Doll Savage⁸² were married on Monday without the knowledge or consent of their parents. My lord of

⁷⁶ Cooper, *Life and Letters*, II:114-115.

⁷⁷ O'Day, *Cassandra Brydges*, 45.

⁷⁸ See Chapter Three.

⁷⁹ Lady Barbara Sydney, the widow of Sir Thomas Smyth, 1st Viscount Strangford.

⁸⁰ HMC *De L'Isle*, 82.

⁸¹ Charles Howard (1615-1679), later 2nd Earl of Berkshire.

⁸² Dorothy Savage.

Berkshire⁸³ and my lady⁸⁴ are in great affliction and my lady Savage⁸⁵ pretends a great displeasure.”⁸⁶

The issue of rank suitability loomed large in the report of the 1797 elopement of Charlotte Stuart that appeared in the *London Times*, “The Marquess of Bute⁸⁷ is quite disconsolate for the loss of his accomplished daughter, who has been seduced from her friends, and eloped with a person of very inferior connections and little or no property. They are since married.”⁸⁸ The groom was William Jackson Homan, an Irishman who became a baronet in 1801. The characterization of the elopement as a seduction “from her friends” illustrates Society’s belief that it collectively had a stake in the marriages that these elite women made and that an aristocratic woman had a duty to accept an endogamous marriage, not just for herself and her family, but also for her rank as a whole. Elopement was thus often construed as a betrayal of a woman’s responsibility to the aristocratic rank identity as a whole.

In the 1740s, John Burgoyne, the future general but a man of very middle-class stock, became friends with James Smith-Stanley, Lord Strange, the son and heir to the 11th Earl of Derby while they were both at school. Through this friendship, Burgoyne began to mix in more exalted circles and he met Strange’s youngest sister Charlotte Stanley. The couple soon fell in love and wished to marry, a desire that her father adamantly opposed (though Lord Strange thought it a fine idea). On April 14, 1751, the pair eloped. Derby cut his daughter off financially leaving the couple essentially

⁸³ Thomas Howard (1590-1669), 1st Earl of Berkshire. He was the son of the 1st Earl of Suffolk.

⁸⁴ Elizabeth Cecil.

⁸⁵ Elizabeth Darcy.

⁸⁶ HMC *De L’Isle*, 101.

⁸⁷ John Stuart, 1st Marquess of Bute (1744-1814).

⁸⁸ Untitled, *The London Times*, June 15, 1797, # 3931, p. 2.

penniless. They soon sold Burgoyne's military commission for £2,600 and left for France where they gained entry into elite salons by exploiting Charlotte's noble birth. It appears that for the years that they remained abroad members of both families contrived to send them some money. It was not until the birth of their daughter in 1755 that Lord Strange was able to broker a reconciliation between the Burgoynes and Earl Derby. Though he never gave them as much money as they hoped, Derby did help Burgoyne further his military career.⁸⁹

Society could be ruthless if it saw an ill-advised match in the making; however, comment could be equally scathing if a parent turned what should have been a perfectly respectable match into a defiant match or an elopement. This was the case in 1719 when Daniel Finch, son and heir of the 2nd Earl of Nottingham⁹⁰ wished to marry Frances Fielding, daughter of the 4th Earl of Denbigh. A letter to Henrietta Hobart, Lady Suffolk, from her friend Catherine Hyde, later Duchess of Queensberry, recorded the outrage against the putative groom's father:

Lord Nottingham's barbarity furnishes the town with a subject to show the good and ill nature of mankind. By what I have heard L[or]d Nottingham has not only disinherited L[or]d Finch in case he marrys Lady Fanny Fielding, but has drawn the deed in such a manner (which he drew with his own hand) that when he dyes, the profits of the estates is to be paid into trustees, till either Lady Fanny is dead or married, or L[or]d Finch is married; and yet there are those who say the whole is a lamely contrivance to break the match.⁹¹

⁸⁹ William Kingsford, *The History of Canada*, Vol. V (1763-1775) (Toronto: Rowsell and Hutchinson, 1892), 384; James Lunt, *John Burgoyne of Saratoga* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, 1975), 12-13, 17; Lauren Paine, *Gentleman Johnny: The Life of General John Burgoyne* (London: Robert Hale and Co., 1973); Gerald Howson, *Burgoyne of Saratoga: A Biography* (New York: Times Books, 1979), 15; Max M. Mintz, 'Burgoyne, John (1723-1792)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4013>, accessed 28 June 2010].

⁹⁰ He also held the title of 7th Earl of Winchelsea.

⁹¹ BL Add. MSS 22626 f. 25.

On December 21, 1720, Anne Howard, Viscountess Irvine wrote to the Honorable Charles Ingram about another scandal:

I suppose you have been merry with Dr. Edgerton's⁹² stealing a match with Lady Betty Bentinck.⁹³ She did it with the greatest resolution. A Sunday night she pretended to go to prayers, locked her chamber door and slipped down a back way and walked afoot out of St. James' with the doctor, who had sat in his coach two hours in the Mall, expecting her. Her whole family are prodigious angry, but the doctor is in the highest transport, and I can't help rejoicing that he has so happily succeeded in his passion...⁹⁴

As in the case of Frances Fielding, society expressed its disapproval because there seemed to be no valid reason for the family to oppose the match, thus forcing the couple to act outside the bounds of respectability. Just as Society saw an elopement with an unworthy spouse as a betrayal of family and rank as a whole, there appears to have been a recognition that if the spouse were of a worthy family Society had a duty to accept the marriage.

In 1744, Georgiana Lennox entered into a romance with Henry Fox,⁹⁵ a man not deemed by her parents, the Duke and Duchess of Richmond,⁹⁶ to be of sufficiently high birth to be an appropriate spouse. The Richmonds had another suitor in mind and told Georgiana to take "especial care over her toilette" in preparation for his visit, as it would be an important evening. Georgiana, realizing that if a proposal were given then her hopes in regards to Fox would be dashed, took matters into her own hands by cutting off her eyebrows, making her unfit to receive visitors. The Richmonds hosted a party of sorts that evening but Georgiana remained alone in her room. She and Fox had put in place

⁹² Hon. Henry Egerton, son of the 3rd Earl of Bridgewater.

⁹³ Elizabeth Bentinck.

⁹⁴ HMC *Var Col.*, 8:102.

⁹⁵ Henry Fox (1705-1774) was the son of Hon. Stephen Fox. He was elevated to the peerage as 1st Baron Holland of Foxley in 1763. He was a prominent politician.

⁹⁶ Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond (1701-1750) and Sarah Cadogan respectively.

plans to elope, which they did that night. The couple went to the area around Fleet Prison⁹⁷ and entered into a clandestine union that produced at least three children.⁹⁸

As in the sixteenth century, widows of later eras were more prone to marry outside of their rank than were first-time brides. This tendency often caused comment and sometimes the woman strove to keep the match a secret in order to avoid the gossip. Mary Fitzwilliam, the widow of the 9th Earl of Pembroke,⁹⁹ married Johan Bernard after her first husband died. She hid this second union to a man below her on the social scale. In September 1751, a woman at court wrote, “Lady Pembroke owns her marriage in private but tho she was at Court yesterday she has not yet been presented.”¹⁰⁰ Mary had little expectation that her second marriage would meet with approval at court.

Families whose daughters eloped or contracted defiant matches often attracted pity. In April 1764, Elizabeth Townshend, Countess Cornwallis wrote to her son, “Lady Susan Strangways¹⁰¹ married last Saturday, Mr. O’Brien,¹⁰² the actor. Lord and Lady

⁹⁷ The precinct (the Rules) around the Fleet Prison was the place of business of many clergy who conducted clandestine marriages for a fraction of the cost of an ordinary wedding. The popularity of this venue, which certainly was not chosen for its romantic ambience, was likely a result of the legislation which imposed stiff fines on clergy who conducted clandestine marriages. More respectable churches became far less willing to conduct secret nuptials. The parsons who operated in the Rules of the Fleet, most often conducted marriages in non-sanctified settings, that is, in ale houses or private homes. The district was rather laxly overseen by the ecclesiastical authorities, such neglect gave the opening for the conduct of the clandestine unions. Quite a large number were conducted. In 1705 it was reported that between October 19, 1704 and February 12, 1705 2,954 marriages took place there. The questionable legal and moral standing of many of the Fleet clergy meant that a Fleet marriage was remarkably open to question as to its validity. If a marriage were questioned in a court of law, there was a great deal of reluctance to take the word of a Fleet parson and they had a reputation for doctoring their registers in exchange for a bribe. Lawrence Stone, *Uncertain Unions: Marriage in England, 1660-1753* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 105; Rebecca Probert, *Marriage Law and Practice and Practice in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 176, 178, 180-81, 186, 189.

⁹⁸ Edward Walford, *Old and New London*, Vol. 5. 1878. Accessed through “British History Online,” <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45229>; Stone, *Road to Divorce*, 115.

⁹⁹ Henry Herbert (1693-1750).

¹⁰⁰ BL Add. MSS 2269, f. 61.

¹⁰¹ Susan Fox-Strangways.

¹⁰² William O’Brien.

Ilchester,¹⁰³ her father and mother, are much to be pitied; she was reckoned both pretty and clever.”¹⁰⁴ The Countess saw Susan as a young woman who could have done so much better for herself, having squandered her potential. More to the point, she had failed in her duty to marry well to the benefit of her natal family and her rank. Elizabeth Seymour, Duchess of Northumberland, made the following entry in her journal on October 21, 1769: “A daughter of Lady Kerry’s who had run away with a hairdresser was stopped here (Dover) by Lady Shellburne and her Mother’s servants, who managed however so ill, that she slipped into an open boat with only two rowers and so escaped to Calais.”¹⁰⁵ The young woman in question was Gertrude Tilson, the granddaughter of the 4th Earl of Cavan.¹⁰⁶ Her mother, Gertrude Lambart, sent Bow Street Runners¹⁰⁷ after the couple, but they made it to Calais and married before being caught.¹⁰⁸

One elite woman described the marriage patterns in the eighteenth century as “a first marriage being often one of interest, and the second one of love.”¹⁰⁹ The elite practiced relative sexual license in the eighteenth century compared to the centuries both before and especially after it. This did not mean, however, that all of Society approved of such behaviour. The letters of the era bear witness to this disapproval. In 1753 Henrietta Knight, the married daughter of Henrietta St. John, Lady Luxborough, ran away¹¹⁰ with

¹⁰³ Stephen Fox-Strangways 1704-1776), 1st Earl of Ilchester and Elizabeth Homer.

¹⁰⁴ HMC, *Var Col*, 6:307.

¹⁰⁵ Greig, *Diaries*, 92-93.

¹⁰⁶ Richard Lambart (d. 1741).

¹⁰⁷ The Bow Street Runners were a proto-police force set up in the 1750s by Henry Fielding. Peter Ackroyd, *London: The Biography* (New York: Anchor Books, 2000), 279.

¹⁰⁸ Greig, *Diaries*, 93n.

¹⁰⁹ This observation fits with nearly all of the period covered in this study. Katherine Thomson, *Memoirs of Viscountess Sundon, Mistress of the Robes to Queen Caroline, Consort to George II...* (London: H. Colburn, 1848), I:56.

¹¹⁰ In the letters of the time, this was referred to as an elopement. Thus that term meant both an unmarried woman (or man) marrying without parental permission on her first marriage and a married woman (or man) running away with a partner who was not their spouse.

Josiah Child.¹¹¹ In response, her mother's good friend Frances Seymour, Countess of Hertford wrote:

Dear Madame, what can I say to you! If sympathizing in everything which rends your Heart, could administer relief you would have been comforted from the moment you stood in need of being so. I never heard one hint of this miserable affair till the E'clat(?) was made, and was so ill informed that I do not know at this time what Mr. Child it is that she has been drawn into this unhappy conduct by. About the middle of the Summer she was at Windsor and I heard such an account of her dress and behaviour that I was almost tempted to have wrote to you – But—was loath to torment you with what I thought it much more than probable tht you had it not in your power to remedy, as I knew the prejudice of her education. I believe her Husband was with her at that time, though he did not attend her to the Cathedral, but a Young Man whose name (I think) was Harris and with whom she talked and laughed during the whole service yet found time to ogle every man in the church, which with her flaunting dress made her be mistaken for a kept mistress; til they afterward discovered who she was. Thus dear Madame I have obeyed your command and wrote all I know or have heard tho it has given me pain for fear it should add to yours. You have certainly acted very prudently in writing to her Husband's Brother, as you could not with any propriety have received her immediately after such an open defiance of every law, Divine and Humane, not I think ever, without the consent or almost the request of Mr. W----L's Family.¹¹² Yet if she should become Penitant and desire with Earnestness of Humility to return, or give the best assurance in her power of an entire reformation I believe it would be the most wise and the most Christian mother to admit her, rather than to force her to continue in a viscious course for bread, which I apprehend must be her care, if neither hew own family or her Husband's will receive her, or at least permit her to live in any place under their direction in the most absolute retirement. But even this necessary as it appears to be, cannot be done without all Parties' agreement.¹¹³

Later the Duchess wrote with sympathy that was perhaps more apparent than real, "Poor Mrs. W----d [Weymondsold]! but since we cannot say nothing to her honour, let us not explicate upon her disgrace."¹¹⁴

On May 16, 1762, Elizabeth Seymour, the first Duchess of Northumberland noted in her journal, "I heard that Mr. Thomas Clifford,¹¹⁵ a younger brother of Lord Clifford¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ BL Add. MSS 23728 ff. 3-4.

¹¹² In a later hand the name Weymondsold is provided.

¹¹³ BL Add. MSS 23728 ff. 43-44.

¹¹⁴ BL Add. MSS 23728 MSS ff. 46-47.

and nephew of the Duchess of Norfolk¹¹⁷ had run away with the youngest Miss Aston,¹¹⁸ a great heiress, a Ward of the Duke of Norfolk's. The suspicion was that the Duchess was privy to this affair¹¹⁹. . . She got a great fortune for her nephew in the next place."¹²⁰ Two years later on October 25, 1764, she reported on the scandal that had shocked all of fashionable London:

Lady Harriet Wentworth youngest Sister to the Marquess of Rockingham a girl of admirable good sense and an unblemished character eloped with John Sturgeon, a lad of about 19 who was her own footman so illiterate when he came into her service he could not even write his [name]. . . She parted with all her fine clothes; she should for the future wear only washing gowns as was fit for his wife. . .¹²¹

In his letters Thomas Gray described her as "not a young or beautiful maiden" and as a "sensible, well-educated woman; twenty-seven years old, indeed, and homely enough."¹²² The couple ran off to France before returning to England to raise their three sons.¹²³ The possible inheritance of the property by the boys concerned the family until Earl Fitzwilliam's son was finally born in 1786.¹²⁴

Eloped¹²⁵ happened even between the offspring of the most elite families. In some cases, it would seem that the couple ran off more for the romance of the undertaking rather than due to familial opposition. This would appear to be the situation

¹¹⁵ Henry Thomas Clifford (1732-1787), son of 3rd Baron Clifford of Chudleigh.

¹¹⁶ Hugh Clifford (1726-1783), 4th Baron Clifford of Chudleigh.

¹¹⁷ Catherine Brockholes.

¹¹⁸ Barbara Aston.

¹¹⁹ Chapter Six contains a discussion of the role of women in the marriage market. Generally this is discussed in the context of women arranging profitable, appropriate, marriages for their kin. In this case the Duchess is thought to have operated within that same paradigm, but in a less appropriate manner.

¹²⁰ Greig, *Diaries of a Duchess*, 43.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹²² Thomas Grey, *Gray's Letters*, Duncan C. Tovey, ed. (London: Bell and Sons, 1912), CCLXII & #50. http://www.archive.org/stream/lettersofthomasg03grayuoft/lettersofthomasg03grayuoft_djvu.txt III:

¹²³ Egerton Castle, ed., *The Jerningham Letters, 1780-1843: Being Excerpts from the Correspondence and Diaries of the Honourable Lady Jerningham and of Her Daughter Lady Bedingfield* (London: Richard Bently, 1896), II:55.

¹²⁴ E.A. Smith, *Whig Principles and Party Politics: Earl Fitzwilliam and the Whig Party, 1748-1833* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975), 113.

¹²⁵ In both senses of the word.

in the marriage of Elizabeth Courtenay and Charles Somerset (though the fact that the bride was only sixteen at the time might well explain the family's hesitancy, as well as the fact that they were not in control of events).¹²⁶ *The Times* ran the following story on May 29, 1788:

Miss Elizabeth Courtenay, daughter of Lord Courtenay, eloped on Thursday evening last from her father's house, Grosvenor Square, to Gretna-Green,¹²⁷ with the second son of the Duke of Beaufort. The particulars are these: -- The young ruaways the better to conceal her designs, had bespoken a new dress for the Duke of York's ball on the Friday evening. On the night preceding, Miss Courtney being engaged with the family at a rout, affected indisposition and consequently remained at home. About twelve o'clock at night, she and her maid sallied forth. At the end of Duke Street, a post-chaise was in waiting with the hero in it, and off the two lovers drove. The maid returned, and went to bed. Being rather late in stirring in the morning, she was called by some of her fellow servants. She then declared that so far from oversleeping herself, she really had not slept a moment; for that she knew that she would be turned off in the course of the day. Then she candidly explained. The hue and cry was raised, but all in vain. The pair had flown too rapidly upon the wings of Love to be overtaken. The maid was discharged, and the whole family, particularly his Lordship, were almost distracted with the girl. It is hoped, notwithstanding all family opposition, that the young lady has made a good choice, and the young nobleman obtained an amiable wife.¹²⁸

The marriage lasted until Elizabeth's death in 1815 and produced three sons and four daughters.

That same year, another prominent family experienced an elopement in which the groom was from a lesser rank. This disparity in rank did not appear to trouble the *Times* which reported the case with great relish (and some inaccuracy):

¹²⁶ Charles Somerset (1767-1831), son of the 5th Duke of Beaufort. Following Elizabeth's death in 1815 he married Mary Poulett, daughter of the 4th Earl of Poulett, in 1821.

¹²⁷ Gretna Green was the primary site of clandestine marriages during this period. The small town was just over the border in Scotland on the main road and since Scotland would allow clandestine marriages when England would not, couples headed there. Stone, *The Road to Divorce*, 130.

¹²⁸ "Untitled," *The Times*, May 29, 1788, #1085, p. 3.

Sunday morning very early, Lady Anna Maria B _____¹²⁹, eldest daughter of Lady S _____¹³⁰ eloped from the house of Mrs. Parish where she lived in Fludyer-Street, Westminster, with Mr. Jepson,¹³¹ who had a house so contiguous, that the parties contrived to lay boards from one to the other, by help of which, and a ladder, they had the pleasure of marching off without being discovered even by the watch, and are by this time on their way to Calais, the gentle God fanning a propitious gale.¹³²

Anna, who was seventeen at the time of her elopement, had been exchanging love letters with the impoverished young lawyer Jepson for nearly a year. The two headed straight for Gretna Green where they were married. Passion notwithstanding, Anna was an heiress with substantial prospects which no doubt made her an attractive match for her neighbor.¹³³

The nineteenth century had more than its share of scandalous elopements. In 1805, Marianne Stanhope sent John Spencer Stanhope an account of an elopement that was rife with class attitudes. On March 1, she wrote:

The Elopement and distress in the House of Petre has been the chief subject of conversation for the last few days. Miss Petre¹³⁴ made her escape from her father's house in Norfolk with her Brother's tutor¹³⁵ on Monday last. It is said they are at Worcester and married only by a Catholic priest. However Lord¹³⁶ and Lady P.¹³⁷ are gone there and it is expected she will be brought back tonight. They can do nothing but get her married to the man at Church. She is 18 he is 30 and no Gentleman. She was advertised and 20 guineas reward offered to anyone who could give an account of the stray sheep. It is a sad History. What misery this idle girl has caused her parents and probably ensured her whole life.¹³⁸

¹²⁹ Anna Maria Bowes (Lyon).

¹³⁰ Mary Bowes, Countess of Strathmore.

¹³¹ Actually Henry Jessop.

¹³² "News in Brief," *The Times*, Jan. 29, 1788, #880129, p. 3.

¹³³ Moore, *Wedlock*, 378-379.

¹³⁴ Maria Petre.

¹³⁵ Stephen Phillips (b. 1774).

¹³⁶ Robert Petre (1763-1809), 10th Baron Petre.

¹³⁷ Mary Howard.

¹³⁸ A.M.W., Stirling, ed., *The Letter Bag of Lady Elizabeth Spencer-Stanhope, 1806-187*, 2 vols. (London: John Lane, 1913), 19.

She wrote again on March 3:

You have doubtless read in the papers the account of Miss Petre's elopement with her brother's tutor, Mr. Phillips. He is a very low man, quite another class, always dined with the children, never associated the least with the family, a sort of upper servant. Lady Petre thought him rather forward, he was to have left them at Easter. She had seen her daughter at twelve the night before and only missed her at breakfast. Her clothes were all gone. A friend of his, a brandy merchant, accompanied her in the chaise, the tutor rode first. A clergyman refused to marry them sometime ago at Lambeth, but they have since been married at Oxford by a Mr. Leslie, a Catholic priest, which is not enough. They are not yet discovered.¹³⁹

The Stanhopes obviously saw this as a case of a servant who reached above himself and an elite woman who made a socially disastrous choice.¹⁴⁰ Stephen Phillips had been educated at the English College at Douai France so it is clear that he was a Catholic, which also added to the unsuitability of the match in the eyes of Society.¹⁴¹

Elopedments between non-aristocratic men and aristocratic women certainly came in for their share of abuse in the nineteenth century. This social stigma perhaps explains this comment from Harriett Cavendish in a letter to her sister in January 1822, "Lady Julia Gore has married a Captain Lockwood."¹⁴² Lady Abercorn¹⁴³ went into furies, fits, hysterics, but ended by forgiving them. The love, the storm, calm, and wedding all included in ten days."¹⁴⁴ In 1825, Lady Holland wrote to her son, "[T]hese unequal marriages never succeed, unless the rank and station are so powerful from wealth and

¹³⁹ Stirling, *Letter Bag*, 19-20.

¹⁴⁰ 1805 was perhaps a bad year for the daughters of noble families and their tutors. On February 27, 1805 *The Times* carried the following notice, "The daughter of a Noble Lord, in the vicinity of Grosvenor-Square, eloped yesterday with the Family Tutor." "Elopement", *The Times*, Feb. 27, 1805, #6267, p. 2. As the paper is specific about a London location and the Petre elopement took place from the family home in Norfolk it does not seem that these are the same cases.

¹⁴¹ This religious unsuitability was in the eyes of Protestant society not the Petre family itself which was staunchly Catholic.

¹⁴² Robert Lockwood, d. 1865. He was very active in the military until his retirement in 1833.

¹⁴³ Anne Gore, Julia's elder sister.

¹⁴⁴ Leveson-Gower, *Letters*, I: 222-223.

family that they are carried down per force.”¹⁴⁵ Eleanor Stanley, a maid of honour to Queen Victoria, wrote at mid-century, “One of the remarks made on Mr. Drummond’s¹⁴⁶ marriage is, how exceedingly impertinent of a Clerk in the Treasury, which he is, to run away with the First Lord’s step-daughter [Adelaide Lister].”¹⁴⁷

Though she may have found the Lister marriage impertinent, Eleanor recognized the hypocrisy of some of the noble parents whose children married without parental permission. She wrote to her mother on October 6, 1846:

I suppose you will have heard long before this of Lady Rose Somerset’s elopement with Mr. Lovell;¹⁴⁸ Lord Worcester is gone after them, that is, to try and find them, for they have only a general idea that they are in Wales. They say Mr. Lovell has long wished it, and was forbid the Duke’s¹⁴⁹ house, as he would not hear of it; so much for the Duchess’s¹⁵⁰ telling Charlie she only wished to see them all married to country clergymen.¹⁵¹

Rose met Francis Lovell when he was serving as a regimental officer and they both attended the same country dance. Not long afterwards they ran off together.¹⁵² The other daughters of the family made appropriate, if not overly exalted, marriages: Emily married George Hay-Drummond, 12th Earl of Kinnoull¹⁵³ in 1848; Katherine married the 2nd Baron Ormathwait¹⁵⁴ in 1858; and Edith wed William Denison, 1st Earl of Londesborough¹⁵⁵ in 1863.

¹⁴⁵ Ilchester, *Elizabeth Lady Holland to her Son*, 37.

¹⁴⁶ Maurice Drummond.

¹⁴⁷ Mrs. Stewart Erskine, ed., *Twenty Years at Court: From the Correspondence of the Hon. Eleanor Stanley... 1842-1862* (London: Nisbett, 1916), 138.

¹⁴⁸ Francis Lovell.

¹⁴⁹ Charles Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort (1792-1853).

¹⁵⁰ Emily Smith. Her own marriage to the 7th Duke of Beaufort was the subject of some controversy as he had previously been married to her half-sister. The case is discussed more fully in Ch. Two.

¹⁵¹ Erskine, *Twenty Years at Court*, 131.

¹⁵² Adrian Margaux, “Elopedments, Some Famous,” *The Strand Magazine* 32 (July-December, 1906): 623-629.

¹⁵³ 1827-1897.

¹⁵⁴ Arthur Walsh (1827-1920).

¹⁵⁵ 1834-1900.

Parents sometimes attempted to stop unions that they saw as unworthy and the nineteenth century witnessed several dramatic cases. A famous example occurred in 1805 when the 7th Earl of Cavan¹⁵⁶ tried to prevent the marriage of his eldest daughter Honora Lambart to John Woodgate. Woodgate was a decorated naval officer who had served with Nelson in Egypt where he had lost a leg. At some point, he met and wooed Honora and the couple decided to marry even though her father opposed the match. They were to wed at the church at St. Pancras on June 16, 1805. The Earl became aware of their plans and made plans of his own. Cavan received permission from the parish clerk to wait in the clerk's house to watch the bridal procession. He had confederates stationed at the church door to notify him when the couple was inside the church. When he received word, he entered the church and demanded the return of his daughter (who was twenty-one at the time). The argument became so heated that bystanders summoned the police. The officiating clergyman took the Earl and the couple back to the vestry where the Earl positively forbade the marriage. Because the couple were not under age, the clergyman agreed to continue with the service, despite the fact that the Earl declared his opposition to it three times in a loud voice.¹⁵⁷ Despite all of this trouble, the marriage did not last long. Woodgate died the following year.

Aristocratic daughters continued to marry against their parents' wishes well into the twentieth century. In 1952,¹⁵⁸ Caroline Blackwood, daughter of the 4th Marquess of Dufferin and Ava,¹⁵⁹ eloped with the painter Lucien Freud.¹⁶⁰ The pair met at a ball given

¹⁵⁶ Richard Lambart (1763-1837).

¹⁵⁷ "Marriage between Lady H. Lambert and Lt. Woodgate of the Royal Navy," Royal Navy History. http://www.royalnavy.org/lib/index.php?title=Marriage_between_Lady_H._Lambert_and_Lt._Woodgate_of_the_Royal_Navy. "Marriage Between Lady Honora Lambert and Lieutenant Woodgate of the Royal Navy," *The Times*, June 20, 1805 #6364, pg 2.

¹⁵⁸ They began living together in 1952 and married in 1953.

¹⁵⁹ Basil Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood (1909-1945).

by Anne Charteris, Lady Rothermere when Caroline was eighteen and Lucian was twenty-six. At the time, Freud was a fairly well-known painter who cultivated aristocrats (he was a member of the bohemian circle surrounding Princess Margaret). According to Caroline's biographer Nancy Schoenberger, Freud liked Caroline because "she was an aristocrat and a Guinness heiress. Hovering around her like an aura was the prospect of some part of her grandfather Ernest Guinness's¹⁶¹ £200 million trust."¹⁶² Many in the aristocratic circles that Freud frequented saw him as a shameless social climber and the fact that he was Jewish did not further endear him.¹⁶³ Caroline's mother, Maureen Guinness disapproved of him. This displeasure made Freud more appealing to Caroline, "Just as Freud needed the patronage of English aristocrats, Caroline needed whatever it took to tear down the gates of 'the Mother's' bridge-playing, upper-class, Anglo-Irish world."¹⁶⁴ Caroline's younger sister Perdita described Maureen's reaction to Freud:

She didn't like him because he was really bohemian looking. I mean, he had a shirt open and no tie. . . and so Mother used to get mad at him. . . He never wore a coat as far as I know and I don't think I ever saw him in a jacket. And of course he was just thirty years before his time – now everybody else dresses that way. But that was not suitable and she wanted a duke's son – any duke's son will do for her daughters, you know.¹⁶⁵

Caroline eloped with Lucien to Paris where they lived for a year. During that period her mother took the path trod by other unhappy aristocratic parents, she withheld money from the errant pair. Poverty did not, however, have the desired effect and in 1953, they returned to London to be married at the Chelsea Registry Office. Despite her continued

¹⁶⁰ (1922-) He was married at the time of their meeting to Katherine Epstein, the illegitimate daughter of the sculptor Jacob Epstein.

¹⁶¹ Hon. Ernest Guinness (1876-1949), son of Edward Guinness, 1st Earl of Iveagh.

¹⁶² Nancy Schoenberger, *Dangerous Muse: The Life of Lady Caroline Blackwood* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2001), 70.

¹⁶³ When they eloped Evelyn Waugh wrote to Nancy Mitford, "You know that poor Maureen's daughter has made a runaway match with a terrible Yid?" quoted in Schoenberger, *Dangerous Muse*, 85.

¹⁶⁴ Schoenberger, *Dangerous Muse*, 73.

¹⁶⁵ Quoted in Schoenberger, *Dangerous Muse*, 84.

unhappiness with the match, Maureen attended and restored Caroline's share of the vast Guinness fortune to them.¹⁶⁶

In the period from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries, aristocratic families attempted to control the marriages of their daughters, an endeavor made more difficult by the social disapproval of overtly arranged marriages. Just as in the sixteenth century, noble women who married without familial approval to inappropriate men implicitly threatened aristocratic rank identity. During this period, however, Society did not always support the parents' decisions regarding their daughter's marriages. If an aristocratic woman wished to marry a man of appropriate rank and her family stood in the way, Society quite often sided with the couple. The primary concern of Society was that rank identity be preserved through marriages between people of appropriate standing.

IV. Hypogamy and Exogamy in Subsequent Marriages

Hypogamous and exogamous subsequent marriage among aristocratic women was an issue for Society as it challenged the women's rank status. Table 27 shows the shifting patterns in subsequent marriages. It is, perhaps, not surprising that the sixteenth century had the highest rate of hypogamous marriage. In that century, James I had not yet created the baronetcy, a title created specifically for sale. This creation lessened the desirability of hypogamous marriage as it lowered the knighthood to a position below the baronet which was not a valued title due to its commercial overtones. Indeed, the statistics indicate a steady decline in the rate of hypogamous subsequent marriages after the reign

¹⁶⁶ Schoenberger, *Dangerous Muse*, 68-89.

of James I. By contrast, with the exception of the seventeenth century,¹⁶⁷ the rate of exogamy in subsequent unions increased over the course of the centuries under examination.¹⁶⁸ Indeed, in all centuries aristocratic women were significantly more likely to marry outside of titled ranks altogether on their subsequent marriages than they were to marry a knight or a baronet.

Table 27: Patterns of Subsequent Marriages

	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	20th to 1920 ¹⁶⁹
Endogamy	78/181 43.09%	98/196 50.00%	41/104 39.42%	37/96 38.54%	29/215 13.5%	3/25 12.00%
Hypogamy	40/181 22.10%	35/196 17.86%	13/104 12.50%	8/96 8.33%	17/215 7.9%	3/25 12.00%
Exogamy	63/181 34.81%	63/196 32.14%	50/104 48.08%	51/96 53.13%	169/215 78.60%	19/25 76.00%

Tables 28 and 29 compare the rates of hypogamy and exogamy in first and subsequent marriages across the centuries. With the exception of the twentieth century, where the difference is small but significant, the rates of hypogamy remained essentially constant between first and subsequent marriages. Noble women did not marry a knight or a baronet on their second marriage any more frequently than they did on their first. The pattern differs from the rates for exogamy. Women in all centuries married below the rank of knight or baronet on their subsequent unions far more frequently than on their first marriage. Since widowhood did not devalue a woman on the marriage market¹⁷⁰ it

¹⁶⁷ The high level of rank consciousness of this century is more fully discussed in Chapter One. The drop in the exogamy rate from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century is not statistically significant, though the increase in that rate from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century is statistically significant.

¹⁶⁸ That increase is not always statistically significant. The increase of 6.6 percent from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century is not significant, though the rise by 24.43 percent from the nineteenth to the twentieth is as is the increase of 21.83 percent from the nineteenth to the first two decades of the twentieth century.

¹⁶⁹ These numbers are a bit misleading as many subsequent marriages would have taken place after 1920.

¹⁷⁰ See discussion in Chapter 6.

seems a likely inference that many of these exogamous unions were reflections of the choices made by the women themselves.

Table 28: Rates of Hypogamy¹⁷¹

Marriages	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	20th to 1920
First	204/822 24.82%	189/997 18.96%	124/991 12.52%	176/1626 10.82%	94/1171 8.02%	36/356 10.11%
Subsequent	39/181 21.55%	35/196 17.86%	13/104 12.50%	8/96 8.33%	17/215 7.9%	3/25 12.00%

Table 29: Rates of Exogamy¹⁷²

Marriages	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	20th to 1920
First	210/822 25.54%	208/997 20.86%	344/991 34.71%	618/1626 38.01%	748/1171 63.88%	161/356 45.23%
Subsequent	64/181 35.36%	62/196 31.63%	50/104 48.08%	51/96 53.13%	169/215 78.60%	19/25 76.00%

V. Runaway Wives: Defiant Matches after Divorce

A particular form of defiant match that caused widespread scandal occurred when a married woman left her husband¹⁷³ and eventually married her lover.¹⁷⁴ The press

¹⁷¹ These percentages are generated by dividing the number of hypogamous marriages by the total number of first or subsequent marriages.

¹⁷² These percentages are generated by dividing the number of exogamous marriages by the total number of first or subsequent marriages.

¹⁷³ As stated above, when a married woman ran away from her family this was also termed an elopement. In order to avoid confusion, I will avoid that use of the term.

¹⁷⁴ In order for this to occur, obviously there had to be a divorce from her first husband. Divorce was not a simple thing. Until the 20th century, the only grounds for divorce was adultery and the only spouse who could obtain one was the husband. Divorces had to be granted by Parliament, a long and expensive affair. The procedures to procure a Parliamentary divorce were set out in the 17th century. There were three basic steps that had to be followed: 1) In ecclesiastical court the husband sought a separation from board and bed. The couple lived apart and the wife generally received regular maintenance. They were still legally married. 2) The husband then sued the wife's lover in civil court for criminal conversation. 3) If the husband wanted a divorce that permitted him to remarry he then had to go to the House of Lords with a private bill to obtain a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. Allen Horstman, *Victorian Divorce* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), 4-5.

The divorce laws underwent a series of reforms. "As usual in political history, the action of powerful personalities played a critical role in each lurch forward in law reform. It was the skilful stage management of Lord Hardwicke which was chiefly responsible for the passage of the 1753 Marriage Act. It was Palmerston's iron determination to keep Parliament sitting through the broiling heat of August which

reported these shocking events with some glee and Society indulged in much gossip about them. The infidelity of a married aristocratic woman generally attracted some interest. In February 1792 the *Times* carried the following item, “A Lady of Fashion in the neighborhood of Hanover Square has eloped from her husband – and took her footman as her companion.”¹⁷⁵ A similar story appeared three years later, “We have hitherto avoided to notice a rumour of a certain Countess near Berkeley-Square having eloped with her footman.”¹⁷⁶ The fact, however is so; and the lady has not been married two years.”¹⁷⁷ It is not, however, with cases of dalliance with the servants that this study is concerned; rather, it is with those women who left their first husbands and eventually married their lover.

In 1808, Augusta Fane left her husband John Parker, Lord Boringdon¹⁷⁸ whom she had married young but always despised. She ran off with Sir Arthur Paget,¹⁷⁹ marrying him in 1809. The acquaintance between Augusta and Arthur began in 1803 (before her marriage in 1804) when he took a house next to her family’s in London. In July 1808, Boringdon brought a charge of Crim. Con.¹⁸⁰ against Paget which the *Times*

railroaded through the first Divorce Reform Act of 1857. It was A.P. Herbert’s tireless public agitation and adept buying off of interest groups which made possible the Divorce Reform Act of 1937. And it was L. Abse’s devotion to the cause of divorce law reform which made possible the even more revolutionary Divorce Reform Act of 1969.” Stone, *The Road to Divorce*, 20.

¹⁷⁵ “News in Brief,” *The Times*, Feb. 11, 1792, #2227, pg. 3.

¹⁷⁶ “So intense was the taboo against upper-class women sleeping with lower-class servants that there are only 11 such cases on record among about 500 crim con trials and divorce petitions between 1692 and 1857. Of course, there were plenty of rumours, and no doubt plenty of cases, which never became public knowledge. Most of these episodes of cross-class adultery involved outdoor rather than indoor servants, affairs with whom would be more easy to conceal.” Stone, *The Road to Divorce*, 272.

¹⁷⁷ Untitled, *The Times*, May 21, 1795, #95021, p. 3.

¹⁷⁸ Later 1st Earl Morey, (1772-1840) Son of John Parker, 1st Baron Boringdon and Theresa Robinson.

¹⁷⁹ Arthur Paget (1771-1840) Son of Henry Paget, 1st Earl of Uxbridge.

¹⁸⁰ This is the usual abbreviation for Criminal Conversation. According to Lawrence Stone, “... the original object of the crim. con. action had been to punish the seducers of married women and to compensate the latter’s cuckolded husbands. By 1800, however, the great majority of actions were collusive, and their true, latent function was to provide a legal smoke-screen under which both husband and wife could obtain an undefended Parliamentary divorce and remarry.” In Crim Con cases “The action was

covered extensively. In the legal arguments, Boringdon's lawyer emphasized the noble rank of both men, the implication being that Paget had violated a code of honour. The court proceedings emphasized the equality and suitability in rank between Augusta and Boringdon and the fact that her first marriage met with the approval of her family (though there was a significant difference in their ages). Boringdon's lawyers asserted that their client had no suspicion that his wife was being unfaithful to him until May 1808 when he heard rumours of Paget's frequent visits to Lady Boringdon. *The Times* reported it saying, "It was in consequence of Lord Boringdon's speaking to her upon the subject and pressing her to know whether these surmizes [sic] were true or not, that Lady Boringdon went off the next day and had since continued to live in a state of open adultery with the Defendant." It appears that since there was no question as to the actual guilt of Paget and Augusta there had been an attempt to slander Boringdon and the wronged husband intended to bring in witnesses and to quote from her letters to him to prove his good conduct. A fair amount of detail emerged as to the level of deception used by Augusta and Paget in order to conceal their adultery based largely on the testimony of servants who witnessed the meetings.¹⁸¹ In February 1809, Parliament granted Boringdon a divorce.¹⁸² Paget and Augusta married two days later.

carried on exclusively between the two men: the husband and the wife's alleged lover. The wife, as one whose legal personality was absorbed into that of her husband, was not permitted to play any part in it; she was denied the opportunity to call witnesses or testify in her own defense." "Collusion in crim con cases in King's Bench certainly existed by 1768 when the Duke of Grafton and Viscount Bolingbroke both entered into agreements with their wives and the latter's lovers not to collect the damages, in order to obtain agreement to conceal their own adulteries and so procure Parliamentary divorces. Over the next fifty years, some forty cases of collusion are definitely known or strongly suspected, and there must have been dozens of others which went undetected." Stone, *The Road to Divorce*, 26, 234, 283.

¹⁸¹ "Law Report, Sheriff's Court," *The Times* July 20, 1808, #7418, p. 2.

¹⁸² The divorce granted allowed both parties to remarry, and they both did in 1809. Boringdon married Frances Talbot by whom he had his son and heir.

At times, the death of a man's first wife served as the catalyst for adultery with another man's spouse. The *Times* reported on October 31, 1814, "It is publicly stated that legal proceedings have been instituted against Sir H. Mildmay¹⁸³ for Crim. Con. with the Countess of Rosebery,¹⁸⁴ with whom the Baronet has lately eloped from the house of her husband¹⁸⁵ in Scotland. It is reported, but we do not know the authority, that the Lady is sister to the Baronet's late wife."¹⁸⁶ On December 10, 1814, the court awarded Earl Rosebery the staggering sum of £15,000. Mildmay's first wife Charlotte (who was indeed the Countess's sister) died in 1810 and he stayed for a time with the Roseberys as he came to terms with his grief. This visit led to an adulterous relationship between Mildmay and the Countess. The illicit romance continued despite efforts of Earl Rosebery to ensure that they did not meet by taking his wife to his seat in Scotland. Eventually, the couple ran away together, returning to London. In the divorce hearings, letters written by Mildmay to Harriett were entered into evidence. The commentary offered on those letters by the lawyers gives some insight into the rank considerations at work, "letters of this nature could not have passed from any man to a lady holding the rank in society of Lady Rosebery, unless she had permitted him the last familiarity." As the countess's adultery was indisputable, the court granted Rosebery his divorce.¹⁸⁷ A similar situation led to the adultery between Anne Wellesely and Lord William Charles Cavendish-Bentinck. In 1806, Anne Wellesely married William Abdy, 7th Baronet.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ Henry St. John-Mildmay, 4th Bart. (1787-1848).

¹⁸⁴ Harriett Bouverie.

¹⁸⁵ Archibald Primrose, 4th Earl of Rosebery (1783-1854). Following his divorce he married Anne Anson.

¹⁸⁶ Untitled, *The Times*, Oct. 31, 1814, #9355, p. 3. St. John-Mildmay was first married to Charlotte Bouverie who was the Countess' sister.

¹⁸⁷ "Consistory Court, Doctors' Commons," *The Times* April 15, 1815 #9496, pg. 3.

¹⁸⁸ William Abdy, 7th Bart. (1779-1868). He never remarried.

When a friend of the couple, Lord William Charles Cavendish-Bentinck's¹⁸⁹ wife¹⁹⁰ died in 1813 Anne offered her sympathy and provided help in raising the dead woman's young daughter. This sympathetic behaviour soon led to a love affair. On September 5, 1815, Anne and Lord William ran away and lived under the names Mr. and Mrs. Brown. Abdy sued Cavendish-Bentinck for Crim. Con. and the court awarded him £7,000. He then divorced Anne¹⁹¹ who married her lover on July 16, 1816.¹⁹²

Agnes Duff, the daughter of the 5th Earl of Fife, illustrated both meanings of the word elope in her career. In 1871 at the age of nineteen, she eloped¹⁹³ with George Hay-Drummond, Viscount Dupplin.¹⁹⁴ Initially, the marriage appeared happy and they had a daughter in December 1873.¹⁹⁵ However, in May 1875 she ran off with Herbert Flower, a friend of both her and her husband.¹⁹⁶ She and Flower lived as man and wife in Dartmouth for some time before (and after) July 1876, when Dupplin was granted a divorce. Their daughter went to live with Dupplin's family and Agnes and Herbert married before embarking on a world cruise. Their happiness was short-lived as Flower died in 1880 at the age of twenty-seven, leaving his young wife penniless and shunned by family and Society. As her grandson, John Julius Norwich, put it, "she had been disowned by her family, was practically penniless and – despite the fact that her brother

¹⁸⁹ William Charles Cavendish-Bentinck (1780-1826). He was the son of William Cavendish-Bentinck, 3rd Duke of Portland and Lady Dorothy Cavendish.

¹⁹⁰ Georgiana Seymour.

¹⁹¹ Since most divorces at the time forbade either of the couple to remarry, Rosebery had to petition the Lords for a divorce that would permit his remarriage. This he was permitted, but his desire to void his first wife's marriage settlement was opposed. "Parliamentary Intelligence," *The London Times*, June 2, 1815, #9537, p. 2.

¹⁹² "Consistory Court, Doctor's-Commons," *The London Times*, May 17, 1816 #9837, p. 3.

¹⁹³ This fits the definition of elopement given in the Introduction to this Chapter: marriages in which women marry according to their own will and not in accordance with familial wishes.

¹⁹⁴ George Hay-Drummond, Viscount Dupplin (1849-1886). He was the son of the 12th Earl of Kinnoull and Emily Somerset.

¹⁹⁵ Agnes Hay-Drummond.

¹⁹⁶ This is an example of the later understanding of elope; that is, when a married woman ran off with a man who was not her husband.

had married the eldest daughter of the future King Edward VII – no longer received in polite society.”¹⁹⁷ The story did have a happy ending though. Agnes decamped to London to train as a nurse and made money by doing menial jobs in a hospital. While scrubbing the floor she met the eminent surgeon Alfred Cooper and the couple married in 1882.¹⁹⁸

Married aristocratic women who eloped with a lover were of particular concern to elite Society. These women challenged the implication that often accompanied noble marriage, that an exchange of property had taken place – possession of the woman had been transferred from her natal family to her groom. This exchange of property worked to the benefit of both families involved in the transaction, but if that property was not securely held, those benefits could be threatened.

VI. Conclusion

Defiant matches and elopements posed a problem across the centuries for the families of aristocratic women. In relatively crude terms, these unmarried women were the property of their natal families. They were property that could be used in a manner to bolster the family’s rank identity. If noble women married without consideration for the needs of their natal family, their value as status-enhancing property was threatened. No matter how strong the familial and societal pressure was to marry in accordance with the wishes of the family, some women chose to defy those mandates. Their defiance threatened the primary purpose of elite marriage, the promotion of the interests of the

¹⁹⁷ John Julius Norwich (ed), *The Duff Cooper Diaries, 1915-1951* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2005), x.

¹⁹⁸ John Charmley, *Duff Cooper: The Authorized Biography* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986), 6-7; Philip Ziegler. *Man of Letters: The Extraordinary Life and Times of Literary Impresario Rupert Hart-Davis*. (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2004), 1.

natal family. The nature of many of the matches undertaken by these women endangered the rank identity of their families and thus Society and the government attempted to prevent their occurrence.

Chapter Five: An Open Elite?

I. Introduction

The myth of the open elite has been an anecdotal truism about the British aristocracy for some time. Commentators and historians long accepted, almost without question, that the British nobility succeeded, in part, because of its relative openness to newcomers and the rapid assimilation of those newcomers into its ranks. Since the mid 1980s, historians have begun to look at the assumption more carefully and in many cases to challenge the idea using various means to judge both the openness of the rank and the willingness of more established members to accept the recently ennobled. This chapter, using the marital patterns of aristocratic women, explores the concept of the open elite from a new perspective. What the evidence shows is that Britain did not have an open elite. All aristocratic families, new¹ or established,² showed a marked preference for marrying their daughters into the established or old aristocracy, which indicates a lack of acceptance of the newcomers into the rank. This lack of acceptance further indicates the desire on the part of the British aristocracy to maintain rank identity.

The issue of the openness of the English elite³ has been the subject of an extensive historiographical debate since 1984⁴ with the publication of Lawrence and Jean

¹ For the purposes of this study, women from the new nobility are those who did not have a titled grandfather.

² For the purposes of this study, women from the established or old nobility are those who did have a titled grandfather.

³ A large part of this debate hinges on the definition of elite that a particular scholar chooses. Many of those whose work is discussed in this portion of the chapter define elite as owning a certain number of acres. As the focus of this study is on the aristocracy, a narrower group than the elite, that is not the definition used here. This difference in definition is somewhat mitigated by the fact that nearly every family in Britain who owned large landed estates had been brought into the peerage before World War One. Wasson, *Aristocracy and the Modern World*, 15.

⁴ Michael McCahill ("Open Elites: Recruitment to the French Noblesse and the English Aristocracy in the Eighteenth Century," *Albion* 30 (Winter 1998), 599) points out that the challenge to the idea of the open elite was begun in 1981 with the publication of W.D. Rubinstein's *Men of Property: the Very Wealthy in*

Fawtier Stones' *An Open Elite*⁵ and John Cannon's *Aristocratic Century*.⁶ The Stones and Cannon contended that the newly ennobled in the eighteenth century were wealthy landowners, many of whom had close ties to the existing aristocracy. This assertion called into serious question the existence of the open elite.⁷

Britain Since the Industrial Revolution (New Brunswick, 1981). Rubinstein contended that the newly wealthy of the nineteenth century did not engage in large scale land purchases as their predecessors had done. He contended that one reason for this reluctance was the inability of the new rich to penetrate the rigid rank boundaries of the aristocracy.

⁵ Lawrence Stone and Jeanne Fawtier Stone, *An Open Elite? England, 1540-1880* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984). Stone began his discussion of the so-called open elite in books well before the publication of this book. In *Crisis of the Aristocracy* he asserts, "the measure of the resilience of a class structure is its ability to absorb new families of different social origin and convert them to the values and ways of life of the social group into which they are projected." (p. 39) It was his contention that the sixteenth and seventeenth century English elite were quite skilled at this. However, in *An Open Elite?*, Stone himself questioned the reality of the open elite arguing that social mobility was, in fact, less a feature of the English aristocracy than had previously been asserted. In *An Open Elite?* the Stones tested the idea that England had an open elite by examining country house ownership. Possession of a house of substantial size set in expansive grounds placed a man, if not into the nobility then at least in to the ranks of the landed elite. This methodology indicated that for more than three centuries the country elite remained essentially stable. They asserted that the openness of the landed elite had no grounding in actual practice. In his review of the book in *Renaissance Quarterly*, Christopher Hill questioned the definition of the elite as being the owners of country seats. This was certainly not the definition used by those who asserted the existence of the open elite over the centuries ("Review of *An Open Elite?*", 338). In *Aristocracy and the Modern World*, Ellis Wasson wrote, "Stone argued that most of the recruits came from traditional genteel backgrounds connected with land, law, and office. They were not truly 'new men.' Only after 1880 did businessmen and bankers begin to compose a majority of the intake. In Britain and elsewhere, significant numbers of businessmen were ennobled throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries." (106)

⁶ John Cannon, *The Aristocratic Century: The Peerage of Eighteenth Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). Cannon saw an eighteenth century peerage that was essentially closed as nearly all new elevations went to families with pre-existing ties to the aristocracy. In his review of the book J.C.D. Clark notes that in Cannon's monograph, "marriage. . . features chiefly as an opportunity to consider the problems of building up, and sustaining, landed fortunes, and to review the demographic controversy surrounding T.H. Hollingsworth's work." ("Review," *English Historical Review* 101 (January, 1986), 180.)

⁷ Other scholars concurred with this contention of the relatively closed nature of the English elite. These include J.C.D. Clark in *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 1985) who finds in it support for his contention that the British aristocracy was a relatively exclusive rank. The same idea was argued by Edward Royle in his monograph *Modern Britain: A Social History, 1750-1985* (London: E. Arnold, 1987). McCahill, "Open Elites," 599n.

However, there are a significant number of scholars who continued to assert the veracity of the concept of the open elite. F.M.L. Thompson in a series of articles questioned Rubinstein's reliance on probate records and by demonstrating that wealthy businessmen (or their sons) in the Victorian era made significant land purchases. F.M.L. Thompson, "Life After Death: How Successful Nineteenth Century Businessmen Disposed of Their Fortunes," *Economic History Review* 43 (Feb. 1990): 40-61; "Desirable Properties: The Town and Connections in British Society Since the Late Eighteenth Century," *Historical Research* 64:154 (June, 1991): 156-171; and "Stitching It Together Again," *Economic History Review* 45 (May, 1992): 362-375. McCahill, "Open Elites," 600.

John Habakkuk argued in 1994 that the newly wealthy in the eighteenth century did still wish to enter the ranks of those who owned landed estates (following the example of the Stones, later writers such

This chapter examines the question of the openness of the British elite by exploring the marriage patterns of the daughters of the nobility of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Comparison of the marriage patterns of the daughters of the old nobles⁸ and the daughters of the new nobles⁹ across the centuries reveals that the women of both groups, when they married endogamously, preferred to marry grooms from the established nobility over those from families whose title was more recent. A way to test the Stone thesis concerning openness of the British elite is to examine the differing marriage patterns of the daughters of the titled peerage. Acceptance of the sons of new noble families as spouses for the daughters of the old noble families indicates the actual openness of the British elite. All of these considerations together indicate the closed nature of the British aristocracy. Consistently during the period up to 1880-1920, their daughters tended to prefer to marry men from the established nobility.

II. Did Britain Have An Open Elite? Contemporary Evidence

So, it is apparent that historians question the veracity of the idea of the open elite, but what about the elite themselves? Certainly, Society changed over the course of the centuries, but did this change actually indicate an openness of the rank to newcomers?

as Habakkuk defined elite as owning a certain number of acres. This chapter offers an alternate definition) and that within no more than two generations nearly all such families had made significant land purchases (John Habakkuk, *Marriage, Debt, and the Estates System: English Land Ownership, 1650-1950* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 5). Michael McCahill argued that the British aristocracy, which he defines quite broadly to include peers, knights, baronets, and wealthy landed gentry, is an open rank (McCahill, "Open Elites," 603.) In her review of *An Open Elite?* Barbara Harris, using the same evidence mustered by the Stones, answers the question with a definitive affirmative. She states that "there were no legal barriers to movement into the ruling class, such as those that existed in other European countries; the social and economic origins of families who moved into the country elite were ignored after only one generation; newcomers were easily assimilated into the lifestyle of the elite; and, most important, the elite early succeeded in establishing its cultural hegemony over the growing numbers of professionals, officeholders, merchants, bankers, and members of the 'middling' ranks of society." ("Review of *An Open Elite?*" *Journal of Social History* 120:1 (Autumn, 1986), 203).

⁸ Men whose father held a title.

⁹ Men whose father did not hold a title.

Nicholas Canny makes the point in his excellent study of the life of Richard Boyle, the 1st Earl of Cork,¹⁰ that the Earl recognized that his newly created title carried less prestige than did titles of older origin and he worked quite hard to try to redress that deficiency. Cork referred to himself as a “new man.” Canny shows that Cork did not protest the unfairness of the difference between his new title and those of more established families. He simply accepted it as a fact and strove to gain acceptance from the established nobility for himself and his children. He went so far as to have a noble genealogy fabricated for himself. Boyle’s quest for acceptance in the upper ranks of British society included the careful orchestration of the marriages of his family.¹¹ Cork differentiated between his sons-in-law based on the antiquity of their bloodlines. He valued those of Old English¹² families above others, paying significantly higher dowries in order to marry his daughters to their sons. He paid a great deal to secure the marriage of the heir to Viscount Barrymore¹³ to his daughter Alice and even more for the union of the 16th Earl of Kildare¹⁴ to his daughter Joan.¹⁵ He showed equal concern about the backgrounds of the brides for his sons and he accepted smaller dowries in exchange for their good lineage.¹⁶ Using this strategy, he secured women from the best families in Britain. His heir Richard¹⁷ married Elizabeth Clifford, daughter and heir¹⁸ of the 5th Earl

¹⁰ Boyle is particularly useful in this discussion as he was an Englishman who held an Irish title, thus his attitudes spanned national boundaries.

¹¹ Canny, *The Upstart Earl*, 53.

¹² These are the descendants of the settlers who came to Ireland from England, Wales, and Normandy in the wake of the Norman invasion of England in 1066.

¹³ David Barry (c. 1605-1642), 1st Earl of Barrymore.

¹⁴ George FitzGerald (1612-1660).

¹⁵ Canny, *The Upstart Earl*, 42, 46-47, 52.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁷ Richard Boyle (1612-1698), 2nd Earl of Cork.

¹⁸ She was Baroness Clifford in her own right.

of Cumberland¹⁹ in 1635. His second son Lewis, 1st Viscount Boyle of Kinalmeaky,²⁰ married Elizabeth Fielding, daughter of the 1st Earl of Denbigh²¹ in 1639. A younger son, Roger,²² 1st Earl of Orrery married, in 1641, the daughter of the 2nd Earl of Suffolk,²³ Margaret Howard. Cork's success in marrying his daughters well gave him the cachet that he needed in order to match his sons with prestigious brides. Cork reminded his son and heir Lord Dungarven²⁴ "that marriages are not to be made merchandizes," and that "noble descent and virtues" should be the characteristics that he sought in a wife.²⁵

Despite his careful planning, Cork found out that just because he could afford to pay a huge dowry to secure a good marriage for his daughters, it did not mean that the more established nobility would accept him. In 1628-1629, he negotiated a match between his daughter Lettice and George Goring, the son and heir to Lord George Goring, later the Earl of Norwich. Cork agreed to give his daughter the astronomical dowry of £10,000. The groom treated his wife and her father with contempt and he soon left England and his family to join the army in the Netherlands.²⁶ In Cork's marital strategy, money and rank were inexorably linked. He could pay a man like Gordon enough to marry his daughter, but he could not pay him enough to treat her with respect. By the same token, he could offer his sons at steep discounts to the families of women who had the rank that he desired.

The creation of new peers and the entry of new families as older ones died out gave rise to the perception that new men were pushing their way into the ranks of the

¹⁹ Henry Clifford (1592-1643).

²⁰ Lewis Boyle (1619-1642).

²¹ William Fielding (c. 1582-1643).

²² Roger Boyle (1621-1679).

²³ Theophilus Howard (1584-1640).

²⁴ Richard Boyle (1612-1698).

²⁵ Canny, *The Upstart Earl*, 56, 59.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 59, 62-64.

peerage and this has become one of the persistent tales of English history. The low moan of protest from the women of more established noble families at the intrusion of unworthy people into the aristocracy bolsters the perception; a lament sung every century since the Tudor era.²⁷ As early as the eighteenth century Lady Townshend pointedly remarked that “she fully expected every day to receive a bill from her fishmonger signed Lord Mount-Shrimp.”²⁸ In 1827 Lavinia Bingham, Countess Spencer wrote that the “genuine old English aristocracy” was being forced “to make way for new names, new wealth, new habits and new notions – a sad unworthy change! and which I must attribute to Mr. Pitt’s long administration. His whole object was to raise commercial men and to lower landowners and old families...”²⁹ These women saw the entry of new families into the rank as a threat to the coherent identity of the aristocracy.

For some nineteenth-century aristocratic women who married outside of the peerage, partial salvation from their fall from exalted rank was possible if their husbands were eventually ennobled. This was merely a partial salvation though, because Society made sharp distinctions between old and new titles,³⁰ a point made by Dorothy Walpole: “Newly ennobled families ... [were] classed a little above the Tom, Dick, and Harry rabble, for which the real aristocrats entertained a great, if good-natured, contempt.”³¹

Not all titles were equal. Baronetcies had always been for sale thus diminishing their

²⁷ Cannon, *Aristocratic Century*, 15.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁹ Quoted in McCahill and Wasson, “The New Peerage,” 8-9. As McCahill and Wasson point out, the Countesses’ dismay was unfounded as most of those being promoted had close ties to the old landed families. There is a bit of irony as well considering that her paternal grandfather was a baronet and her father, 1st Earl Lucan was a younger son who was not promoted to the peerage until 1776 only five years before Lavinia’s marriage to the 2nd Earl Spencer.

³⁰ It would be interesting to compare the overall (both male and female) marriage patterns of the newly ennobled with the more established families. One suspects that the older families would be more assiduous in their pursuit of endogamous unions, but that may well not be true.

³¹ Nevill, *The Life and Letters*, 177.

luster. Lady Charlotte Bertie, the daughter of the Earl of Lindsay who had married a wealthy businessman,³² bemoaned the fact that her husband had been granted no more than a baronetcy, saying “I consider it a paltry distinction and was much averse to his taking it, but he liked to secure something which would descend to Ivor [the couple’s son]. . . I shall not rest till I see something of more value bestowed upon him.”³³ Unfortunately, for Charlotte “something of more value” had to wait for their son.³⁴

The relationship of the established aristocracy and commerce has been an ambivalent one. There was, of course, a need for real money but the nobility were unwilling to be too closely associated with the business of making it. When some elite women married into the business community, they did not receive an altogether positive reaction. In 1822 Lady Elizabeth Manners, the daughter of the 5th Duke of Rutland³⁵ married Andrew Drummond,³⁶ a banker. Despite the fact that his family was related to Scottish nobility on his mother’s side,³⁷ the Rutlands did not approve of his job.³⁸ Perhaps Lady Elizabeth was simply ahead of her time. By the late nineteenth century, noble women married bankers in increasing numbers, one fourth of leading bankers had an aristocratic father-in-law.³⁹

Many commentators pointed to the coming of the so-called Dollar Princesses as one of the major contributing factors in the changes occurring in Society in the period

³² Josiah Guest.

³³ In her journal entry of July 3, 1838. Bessborough, ed., *Lady Charlotte Guest*, 71.

³⁴ Ivor was promoted to 1st Baron Wimborne and married Lady Cornelia Spencer-Churchill, the daughter of the 7th Duke of Marlborough in 1868. His son Ivor became the 1st Viscount Wimborne.

³⁵ John Manners (1778-1857).

³⁶ Andrew Drummond (1794-1865).

³⁷ His mother was Mary Perceval, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Edgemont and Catherine Compton, Baroness Arden.

³⁸ Lewis, *In the Family Way*, 28-29.

³⁹ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 347. Further study about the family origins of these bankers needs to be done. It may well be that many of these men who married into titled families had familial links to the nobility.

between 1880 and 1920.⁴⁰ Dorothy Walpole was scathing about the vulgar tendency toward lateness brought in by the Americans.⁴¹ Indeed, the less than warm welcome that many of these American women received from the British aristocratic women demonstrates the persistence of closed attitudes. Jennie Jerome, one of the first of the rich Americans to marry into British Society, wrote in 1908:

Thirty years ago there were very few Americans in London: Miss Consuelo Ysnaga, afterwards Duchess of Manchester; Miss Stevens,⁴² now Lady Paget; and Miss Warden,⁴³ now Lady Carrington were among those I knew. In England, as on the Continent, the American woman was looked upon as a strange and abnormal creature with habits and manners something between a Red Indian and a Gaiety Girl. Anything of an outlandish nature might be expected of her. If she talked, dressed, and conducted herself as any well-bred woman would, much astonishment was invariably evinced, and she was usually saluted with the tactful remark, "I should never have thought you were an American," – which was intended as a compliment. As a rule, people looked upon her as a disagreeable, and even dangerous person, to be viewed with suspicion, if not avoided all together. Her dollars were her only recommendation, and each was credited with the possession of them, otherwise what was her *raison d'être*? No distinction was ever made among Americans: they were all supposed to be of one uniform type.⁴⁴

The Spencer-Churchill Dukes of Marlborough had a strong tradition of attracting rich American brides. The 8th Duke,⁴⁵ after being divorced by his first wife, the respectable Lady Alberta Hamilton, married Lillian Price, a wealthy American widow in 1888.⁴⁶ The family used her money to put electric light and central heating in Blenheim

⁴⁰ It was in this period that the marriage patterns of aristocratic women underwent a substantial change toward a far higher rate of exogamy.

⁴¹ Nevill, *Life and Letters*, 141, 142. In the period between 1874 and 1910 more than 160 American heiresses married into the British aristocracy, bringing with them more than \$160 million. "The Dollar Princesses," *Time* (Dec. 21, 1959); <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,865177,00.html>. Accessed May 11, 2007. Between 1870 and 1914, 10% of aristocratic marriages were to Americans. Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 347.

⁴² Mary Stevens.

⁴³ Juliet Warden.

⁴⁴ Mrs. George Cornwallis-West (Lady Randolph Churchill), *The Reminiscences of Lady Randolph Churchill* (London: George Arnold, 1908), 47.

⁴⁵ George Spencer-Churchill (1844-1892).

⁴⁶ She had first been married to Louis Hammersley. After the Duke's death in 1892, she married Lord William de la Poer Beresford, the son of the 4th Marquess of Waterford, in 1895.

Palace.⁴⁷ The 8th Duke's brother, Lord Randolph Churchill⁴⁸ married the American heiress Jennie Jerome in 1874 and his son, the 9th Duke⁴⁹ married Consuelo Vanderbilt in 1896. When that marriage ended in divorce in 1921, he married the wealthy Gladys Deacon. Both Consuelo and Gladys came from very wealthy American families. Consuelo wrote in her memoir that she was welcomed by most of her husband's family as well as by the younger members of the Royal family (especially the Prince of Wales), though at her first major dinner at Blenheim, the Duke's aunt tried to humiliate her.⁵⁰ Her mother-in-law sponsored her when she debuted at court just after her marriage.⁵¹

These women, who had far more wealth than the British noble families into which they had married, chafed against the centuries-old strictures on behaviour. To the British women watching, they seemed to charge into the halls of Society without regard for tradition. These types of incursions by women new to the rank fundamentally altered traditional aristocratic Society.⁵² Many aristocratic women attempted to hold back the tide of change or refused to acknowledge that change when it came. Susan Stewart-Mackenzie, Lady St. Helier recalled that, "One of the greatest characters of that time [1860s] was the Dowager Duchess of Cleveland, nee Lowther."⁵³ She was one of the few people left who absolutely refused to accept the social changes that were so rapidly altering the whole aspect of English society."⁵⁴ Some aristocratic ladies withdrew from

⁴⁷ Balsan, *All that Glitters*, 42.

⁴⁸ Randolph Churchill (1849-1895) was the son of the 7th Duke.

⁴⁹ Charles Spencer-Churchill (1871-1934).

⁵⁰ Balsan, *All that Glitters*, 55, 106-107, 108-109, 113.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁵² Aristocratic Society was changed by these newcomers in the period between 1880 and 1920 in terms of its make-up and its behaviours. After 1920, Society bore little resemblance to what it had been prior to 1880.

⁵³ Grace Lowther, daughter of the 1st Earl of Lonsdale. There is a bit of irony here in that her paternal grandfather was a baronet. Her father was a politician who had made a fortune in the coal industry.

⁵⁴ Lady St. Helier, *Memoirs of Fifty Years* (London: Edward Arnold, 1909), 95.

London in order to avoid the transformations of the period. They were unhappy with these new people and with their manners and morals. The Duchess of Buccleuch⁵⁵ opposed the “vulgarity” of the “smart set” and Lady Paget⁵⁶ was not alone in deploring the company kept by the Prince of Wales.⁵⁷ The acerbic Dorothy Walpole blamed a lack of control exercised by Society: “If most of us have outgrown the somewhat snobbish veneration which was once accorded birth and rank, the cult of the golden calf has, without doubt, increased; multi-millionaires have taken the place of the old aristocracy...” Instead of simply admitting anyone with money into Society, she wrote:

it would have done better to have exercised more discretion, and admitted to their drawing rooms only such of the invaders who possessed social and mental qualities likely to be of use to the old English governing class. Alas! lured by ideas of material benefit, ‘society’ showed no discrimination at all, with the result that in its old sense it no longer exists, whilst the invaders have now pretty well carried all before them, and quite relegated the old English families to the background!⁵⁸

Not everyone entirely deplored the changes happening in the nineteenth century. Some women saw them as a breath of fresh air, as long as the outsiders remained at some distance. Susan Stewart-Mackenzie, Lady St. Helier remembered, “Then of a sudden, as it were, the conventional rules were swept away and those who had the courage and appreciation to open their houses to everyone who was interesting and distinguished found an ideally delightful society waiting for its new entertainers.”⁵⁹ Although she wrote of these new people as being lovely and interesting dinner companions, in no place did she refer to them as appropriate marriage partners. In March 1820, Lady Louisa Stuart wrote to her friend Louisa Clinton about the upcoming election and the opposition of the

⁵⁵ Probably Charlotte Thynne.

⁵⁶ Probably Sophia Eversfield.

⁵⁷ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 348-49.

⁵⁸ Nevill, *My Own Times*, 157-58.

⁵⁹ St. Helier, *Memoirs of Fifty Years*, 180-81.

old powerful aristocratic families to the upstarts, “I must acknowledge I should have been for Cavendish and Stanley against Curteis⁶⁰ and Horricks, but everything must have a beginning. It is pleasant to see with what secret disdain Lord Burghley – a new man, originally a Curteis or Horricks – speaks of birth; which he says, ‘is nothing but ancient riches,’ – and then to consider how we think of the Cecils, and they of themselves. And Cavendish and Cecil are much on a par.”⁶¹ Four years later Harriet Cavendish wrote from Paris to her sister Georgiana, “On Saturday we dined at a sumptuous feast at Rothschild’s. He has married his niece, a pretty little Jewess, . . . a very good thing at Paris for just out of her nursery, she does honours of her house as if she never had done anything else.”⁶² Some noble women apparently appreciated the diversion that such new blood could provide. It is worth noting, however, that Louisa Stuart was writing about politics and Harriet Cavendish about a marriage in a Jewish family in France. Neither of these cases hit very close to home.

In 1840, *The Times* published the obituary of Mary Monckton, Countess of Cork, praising among other things, the openness that she brought to elite society:

Her social reputation dates from her attempts, the first of the kind, to introduce into the routine and formalism of our high life something of the wit and energy which characterized the society of Paris in the last century. While still young and unmarried she made the home of her mother, Lady Galway,⁶³ the point of rendezvous where talent and genius might mingle with rank and fashion and the advantages of a worldly position and intellectual endowment be mutually interchanged.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ She appears to be referring to Edward Jeremiah Curteis, a classical scholar who was an independent member of Parliament elected in 1820. Deborah Manley, “Elwood, Anne Katharine (1796–1873),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48643>, accessed 27 Sept 2010].

⁶¹ Louisa Stuart and James J. Home, *Letters of Lady Louisa Stuart to Miss Louisa Clinton* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1901), I:64.

⁶² Leveson-Gower, *Letters*, I:323.

⁶³ Jane Westenra.

⁶⁴ “The Late Countess Dowager of Cork,” *The Times*, June 2, 1840, #17373, pg. 7.

Others were more pragmatic in their approval. In 1896 the future 4th Marquess of Bristol⁶⁵ married the daughter of a “former contractor for public works,” Alice Wythes. A trustee of his estate wrote “It is most fortunate that the large fortune which your fiancée has, and will inherit, renders. . . further encumbrances unnecessary.”⁶⁶

Comments in the letters and diaries of aristocratic women across the centuries support the contention of some historians that Britain did not have an open elite, or at least they indicate that the ladies of the established nobility did not accept newcomers into its midst with good humour. Though by the late nineteenth century, aristocratic men were marrying non-aristocratic women of great wealth with some frequency, there remained a level of resistance to the changes this brought to traditional Society and to the aristocratic rank.

III. Did Britain Have An Open Elite? The Statistical Evidence

The overwhelming majority of aristocratic women marrying (or not marrying) in the nineteenth and first two decades of the twentieth centuries came from the ranks of the old aristocracy. Table 30 gives the number of women⁶⁷ tracked for this study from new noble families. This finding would seem to indicate that the ranks of the titled elite were being penetrated at a much lower rate during the nineteenth and the first two decades of the twentieth centuries than they had been in the previous three centuries. An analysis of the peerage creations for men whose daughters would have married in the nineteenth century shows that there were relatively few elevations of men who did not already have

⁶⁵ Frederick Hervey (1863-1951).

⁶⁶ Horn, *Ladies of the Manor*, 20.

⁶⁷ For this study, as explained in the Introduction, each woman was counted separately for each time her marital history was counted; that is, if a woman was married once, she appears in the records once. If she was married 3 times she appears in the records 3 times, and if she was unmarried then she appears once.

close ties to the aristocracy. Wealth and charm might have ushered people into the same parties as the aristocrats, but this did not mean that they themselves would become aristocrats.

Table 30: Percentage of Marriages that Came from the New Nobility⁶⁸

Century	Marriages from New Noble Families/Total Marriages	Percentage of Marriages that are from New Noble Families
16th Century	161/1003	16.05%
17th Century	295/1193	24.73%
18th Century	188/1095	17.17%
19th Century	181/1,722	10.51%
20th Century	96/1386	06.93%
20th Century through 1920	30/381	07.87%

Instead of defining the elite as owners of stately piles set on broad acres, as Stone did⁶⁹ this study instead defines elite as being accepted as marriage partner by the aristocracy. As has been demonstrated elsewhere in this project, noble families took the marriages of their female members seriously. The intent behind those marriages was to increase the power and prestige of the natal family and thus they took care in arranging the marriages of their daughters. As Table 31 indicates, daughters from old noble families did not marry into the new noble families at a high rate in any of the centuries under consideration.⁷⁰ This calls into question the validity of the idea of the open elite. A man might well have had a big house set on a great deal of land, he might even have been given a title to go along with that wealth, but if the established aristocracy would not accept his children as spouses for their own, he had not yet been accepted in the rank by

⁶⁸ New nobles are those where the title has not yet been in the family for two generations.

⁶⁹ This is the definition used by Stone and others.

⁷⁰ In all centuries the daughters of old nobles were statistically more likely to marry men from old families than they were to marry men from new families.

those who were already there as the established families were unwilling to marry their children with those from the new families.

Table 31: Marriage Patterns in terms of Rank of New and Old Nobles⁷¹

	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	20th to 1920
New to New ⁷²	17/66 25.76%	60/154 38.96%	35/93 37.63%	21/93 22.58%	6/30 20.00%	4/9 44.44%
New to Old ⁷³	49/66 74.24%	94/154 61.04%	58/93 62.37%	72/93 77.42%	24/30 80.00%	5/9 55.56%
Old to New ⁷⁴	75/420 17.86%	138/545 25.32%	104/471 22.08%	132/776 17.01%	49/328 14.94%	28/153 18.3%
Old to Old ⁷⁵	345/420 82.14%	407/545 74.68%	367/471 77.92%	644/776 82.99%	279/328 85.06%	125/153 81.70%

In every century under consideration here, daughters of the new nobility were significantly more likely to marry men from the new nobility than were the daughters of the old nobility. Averaged across the centuries (sixteenth through the twentieth) 31.88 percent⁷⁶ of the women from the new families married into other new families while only 19.61 percent⁷⁷ of the daughters from established families married sons of the newly ennobled.⁷⁸ This also undermines the perception of the openness of the British elite.

The most striking result of this statistical analysis, however, is that women from both the new and the old aristocracy were far more likely to marry men from the old

⁷¹ These numbers reflect only those women who married endogamously. In the fractions, the denominator represents the total number of endogamous marriages entered into by the women of each type of family.

⁷² A marriage between a woman whose grandfather was not titled and a man whose grandfather was not titled.

⁷³ A marriage between a woman whose grandfather was not titled and a man whose grandfather was titled.

⁷⁴ A marriage between a woman whose grandfather was titled and a man whose grandfather was not titled.

⁷⁵ A marriage between a woman whose grandfather was titled and a man whose grandfather was titled.

⁷⁶ 139 out of a total of 436 endogamous marriages of women from the families of new nobles.

⁷⁷ 498 out of a total of 2,540 endogamous marriages of women from the families of old nobles.

⁷⁸ This result is statistically significant.

nobility than they were men from the new.⁷⁹ For daughters of all titled families in all centuries the more desirable match was with the established nobility. Indeed, the statistics compiled for this study indicate that daughters of old nobles in all centuries married exogamously more frequently than they married men from the new nobility (See Table 32).⁸⁰

Table 32: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁸¹

	Exogamous	Hypogamous	To New
16th Century	217/830 26.15%	191/830 23.01%	73/830 0.88%
17th Century	187/897 20.85%	161/897 17.95%	135/897 15.05%
18th Century	317/906 34.99%	107/906 11.81%	99/906 10.93%
19th Century	598/1536 38.93%	158/1536 10.29%	126/1536 8.20%
20th Century	853/1290 66.12%	100/1290 7.75%	45/1290 3.45%
20th Century through 1920	162/351 46.15%	36/351 10.26%	26/351 7.41%

In part the relative scarceness of new nobles explains this disparity. The number of daughters of the old nobility certainly outnumbered the available sons from the new nobility. This caveat aside, grooms from newly ennobled families were not highly valued on the marriage market by the old nobility. This tendency can be seen in Table 31 and underscores the contention that the aristocracy of Britain from the sixteenth through the twentieth centuries was, in fact, anything but open.

⁷⁹ This trend was statistically significant in all centuries under consideration with the exception of the first two decades of the twentieth in which the numbers of the daughters of new nobles were so small as to make the comparison essentially meaningless.

⁸⁰ The difference is statistically significant in all centuries.

⁸¹ These numbers only reflect the patterns of those women who married; unmarried women are not included in the total numbers (the denominators).

An examination of the background of those men who were ennobled between 1780 and 1820 gives no cause to assert that they were in any significant way different in their social origins from such creations in previous centuries. The increase in the number of creations did little more than keep up with the increase in population. The majority of new creations already had connections with the nobility.⁸² Cannon provides the following statistics for the eighteenth century: there were 163 male peers in 1700 of which sixty-three⁸³ held titles which had existed less than two decades, 134 of these peerages⁸⁴ had been created within the previous century. These numbers did not drastically alter by 1800 despite the fact that there had been a significant number of creations after 1784. Within the prior twenty years, the percentage of titles created rose from 38 percent to 43 percent, examination of the entire previous century reveals, the percentage had actually fallen from 82 percent to 79 percent. Only 7.9 percent of the peerages in 1700 were more than two-hundred years old and that small number dropped to 6.2 percent by 1800.⁸⁵

IV. Differences in Marriage Patterns Between Old and New Nobles

The figures discussed above indicate that the established nobility were slow to accept the newly ennobled into their ranks, that slowness does not appear to have affected the newly ennobled in terms of taking on the behavioural patterns of the more established aristocrats. There are real differences in the marriage patterns of the two groups, but those differences often do not rise to the level of statistical significance. This similarity between the groups would seem to indicate a quick appropriation of rank identity on the

⁸² That is, they were the younger sons of aristocrats or men who had married into the aristocracy or the like. Cannon, *Aristocratic Century*, 23.

⁸³ That is 38 percent.

⁸⁴ That is 82 percent.

⁸⁵ Cannon, *Aristocratic Century*, 14-15.

part of the new noble families. Over the period until 1920, the daughters of the established nobility were more likely to marry within their own rank while the female offspring of the newer creations tended to marry outside of titled circles either entirely or down into the ranks of the knights and baronets. Based on these large comparisons, until 1920 the old nobility demonstrated a stronger sense of rank identity as evidenced by their greater tendency to marry endogamously than did the new nobility. More telling in terms of the appropriation of rank identity on the part of the newly ennobled is the essential sameness in the rates of exogamy. Through the nineteenth centuries, both groups were decidedly unwilling to marry their daughters outside of rank and when that changed in the twentieth century it affected both groups at the same level.

Tables 33 to 38 provide a comparative examination of the overall marriage patterns of the daughters of old and new nobles broken down by century. Daughters of the new nobility were in all centuries less likely to marry endogamously than were women whose grandfather had held a title. From the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, the disparity in endogamy between the two groups fell steadily, from a high of 12.33 percent in the sixteenth century to a low of 4.03 percent in the nineteenth. The rate then essentially held steady for the twentieth century at 4.24 percent. A break in this steady decline came in the first two decades of the twentieth century when the disparity rate spiked sharply to 13.6 percent.⁸⁶ The daughters of the new nobles were always more likely to marry hypogamously⁸⁷ and exogamously than were those of the established titled families over all. There is a small exception in the nineteenth and twentieth century when the exogamy rate was essentially the same and in the first part of the twentieth

⁸⁶ This is likely explained, at least in part, by the very small numbers of women in this sample.

⁸⁷ The figures for the first two decades of the twentieth century are a slight exception to this pattern, but again, this is likely due to the small number of women from the new nobles represented.

century when the hypogamy rate was nearly identical. In all but the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries, daughters of the established nobility were more likely to remain unmarried than were those of the newly ennobled families. That unmarried rate coupled with the relative paucity of hypogamous marriages among the old nobility is an indication of the perception among this group that it was better to remain unmarried than to make a bad match. All of these patterns indicate that across the centuries the more established families had a stronger sense of rank identity than did those who were new to the titled nobility.

Table 33: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New vs. Old Nobles, 16th Century

	Daughters of New Nobles ⁸⁸		Daughters of Old Nobles ⁸⁹	
Endogamous	62/161	38.51%	422/830	50.84%
Hypogamous	49/161	30.43%	191/830	23.01%
Exogamous	50/161	31.06%	217/830	26.15%
Unmarried	7/139 ⁹⁰	5.04%	22/700 ⁹¹	3.14%

Table 34: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New vs. Old Nobles, 17th Century

	Daughters of New Nobles		Daughters of Old Nobles	
Endogamous	150/295	50.85%	549/897	61.20%
Hypogamous	62/295	20.92%	161/897	17.95%
Exogamous	83/295	28.23%	187/897	20.85%
Unmarried	14/259 ⁹²	5.41%	60/812 ⁹³	7.39%

Table 35: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New vs. Old Nobles, 18th Century

	Daughters of New Nobles		Daughters of Old Nobles	
Endogamous	82/188	43.72%	482/906	53.20%
Hypogamous	29/188	15.32%	107/906	11.81%
Exogamous	77/188	40.96%	317/906	34.99%
Unmarried	9/181 ⁹⁴	4.97%	115/934 ⁹⁵	12.31%

⁸⁸ A new noble is a man whose father did not hold a title.

⁸⁹ An old noble is a man whose father did hold a title.

⁹⁰ This is the number of women who were the daughters of new nobles in the sixteenth century.

⁹¹ This is the number of women who were the daughters of old nobles in the sixteenth century.

⁹² This is the number of women who were the daughters of new nobles in the seventeenth century.

⁹³ This is the number of women who were the daughters of old nobles in the seventeenth century.

⁹⁴ This is the number of women who were the daughters of new nobles in the eighteenth century.

⁹⁵ This is the number of women who were the daughters of old nobles in the eighteenth century.

Table 36: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New vs. Old Nobles, 19th Century

	Daughters of New Nobles		Daughters of Old Nobles	
Endogamous	85/181	46.96%	780/1536	50.78%
Hypogamous	25/181	14.30%	158/1536	10.29 %
Exogamous	70/181	38.74%	598/1536	38.93%
Unmarried	28/202 ⁹⁶	13.86%	271/1720 ⁹⁷	15.76%

Table 37: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New vs. Old Nobles, 20th Century

	Daughters of New Nobles		Daughters of Old Nobles	
Endogamous	21/96	21.88%	337/1290	26.12%
Hypogamous	11/96	11.45%	100/1290	7.76%
Exogamous	64/96	66.67%	853/1290	66.12%
Unmarried	7/93	7.53%	144/1229	11.72%

Table 38: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New vs. Old Nobles, 20th Century Through 1920

	Daughters of New Nobles		Daughters of Old Nobles	
Endogamous	9/30	30.00%	153/351	43.60%
Hypogamous	3/30	10.00%	36/351	10.25%
Exogamous	18/30	60.00%	162/351	46.15%
Unmarried	NA		NA	

Tables 39 and 40 give the marriage patterns for first marriages only. It is only in the long sixteenth (1485-1600)⁹⁸ and the early twentieth (1901-1920)⁹⁹ centuries that the daughters of the old nobles were more likely to marry endogamously on their first marriage than were those of new nobles and it was in the eighteenth century that there was a large difference in the rates of those who remained unmarried.¹⁰⁰ With the exception of the early twentieth century (1901-1920), where the rate is essentially equal, women from newly elevated families were distinctly more likely to marry hypogamously

⁹⁶ This is the number of women who were the daughters of new nobles in the nineteenth century.

⁹⁷ This is the number of women who were the daughters of old nobles in the nineteenth century.

⁹⁸ This result is statistically significant.

⁹⁹ This result is not statistically significant due to the very small number of the daughters of new nobles.

¹⁰⁰ This result is not statistically significant due to the large disparity in the number of the daughters of the new nobility versus those of the old nobility.

than were the more established women.¹⁰¹ It seems likely that this is because many of the newly promoted families had risen from the ranks of knighthood or the baronetcy and thus had ties with other families from that rank. For the new nobles, marrying a daughter into those ranks likely would appear to be more of a horizontal connection instead of the downward movement that such a union would represent to the older nobility. In all but the nineteenth century, new noble families were considerably more likely to marry men with no title whatsoever (those below the level of knight or baron).¹⁰²

Table 39: First Marriages and Unmarried Rate of Daughters of New Nobles

	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	20th C (to 1920)
Endogamous	49/138 37.12%	129/245 52.65%	75/172 43.60%	85/174 48.85%	20/86 23.26%	9/30 30%
Hypogamous	42/138 31.82%	53/245 21.63%	28/172 16.28%	26/174 14.94%	11/86 12.78%	3/30 10%
Exogamous	41/138 31.06%	63/245 25.72%	69/172 40.12%	63/174 36.21%	55/86 63.96%	18/30 60%
Unmarried ¹⁰³	7/145 4.83%	14/259 5.41%	9/181 4.97%	28/202 13.86%	7/93 7.53%	NA

Table 40: First Marriages and Unmarried Rate of Daughters of Old Nobles

	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C	20th C (to 1920)
Endogamous	360/684 52.63%	472/752 62.77%	448/819 54.70%	746/1452 51.38%	309/1085 28.48%	150/326 46.01%
Hypogamous	160/684 23.39%	136/752 18.10%	96/819 11.72%	152/1452 10.47%	83/1085 7.65%	33/326 10.12%
Exogamous	164/684 23.98%	144/752 19.15%	275/819 33.58%	554/1452 38.15%	693/1085 63.87%	143/326 43.87%
Unmarried ¹⁰⁴	22/706 3.12%	60/812 7.39%	115/934 12.31%	271/1723 15.73%	144/1229 11.72%	NA

¹⁰¹ The percentages make this disparity apparent; however, due to the large disparity in the number of women from new families versus those from the established families, these differences do not rise to the level of statistical significance.

¹⁰² The percentages again make clear this disparity; however, due to the large disparity in the number of women from new families versus those from the established families, only in the seventeenth century is the difference statistically significant.

¹⁰³ The denominator is the number of women contracting marriages (first) added to the number of unmarried.

¹⁰⁴ The denominator is the number of women contracting marriages (first) added to the number of unmarried.

Since 1920, the number of marriages between the children of established noble families has fallen to nearly nil. An exception to this was the 1977 wedding of Lady Jane Grosvenor, the daughter of the 5th Duke of Westminster,¹⁰⁵ to Guy Innes Kerr, the 10th Duke of Roxburghe. Madeline Beard in her study of twentieth century landed society characterized the union as “a gesture of defiant solidarity in the face of economic difficulties by the landed super-rich.”¹⁰⁶ The fact that it elicited such comment is an indication of the changes in aristocratic marriage patterns in the last decades of the twentieth century. Jane married again within her rank. In 1996, following an acrimonious 1990 divorce from the Duke of Roxburghe, she married her second cousin¹⁰⁷ Edward Dawnay. More typical of the daughters of the established nobility is Carina Fitzalan-Howard, the daughter of the 17th Duke of Norfolk. In 1983, she married the media personality David Frost, a man of high social visibility but certainly not of noble birth. That same year, Julia Percy, daughter of the 10th Duke of Norfolk married the businessman Nicholas Craig Harvey, again, a man of some status and wealth but not an aristocrat.

An examination of the marriage patterns within families that continued for at least two generations after ennoblement provides another means to investigate the differences between new and established families. The figures given below indicate that newly ennobled families took on the marriage patterns of the established aristocracy quite quickly. Tables 41 and 42 give the results of the examination of thirty-five such

¹⁰⁵ Robert Grosvenor (1910-1979).

¹⁰⁶ Beard, *English Landed Society*, 136. The marriage, however, was not to last, the couple divorced in 1990.

¹⁰⁷ Their grandfathers were brothers

families.¹⁰⁸ The pattern through the end of the twentieth century indicates that the endogamy rate within the established nobility was quite a lot higher than it was for the newly ennobled. However, this difference does not rise to the level of statistical significance. As was found in the statistics cited above, the daughters of new nobles are significantly more likely to marry hypogamously than are the women born when the same family has held the title longer. The rate of exogamous marriages contains a deviation from the more general pattern. In the general statistics, the daughters of new nobles were slightly more likely to marry exogamously than were those of the old nobility.¹⁰⁹ However, in the statistics that follow particular families across generations the trend is reversed.

Table 41: Patterns of Families Who Continued for Several Generations after Ennoblement, 1485-2000¹¹⁰

Daughters of:	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
New Nobles	65/134 48.51%	33/134 24.62%	36/134 26.87%
Old Nobles	299/568 52.64%	79/568 13.91%	190/568 33.45%

As has been shown throughout this study, marriage patterns shifted after World War One. In examining the patterns only through 1920 there is a difference from the patterns through 2000. The difference in the endogamy rate expands¹¹¹ and the pattern in the hypogamy rate above does not shift greatly. The exogamy rate for the daughters of the old nobility drops by more than 5 percent over the rate seen in the table that gives the

¹⁰⁸ These families were the Achesons, Adderlys, Ansons, Balfours, Barrys, Belayses, Blighs, Boscowans, Boyles, Bruges, Capells, Careys, Cavendishes, Cecils, Cokes, Conyers, Coventrys, Devereuxs, Duffs, Duncombes, Fanes, Herberts, Holyroyds, Hopes, Keppels, Kerrs, Montagus, Osbornes, Pagets, Pitts, Primroses, Seymours, Spencers, Windsors [not the current royal family], and Wriothesleys.

¹⁰⁹ This difference is not statistically significant.

¹¹⁰ These numbers include all marriages, both first and subsequent.

¹¹¹ Despite this expansion, the difference is not statistically significant.

statistics to the year 2000.¹¹² These figures do not alter the assertion given above that families, once given a title, within no more than two generations appropriated for themselves the marriage patterns of the established nobility, indicating the strength and persistence of the aristocratic rank identity.

Table 42: Patterns of Families Who Continued for Several Generations after Ennoblement, 1485-1920¹¹³

Daughters of:	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous
New Nobles	65/134 48.51%	33/134 24.62%	36/134 26.87%
Old Nobles	281/491 57.23%	72/491 14.65%	138/491 28.12%

As shown in Table 43, the daughters of the old nobility were significantly more likely to remain unmarried than were the daughters of the more recently ennobled. This is likely due to the higher rate of rank consciousness found among the established nobility, which manifested itself in a marked disinclination to marry hypogamously, a disinclination that was not shared by the new nobility. There does appear to have been the attitude among the established nobles that it was better for their daughter to remain unmarried than to make a socially inappropriate match. This attitude may well have been shared by the newer nobility, but they had a broader definition of what constituted an appropriate match.

Table 43: Rates of Unmarriedness in Families Who Continued for Several Generations After Ennoblement, 1485-2000

Daughters of New Nobles	7/134 ¹¹⁴ 5.22%
Daughters of Old Nobles	61/527 ¹¹⁵ 11.57%

¹¹² The difference between the two groups is not statistically significant.

¹¹³ These numbers include all marriages, both first and subsequent.

¹¹⁴ This number represents the total number of the daughters of the new nobility in the sample

¹¹⁵ This number represents the total number of the daughters of the old nobility in the sample.

Table 44 provides the figures for the rate of unmarriedness from 1485-1920. As shown elsewhere in this study, World War One had a profound effect on the marriage patterns of aristocratic British women, but this was not the case when looking at the percentages of women who remained single. The difference in the unmarried rate for the old nobility¹¹⁶ is negligible between the sample that ends in 1920 and that which continues to 2000.

Table 44: Rates of Unmarriedness in Families Who Continued for Several Generations After Ennoblement, 1485-1920

Daughters of New Nobles	7/134 ¹¹⁷ 5.22%
Daughters of Old Nobles	56/460 ¹¹⁸ 12.17%

V. Attempts to Make New Nobility Respectable

Scholars who support the concept of the open elite argue that at least by the eighteenth century, a rather distinct aristocratic identity to which new recruits conformed had developed. This contention is supported above. The education that the nobles received (or saw to it that their heirs received) was the basis for this identity. The upper ranks accepted newcomers, according to these scholars, as long they adhered to those common ideals.¹¹⁹ While a shared set of values that aspirants to the heights of Society espoused did exist, I would argue, nevertheless, that this commonality was not enough to allow them access to the inner sanctum. That type of acceptance, as is shown by the marriage patterns discussed above, would only come with time and generations.

¹¹⁶ This only includes the old nobility because families which were raised to the peerage after 1920 did not have a sufficient number of ennobled generations to be included in this analysis.

¹¹⁷ This number represents the total number of the daughters of the new nobility in the sample. This number is the same as in Table 44 as no families that were ennobled after 1920 are included in the sample.

¹¹⁸ This number represents the total number of the daughters of the old nobility in the sample.

¹¹⁹ McCahill, "Recruitment," 604; J.C.D. Clark, "Review," 180 [Clark is characterizing the argument of John Cannon].

Nearly everyone acknowledged the power of Society in the nineteenth century to determine who was “in” and who was “out.” Lady Charlotte Bertie, the daughter of the 9th Earl of Lindsey,¹²⁰ who felt that she had been placed outside of the bounds of polite company by her marriage into “trade” made great efforts “to place my children on that footing with theirs...”¹²¹ At times her musings about the issue border on the defensive:

Though my husband is particularly formed to shine and rise and is infinitely more elegant than half of the lordlings I meet, and though I have my own rank which is high enough to assist me, the consciousness frequently obtrudes itself that in this aristocratic nation the word trade conveys a taint. . . I am determined to overcome the prejudice; I will force them, whether they will or not, to disguise, if they do not forget, its existence in my case. For myself I care not. . . But the children shall never feel that there live any of earth who do, or who dare look down upon them...¹²²

Charlotte married Josiah Guest¹²³ in 1883. Guest was an ironmaster and one of the wealthiest businessmen of the time. When they married, she was twenty-one and he was in his late forties.¹²⁴ Despite his wealth and the apparent happiness of the marriage, she never got past the idea that she had married down and that her children were thus handicapped.

Scholars such as Lenore Davidoff assert that Society was a means by which industrial wealth could be made respectable, that there was a mechanism for incorporating that wealth.¹²⁵ This does not seem to be born out by the experiences of the women themselves. While wealthy men were given titles and industrial heiresses did marry into the upper echelons, marriage to an aristocratic woman was not the means by which such a man could improve his social standing. Such a marriage merely served to

¹²⁰ Charlotte was the daughter of Albermarle Bertie’s (1744-1818) second marriage to Charlotte Layard.

¹²¹ Bessborough, *Lady Charlotte Guest*, 71 & 131.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 133.

¹²³ Josiah Guest (1785-1852).

¹²⁴ Horn, *Ladies of the Manor*, 73-75.

¹²⁵ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 14.

lower the standing of the woman in question. This was the experience of Charlotte Bertie. She had to work to put her children on an “equal footing” because their father was a businessman. Society wielded the rules of access and of etiquette ruthlessly in order to maintain some sort of exclusivity.¹²⁶

VI. Changes Wrought by the New Nobles

There is general agreement among scholars and contemporary commentators that Society underwent a fundamental change in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.¹²⁷ The impression given is that despite the best efforts of the Dowagers-at-the-Doors, hoards of the industrially-moneyed overwhelmed their defenses and irreparably tainted Society. In 1907, writing in her indomitable manner, Dorothy Walpole complained “Society in the old days cannot in any way be compared with the motley crowd which calls itself society today ... Today it would be difficult to discover accurately who is in and who out of society.”¹²⁸ Five years later she wrote deploring the excessive love for money that she believed characterized the newcomers, “Ladies and gentlemen, it is sometimes said, are no longer what they were; it is even maintained that the class in question has seen its best days. Be this as it may, during the last thirty-five years a great change has assuredly taken place in the social organization of the Upper Classes,¹²⁹ whose ideas and ideals seem to have altered even more than those of a less

¹²⁶ Ibid., 15.

¹²⁷ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 425; Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall*, 342. Though the precise nature of that change is a bit murky. It has been argued that out-marriage was a large part of the change, but that seems questionable. Many point to the Prince of Wales (the future Edward VII) and his set as a catalyst for change. The Prince’s attraction to plutocrats is well-documented.

¹²⁸ Nevill, *Leaves*, 22.

¹²⁹ Dorothy is discussing Society here, “Upper Classes” is a term she is employing to mean those with the wealth to participate in the elite social life. This is distinct from the aristocratic rank which is under discussion in this study.

favoured section of the population. . . ¹³⁰ Here Dorothy lamented the change in Society brought about by those who had been admitted due to their wealth rather than their birth. Their money may have admitted the newcomers to the parties but it did not buy them the approval of aristocratic doyens.

Elite women worked quite hard to keep the boundaries of Society in place. A fair amount of distress accompanied the breaking down of the restrictions in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.¹³¹ Women reminiscing about the good old days often looked back to the time when Society was small and ruled by the traditional aristocracy.¹³² Their writings indicate distress over the state of their world. Most who pointed out the changes that were happening blamed money and the decline of privileges accorded to birth. Many of these comments put the beginning of the end well before 1880. In 1840, Lady Charlotte Fox wrote “It goes to my heart to see disappear all the little privileges, the *prestige* that we enjoyed . . .”¹³³ The onslaught of wealth against the exclusive social position that had been held by birth had begun even in the first half of the century and there was little these women could do to stop it.¹³⁴ The Countess of Cardigan had pleasant memories of Cowes¹³⁵ during the 1840s when it “was full of lighthearted gaiety, over which the shadow of the American millionaire and knighted plutocrat had not yet fallen.”¹³⁶

Some commentators place the point of change in the 1880s with presentation of the Tennant sisters (though their pivotal role is not reflected in the letters and diaries of

¹³⁰ Nevill, *My Own Times*, 144-145.

¹³¹ Davidoff writes, “Like all status groups, the traditional aristocratic elite were obsessively concerned with the question of access to their ranks.” *The Best Circles*, 15.

¹³² Londonderry, *Retrospect*, 40; Nevill, *Life and Letters*, 176.

¹³³ Quoted in Wasson, *The Aristocracy of Europe*, 103.

¹³⁴ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 347; Nevill, *Life and Letters*, 184.

¹³⁵ She is referring to a regatta held on the Solent in August. It was first held in 1826.

¹³⁶ Quoted in Wasson, *The Aristocracy of Europe*, 119.

the time nor in the memoirs). Laura and Margot Tennant made their debut at court in 1881 and 1882 respectively. Their father was an illegitimately born wealthy Glasgow industrialist. Their presentation underscored the relative openness of the Prince of Wales' set to rich people of questionable social backgrounds.¹³⁷ Mary Gladstone wrote of her encounter with the Tennants in 1882, "I have had the strange, rather mad experience of the Tennant circle. I couldn't describe it – it is the maddest, merriest, whirl from morn till night – wonderful quickness, brightness, wit, cleverness – the four sisters all so pretty and fascinating in their different ways..."¹³⁸ These were women whose approach to life was far different than that of the traditionally raised aristocratic women. They were well-educated, witty, and stimulating company. The competition was beginning to favour those with money and wit¹³⁹ over those with only breeding and manners.

By the 1880s things were changing and the exclusivity that had characterized Society broke down quite rapidly (the process was essentially complete by the end of the First World War).¹⁴⁰ The statistics gathered for this study as shown in Table 10¹⁴¹ support this observation. The rate of endogamous marriages dropped sharply in the decade of 1881-1890 to 45.76 percent from 54.84 percent in the previous ten years.¹⁴² The rate continued to fall in the final decade of the century to only 35.91 percent.¹⁴³ However, when the analysis includes the first two decades of the twentieth century, the pattern of

¹³⁷ Lambert, *Unquiet Souls*, 20; Stone, *An Open Elite*, 425.

¹³⁸ Mary Gladstone, *Her Diaries and Letters* (London: Methuen, 1930), 268.

¹³⁹ Or perhaps simply a less restrained or proper wit.

¹⁴⁰ Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall*, 344. Cannadine bases his study on the experience of aristocratic men and he finds a sharp break at 1880. The focus of women in this study makes that shift less dramatic, rather it took place in the period from 1880 to 1920.

¹⁴¹ In Chapter One.

¹⁴² Despite the large difference in the percentages, the disparity is not statistically significant.

¹⁴³ This represents a statistically significant drop from the 1871-1880 rate.

steady decline reverses itself slightly, as shown in Table 11.¹⁴⁴ The endogamy rates never recover their pre-1880 level but in those years, 42.43 percent of the marriages of elite women are with men of their own rank.

The changes that began in the 1880s escalated in the twentieth century, especially following the First World War.¹⁴⁵ With some prescience, Arthur Gore, 6th Earl of Arran¹⁴⁶ wrote following the elections of 1906,¹⁴⁷ “I believe that we are on the eve of many changes. I feel the first earthquake tremors shaking the safe and comfortable – perhaps too comfortable – world into which we were born. The cracks have not yet appeared, but they will and before very long.”¹⁴⁸ According to David Cannadine, “patrician high society was being eroded by the inexorable force of mere ‘wealth’ which it could neither contain nor control.”¹⁴⁹ This erosion of the safe and comfortable world of the elite was completed by the seismic waves of the First World War.¹⁵⁰ The endogamy rate for the rest of the twentieth century was 19.84 percent¹⁵¹ as compared with 42.52 percent for the period from 1901-1920.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁴ In Chapter One.

¹⁴⁵ The average size of the English landed family fell from 5.96 children per married couple in 1800 to 2.25 in 1939. Some have attributed this to the ‘decline’ of landed society; money was getting tight for families whose money came from the land. Mark Rothery, “The Reproductive Behavior of the English Landed Gentry in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” *The Journal of British Studies* 48:3 (July, 2009), 674-675.

¹⁴⁶ Arthur Gore (1839-1901). He is the brother of Mabel Gore, Countess of Airlie.

¹⁴⁷ In this election the Liberals under Henry Campbell-Bannerman won.

¹⁴⁸ Mabel, Countess of Airlie, *Thatched with Gold: The Memoirs of Mabel Countess of Arlie* (London: Hutchinson, 1962), 122-123.

¹⁴⁹ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 347.

¹⁵⁰ Perhaps one reason for the sharp drop in the endogamous marriage rate for aristocratic women following World War One is the large proportion of aristocratic men who were killed in that conflict. Possibly there were simply not enough well-born grooms to go around. One generation in which considerations of birth were not overwhelming in the choice of a spouse might well have been enough to change centuries-old habits.

¹⁵¹ This represents 195 endogamous marriages out of a total of 983 marriages for those years. The hypogamy rate for the same period was 7.12 percent (70 marriages), while the exogamy rate was a staggering 73.04 percent (718 marriages).

VII. Conclusion

The consideration of the marriage patterns of aristocratic women over five centuries has permitted a different perspective on the question of the open elite than that found in any other study. The statistical analysis of the daughters of both established and new nobles indicates that the distinct preference was to marry into established families. This shows that the aristocracy held older titles in higher regard than newer ones. The disinclination of elite women to marry into the ranks of the recently ennobled signifies a lack of full acceptance for the newcomers. The evidence of letters and journals supports the findings of the statistics and shows the role played by noble women in keeping the rank closed. Until after the First World War, the British nobility was essentially a closed rank in which the women worked hard to preserve the rank identity.

¹⁵² This figure represents 162 endogamous marriages out of a total of 381 marriages for that period. The difference is statistically significant. The hypogamy rate for the same period was 10.24 percent (39 marriages). The exogamy rate was 47.24 percent (180 marriages).

Chapter Six: To Catch a Man

I. Introduction

Despite the fact that aristocratic British women often operated as members of a larger family unit and that their marriages served to further the status of their natal family, they themselves were often active participants in the quest for a mate, both for themselves and for family members. They had precise expectations about the characteristics that a husband ought to possess, and throughout the period between 1485 and 2000, those expectations generally revolved around the issues of rank, property, and personal character. The man they married served to solidify their and their families' place within the aristocracy and thus strengthen their sense of rank identity. At times, their pursuit of the man who would have this important effect extended beyond the normal avenues of social interaction into arenas of orchestrated scheming. The search for an appropriate husband often took place in what has been termed since the sixteenth century as the marriage market. Much of the maneuvering for a mate took place within very constrained circumstances, most often in the London Season. When not in London, the country houses of the aristocracy provided a convenient place for socially-sanctioned courtship.

II. “What a Girl Wants”: Expectations and Desires of the Women Themselves in Their Quest for an Appropriate Husband

Generally, in the early modern period both parents and children agreed that rank and property were paramount in the selection of an appropriate husband. One of the great marital strategists of the sixteenth-century was Elizabeth Hardwick. Her career illustrates what many women sought from marriage. Her first husband, Robert Barlow, a minor

country squire, died when she was only twenty. She then married the prominent courtier Sir William Cavendish as his third wife. Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset hosted the wedding at his home, a sign of the social prominence of the couple. With debts and a large family to raise after Sir William Cavendish died,¹ Elizabeth Hardwick carefully considered her choice of her next husband, choosing George Talbot, 6th Earl of Shrewsbury² in 1568.³ With each marriage, she climbed the ladder of rank and property.

In the eighteenth century, the personal character of a possible husband began to dominate the discourse of aristocratic women⁴ and romantic overtones tinged their discussions. In 1730, Mary Chamber wrote to Lady Suffolk⁵ about a young man who had caught the attention of many eligible young women: “We all desire to marry Mr. Conolly,⁶ but he does not greatly take to anybody but Lady Betty⁷ for when all the Virgins sat sighing around to dance with him he seriously asked her and would dance with nobody else upon her refusal.”⁸ Sarah Lennox noted in a letter to her friend Lady Susan Fox-Strangways⁹ in the 1760s he marriage of Frances Greville to John Crewe,¹⁰ “I am sure you will be glad, for you like her I know, and he is a very amiable man and there is no harm in his having £10,000 a year you know.”¹¹ Earlier she had written of Mr. Crewe that he “is a fine catch for any Miss, he is very rich and is a very good kind of

¹ William Cavendish died c. 1562.

² 1528-1590.

³ David N. Durant, *Bess of Hardwick : Portrait of an Elizabethan Dynast* (New York: Atheneum, 1978),1, 31.

⁴ Though issues of rank and money are still of real concern.

⁵ Possibly Henrietta Hobart.

⁶ This is most likely William Conolly (d. 1754), the nephew and heir of William Conolly who was the very wealthy speaker of the Irish House of Commons who had died the previous year without a child. The younger Mr. Conolly married Anne Wentworth in 1733.

⁷ Elizabeth Berkeley.

⁸ BL Add. MSS 22627 f. 98.

⁹ Susan Fox Strangways.

¹⁰ John Crewe, created 1st Baron Crewe in 1806.

¹¹ Ilchester, *The Life and Letters*, I:188. The couple married in 1766.

man, but he is so prodigiously afraid of being married too that he won't speak to a Miss."¹² Aristocratic women expressed decided opinions about the marital choices of other women and on the institution of marriage overall. Therese Parker commented to her brother Lord Grantham in 1774: "I think nothing contributes more to the many unhappy marriages one sees, than want of nicety in the Young Women at present who are much more to blame in that respect than the Men. They set their caps at every man of Fortune that comes out, are strongly seconded by the Mothers and take the first that offers."¹³ This statement is in line with the social commentary of the eighteenth century that deplored the mercenary nature of elite marriage.

Young elite women used the events of the London Season to conduct their quest for an appropriate husband. The ultimate aim was to fall in love with a man whom their family would consider fitting. In May, 1808 at the age of seventeen Sarah Spencer gave an account of a ball that she attended where she danced "the two last with Lord Percy,¹⁴ who, being to be one day the Duke of Northumberland, is of course the best partner in London, by the unanimous consent of the young ladies, who agree that he is the most charming, interesting, bewitching, fascinating youth that ever trod with the light fantastic toe the chalked floor of any ballroom in Europe since the days of his ancestor Hotspur..."¹⁵ There is a sardonic tone in this description, but it describes a potent truth: high social status enhanced one's charm. Four years later, Sarah described the perfect

¹² Ilchester, *The Life and Letters*, I: 182. He got over his fear, within six weeks of meeting Miss Greville he had proposed.

¹³ BL Add. MSS 48218 f. 152.

¹⁴ Hugh Percy, later 3rd Duke of Northumberland. He married Charlotte Clive, daughter of the 1st Earl of Powis in 1817.

¹⁵ Wyndham, *Correspondence of Sarah Spencer*, 13.

mate, “Lord Herbert¹⁶ is handsome, *rather*; he is nobly born, *very*; he will have a fortune, *sufficient*, and his connection is admirable.”¹⁷

The quest for Lord Right who combined the qualities of rank, money, and fine character continued to be a major theme in the writings of aristocratic women in the following century. Through the nineteenth century, most noble women had little existence independent of their families. If they did not have a future as a wife then they truly did not have a future. It was their purpose to make a marriage that permitted the maintenance of their aristocratic rank identity. Mabel Gore, Countess of Airlie stated that in her adolescence the primary pre-occupation for young women was finding a husband.¹⁸ Among the young women looking for husbands in the nineteenth century, a slang had emerged. A “parti” was an eligible, in all senses of the word, man (the term seems to come from *bon-parti*) while a man who was not a good prospect was referred to as a “detrimental.”¹⁹ A young aristocratic woman’s future was dependent upon her ability to capture a “parti” while avoiding the “detrimentals.”²⁰

In 1809, Harriet Cavendish announced to her brother her decision to marry Lord Granville:²¹ “Lord Granville’s character and attachment give me a security in looking forward to uniting my fate with his that I could not have believed I should ever feel at such a moment as this.”²² Sarah Spencer wrote concerning Harriet’s engagement: “He is

¹⁶ Edward Clive (1785-1848), the son of the 1st Earl Powis and later 2nd Earl Powis.

¹⁷ Wyndham, *Correspondence*, 130.

¹⁸ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, 39.

¹⁹ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 50.

²⁰ An example of this usage comes from the memoir of Jenny Jerome, Lady Randolph Churchill, “My sister, who was staying with us, had been walking in the garden with young Lord _____, who was a *parti*, and much run after by designing mothers with marriageable daughters.” Cornwallis-West, *Reminiscences*, 37-38

²¹ Granville Leveson-Gower, the son of the 1st Marquess of Stafford. She had been wavering because he had been the long-time lover of her aunt, Henrietta Spencer.

²² Levison-Gower, *Hary-O*, 335.

reckoned uncommonly handsome, and he is extremely gentlemanlike in his manners; besides which he is very well connected...²³ In 1848 Priscilla Wellesley-Pole, Countess of Westmorland said of Gerald Ponsonby,²⁴ “I think him quite charming, clever, agreeable, and amiable – in short I never saw a nicer lad.”²⁵ Louisa Bowater, Lady Knightley wrote plaintively in her journal in 1863 “I long for intercourse with someone infinitely superior to myself – not exactly what I had last week at Stanmore, because a man who is making up to a woman necessarily flatters her vanity and self-love by the mere fact of doing so.” The suitor in question was an altogether appropriate match, but upon reflection, Louisa determined that she did not have strong enough feelings to prompt her to marry him.²⁶ Rank was no longer the only concern when nineteenth-century women were choosing or imagining a mate, though it remained an important issue.²⁷

By the nineteenth century, the emotional aspects of a proposed match were of deep concern to elite mothers. Henrietta Maria Dillon-Lee, Lady Stanley, wrote to her husband about their eldest daughter Henrietta Blanche in July 1851:

I am anxious you should know in what an uncertain state of mind I find Blanche – I think she is more annoyed at Lord Airlie²⁸ coming before she expected him than pleased at his impressments. She says she does not know why he comes for that he is only just in love, that she does not think he will like her when he finds how spirited she is, that if he had any wish to be useful among his own people she might be happy but that a life of amusement with him she could not look forward to. Yet when I say would you like him to be put off she says she knows she would be sorry after. I

²³ Wyndham, *Correspondence of Sarah Spencer*, 86.

²⁴ She is writing of her husband’s nephew, Gerald Ponsonby (1829-1908), son of the 4th Earl of Bessborough and Maria Fane (daughter of the 10th Earl of Westmorland). He married Maria Coventry, daughter of Viscount Deerhurst in 1858.

²⁵ Lady Rose Weigall, *The Correspondence of Priscilla, Countess of Westmoreland* (London: John Murray, 1909), 150.

²⁶ Cartwright, *Journals*, 63.

²⁷ Though it was still quite important.

²⁸ David Ogilvy, (1826-1881) 5th Earl of Airlie.

am sorely perplexed. She wants me to speak to him but I can hardly say what she wants, he is so inattentive and so difficult to get on with. She says she wishes the whole thing had never been, that she likes her present life and is quite happy here and does not wish to marry just now – and yet she will accept him I know. Will she love him after, is it safe to run that risk?²⁹

The following month the proposal had been given and accepted and Lady Alderly wrote, “It is all settled, and I do hope it will be for our darling’s happiness – I never saw more deep feeling than on his part...”³⁰ This match had everything that an ambitious mother could want: high social rank, ample money, and love.³¹

III. Scheming to Catch a Mate

Though many of the marriages of aristocratic British women were arranged, that does not mean that these women were necessarily passive in the process. They understood the importance of making a good marriage and often they planned quite actively to make that happen. Their plots to catch a husband, or to deny one to someone else, were often quite elaborate and sometimes intensely cruel. The stakes in this quest were high. The right husband solidified their position within the aristocratic rank and there were a finite number of “right” husbands to go around.

Anne Boleyn was an active participant in the marital plots that preceded her marriage to Henry VIII.³² When she returned from the French court, she was a woman on a mission to marry well. While she was serving as lady-in-waiting to Katherine of Aragon she met and entered into a relationship with Henry Percy, the heir to the

²⁹ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 8.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 10.

³¹ There was love on the side of the groom at least. One does wonder if the prospective bride simply bowed to familial and social pressure.

³² Retha Warnicke, “The Eternal Triangle and Court Politics: Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, and Sir Thomas Wyatt.” *Albion* 18 (1986): 567.

Dukedom of Northumberland who was in the service of Cardinal Wolsey. Like many young men around court, Percy spent quite a lot of time in the company of the young women who were in service to the Queen. In 1522, there were plans to match Anne with James Butler, the heir to the Irish Earl of Ormonde. Some historians have speculated that Anne, who by all appearances enjoyed the life of the court, had no desire to become the Countess of Ormonde as it would involve her rustication to the Irish countryside. A match with Percy would make her a Duchess and likely keep her closer to the center of things in London.³³

Sometimes the plots to catch a mate were quite elaborate; Mary Clavering, Countess Cowper told the following story: In 1706,

My Lord being a widower when the late Queen gave him the Seals, it was no wonder the young women laid out all their snares to catch him. None took such pains as Lady Harriet Vere,³⁴ whose poverty and ruined reputation made it impossible for her to run any risk in the pursuit, let it end as it would. She had made several advances to my Lord by Mrs. Morley, her kinswoman and finding nothing came of it, they immediately concluded my Lord must be pre-engaged to somebody else; so they set a spy upon him and found that he had country lodging at Hammersmith, where he lay constantly and upon enquiry they found I was the cause of this coldness to Lady H. Upon this, they settled a correspondence under a feigned name with him; and in those letters (which were always sent by a fellow dressed up in woman's clothes, who could never be overtaken) they pretended to be some great person, that threatened him, if he married me, to hinder the passing of his title. The first of these letters came the day before I was married. However, it did not hinder our marriage, though my lord thought it advisable to keep it a secret;³⁵ and so he removed the next day to London. His correspondents, seeing they had made him leave the place, thought it would be no hard matter to break the match; and from that time to the beginning of January, which was almost four months, my Lord had a letter every day, some whole sheets of paper, filled with

³³ Ives, *The Life and Death*, 34-35, 63-67. Of course this match came to nothing; Cardinal Wolsey alerted the Duke of Northumberland and the two of them put an end to the relationship; perhaps to open the way for the King, perhaps to safeguard the Butler match as well as to ensure that Percy went through with the planned match to Grace Talbot, the Earl of Shrewsbury's daughter.

³⁴ Lady Vere was the subject of some comment. In Walter Sydney Sitchel's, *Bolingbroke and His Times*, on page 128. is the following: "The notorious Lady Harriet Vere who had been the sinister star of Cowper's life blackmailed young Onslow when he refused to espouse her." (London: James Nisbett, 1901).

³⁵ He also apparently thought that it would be a good idea to keep the marriage a secret from his mother as well.

lies about me: to say I was a mean wretch; that I was a coquette, and should be more so; that my playing so well was, and would be a temptation to bring all the rakes in town about me; that it had been so thus far of my life; and that I was treated so familiarly by the rakish part of the town....³⁶

Even after it was known that Cowper had married Mary, Harriet Vere continued to contrive to meet Cowper and her friends put forward her case to him, “They told him that the Queen had promised Lady H. 100,000£ when she married.” He replied that he certainly was not grand or rich enough to warrant a wife with that kind of wealth.³⁷

Harriet may well have been emboldened in her quest for Cowper due to the superiority of her birth over that of her rival. The Veres were one of the oldest families in the English aristocracy and Mary Clavering was gentry.³⁸

In 1744, Sophia Fermor married John Carteret, later 2nd Earl of Granville,³⁹ a match that some thought resulted from effective scheming on the part of the young woman and her mother. The groom was much older than his beautiful bride,⁴⁰ but powerful and charming. His first wife⁴¹ had died in 1743, and Carteret was reputed to want to marry again because his eldest son⁴² was showing disquieting signs of mental instability.⁴³ The role of the women involved in the match elicited comment from Horace Walpole, “Do but imagine how many passions will be gratified in that family; her own

³⁶ Mary Clavering, Countess Cowper, *Diary of Mary, Countess Cowper, Lady of the Bedchamber to the Princess of Wales, 1714-20* (London: J. Murray, 1864), 34-35 & n.

³⁷ Cowper, *Diary of Mary, Countess Cowper*, 36-37.

³⁸ While it is true that in the eighteenth century the Claverings were gentry, they could trace their family line back to the Norman age when they had been a great baronial family who were related by marriage to John Balliol, King of Scotland.

³⁹ John Carteret (1690-1763).

⁴⁰ Granville was about fifty-four while Sophia was only twenty-three.

⁴¹ Frances Worsley.

⁴² Robert Carteret (1721-1776), later 3rd Earl of Granville. He never married and upon his death the title became extinct.

⁴³ Unfortunately, this marriage did not produce any children. John Cannon, ‘Carteret, John, second Earl Granville (1690–1763)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2006. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/4804>, accessed 24 March 2010].

ambition – vanity and resentment – love, she never had any. The politics, management, and pedantry of the mother. . .”⁴⁴ The plotting undertaken to catch such a prominent man apparently did not meet with Walpole’s approval.

An aristocratic woman had to guard her reputation. The loss of her good name could ruin her chances for a good marriage. The Duchess of Northumberland recounted in her journal in May 1777 the following story of an elaborate plot that resulted in the destruction of a woman’s reputation and her opportunities for marriage:

Sir Watkins Williams-Wynn⁴⁵ seem’d to pay very great attention to Lady Anne Howard, eldest sister to Lord Carlisle and very prudent deserving young woman, but all on a sudden his behaviour changed, some said owing to his mother’s not approving of the match, others that he received an anonymous letter telling him that she played so deep she would ruin him. There was no foundation for this accusation. The letter was supposed to be wrote by Lady Bridget Lane,⁴⁶ some said she had a mind to the Baronet herself,⁴⁷ and others that it was out of sheer love of mischief. In either case she was unpardonable, if she was so treacherous to have wrote it, as she at the same time professed the utmost friendship to Lady Anne.⁴⁸

The match between Anne Howard and Sir Williams-Wynn came to nothing and Anne died unmarried. The Baronet married Charlotte Grenville in December 1771. This rather cruel destruction of Anne’s reputation indicates the seriousness of some of these games.

IV. The Marriage Market

As has been shown in this study, throughout the period from the sixteenth through the twentieth century (at least through 1920), great care was taken in the arranging of the marriages of aristocratic women. This care and the attitude toward such unions resulted in

⁴⁴ Henrietta Jeffreys. Thomason, *Memoirs of Viscountess Sundon*, I: 111.

⁴⁵ Watkins Williams-Wynn (1749-1789), 4th Bt. He had married first Henrietta Somerset, daughter of the 4th Duke of Beaufort in 1769. She died without issue the following year.

⁴⁶ Bridget Henley.

⁴⁷ It is possible that she was in pursuit of the Baronet. She had been widowed in 1768 and did not remarry until 1773.

⁴⁸ Grieg, *Diaries of a Duchess*, 153-54.

the creation of what has been called the “marriage market.” The term itself is highly appropriate as the potential partners were frequently assessed as commodities for trade or sale rather than as actual people.⁴⁹ Aristocratic women played a significant role in the operation of the marriage market throughout this period. It was, indeed, one area in which these women exercised a great deal of agency. Their activities on behalf of their families in this arena demonstrate a high level of concern for the maintenance of their families’ place in the aristocratic hierarchy and, on a larger scale, the preservation of noble rank identity.

Women, often in their roles as mothers,⁵⁰ were important actors in the marriage market.⁵¹ In the sixteenth century, Jane Guilford, Duchess of Northumberland actively participated in all of the maneuverings of her prominent family. She played a central role in arranging the marriage of her eldest son John Dudley⁵² to Anne Seymour, the daughter of Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Somerset in 1550.⁵³ This marriage linked the two leading families in Britain during the reign of Edward VI. One of the best examples of the manipulating mother was Elizabeth Hardwick (Bess of Hardwick). In 1574, she had one unmarried daughter left, Elizabeth Cavendish, who was dangerously old.⁵⁴ Many at the time noted that Bess was active in trying to secure a suitable husband for her daughter.⁵⁵ Like many noble women, Bess worked hard to gain advantage for her family in the

⁴⁹ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 44.

⁵⁰ Often, though not always, these women were widows and thus were the de facto heads of their families. If the father of the prospective bride (or groom) were still alive, generally he undertook the actual legal negotiations, though his wife was quite likely the one who had found the potential spouse.

⁵¹ Barbara Harris, “Women and Politics in Early Tudor England” *Historical Journal* 33:2 (June 1990): 260.

⁵² John Dudley (d. 1554), Earl of Warwick.

⁵³ Jane Grey and S.J. Gunn, “A Letter of Jane, Duchess of Northumberland in 1553.” *English Historical Review* 114:459 (Nov. 1999), 1268.

⁵⁴ She was nineteen.

⁵⁵ Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her*, 120; Durant, *Bess of Hardwick*, 81.

marriage market.⁵⁶ Indeed, it was important enough to risk incurring the wrath of Elizabeth I, which came down heavily on Bess when she did arrange a marriage for her daughter without the Queen's permission. In early 1591, Anne Russell, Countess of Warwick, the aunt and guardian of Edward Russell, 3rd Earl of Bedford⁵⁷ expended a great deal of effort attempting to arrange a marriage for him. It took her nearly four years to find a suitable bride. She first went to William Cecil, Lord Burghley indicating her interest in his granddaughter, Lady Elizabeth Vere. Burghley however did not support the match and it came to nothing.⁵⁸ Elizabeth Cooke actively worked as a match-maker on behalf of her daughters. In 1597, she had two from her second marriage, Anne and

⁵⁶ She was willing to take some considerable risk to accomplish her aim. In 1574, Bess colluded with another great dynast of the era, Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox, to match their children. After a whirlwind romance facilitated by the mothers, Elizabeth Cavendish married Charles Stewart. With a marriage at this level (through his mother Charles was closely related to Elizabeth I), care should have been taken to obtain Elizabeth's permission and this was not done. As a result, both of the mothers were imprisoned for a short time and they did a great deal of groveling in order to gain their freedom. Schutte, *Margaret Douglas*, 226-32; Maude Stepney Rawson, *Bess of Hardwick and Her Circle* (New York: John Lane, 1910), 145; Durant, *Bess of Hardwic*, 83-84; Cecilie Goff, *A Woman of the Tudor Age* (London: John Murray, 1930), 307.

⁵⁷ 1572-1627.

⁵⁸ Lesly Lawson, *Out of the Shadow: the Life of Lucy, Countess of Bedford* (London: Hambledon, 2007), 15, 16. This is likely because he was trying to arrange a marriage between Elizabeth and his ward Henry Wriothesley, the Earl of Southampton. That marriage did not come off either. Bedford later married Lucy Harrington.

Anne had also been involved in attempting to secure a good marriage for her son. Margaret Dakins, born in 1571, was the daughter of Arthur and Thomasin Dakins of Linton, Yorkshire and the sole heir to her father's considerable fortune. Her family understood that she would be a sought-after bride, so they sent her to the household of Henry Hastings, the 3rd Earl of Huntingdon. There she was educated by his wife Catherine Dudley. Here she met two future husbands: Walter Devereux and Thomas Sidney (both younger brothers of much more famous courtiers). Margaret married Devereux in 1589, thus propelling this rather obscure, but very wealthy, young woman into the highest court circles. Unfortunately, Walter died in battle on September 8, 1591. There was fierce competition for the hand of the widowed heiress. In November 1591, Lady Elizabeth Cooke wrote to her son, Thomas Posthumous Hoby, urging him to press his suit for Margaret. A potential obstacle stood in young Thomas' path however, the girl "hath her father's consent to match where she list" and she was in love with Lord Sidney. Indeed, Margaret chose Sidney, whom she married on December 22, 1591. This second marriage did not have a happy conclusion either. Sidney died in July 1595. At this point Thomas Hoby successfully pressed his suite. Margaret chose to marry him (most likely because she needed allies to help her fight a suite brought against her by the new Earl of Huntingdon over some property). The wedding took place on August 9, 1596 at his mother's house in Blackfriars, London. (Joanna Moody, *The Private Life of an Elizabethan Lady: the Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599-1605* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), xvi-xvii, xxiii-xxiv, 231-232.

Elizabeth Russell. She wrote to her brother-in-law William Cecil⁵⁹ for assistance in arranging a marriage for the elder, Elizabeth, who was already twenty-two:⁶⁰

This is all I have to trouble you with, but desire you in this being of the Earl of Worcester's⁶¹ daily in Court, it will please you in your best opportunity to persuade the Earl so as my daughter Bess may be wife to Lord Herbert⁶² his eldest son. Her virtue, birth, and place, joined to the hundred pounds of inheritance presently enjoyed and the part in reversion of my Lady Grey, joined with 200 pounds yearly after my death til 2,000 pounds be come out in ten years to her own good whether she be sole or married, will be a sufficient portion for an Earl of so small revenue and so many children as the Earl of Worcester. It is the virtue and honour of the parents joined with the young lord's best affections that maketh me thus desirous.⁶³

Elizabeth did manage to engineer the match between her daughter and the heir to the Earl of Worcester.⁶⁴

The Cecils were, of course, considered good catches by the matchmaking women of the elite.⁶⁵ The family had to be careful that the marriages they entered into were in their own best interest and so, at times, they resisted the blandishments of noblewomen who had a marriageable relative on the market. By 1605, Lucy Harington, Countess of Bedford was attempting to arrange a marriage between her brother⁶⁶ and a daughter⁶⁷ of Robert Cecil.⁶⁸ Cecil did not want the grasping Haringtons to use him as a means to increase their own prestige, but there was no diplomatic way for him to reject the groom

⁵⁹ He was married to her sister Mildred Cooke.

⁶⁰ It is clear that in this instance Elizabeth Russell is writing about her daughter Elizabeth who was a lady-in-waiting to Elizabeth I. Sources, however are mixed as to whether it was actually Elizabeth who married Somerset or if it was her sister Anne and Elizabeth died unmarried.

⁶¹ Edward Somerset (c. 1550-1628), 4th Earl of Worcester.

⁶² Henry Somerset (1577-1646). He had the title Lord Herbert as a courtesy during the life of his father. He inherited the title 1st Marquess of Worcester.

⁶³ Quoted in Meads, *Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, 21.

⁶⁴ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 44.

⁶⁵ This is more true following the ennoblement of William Cecil as Lord Burghley in 1571 and the creation of his son Robert as the Earl of Salisbury in 1605.

⁶⁶ John Harington (1592-1614), 2nd Baron Harington of Exton. He died unmarried.

⁶⁷ Probably Frances Cecil.

⁶⁸ Robert Cecil (1563-1612), 1st Earl of Salisbury. He was the son of William Cecil, Lord Burghley and Mildred Cooke. He essentially succeeded his father as a leading government minister under both Elizabeth I and James I.

on offer so he turned the tables and said that Harington was too good for his daughter.⁶⁹

Lucy obviously wished to link her already quite prominent family with the even more elite Cecils.

Sometimes male members of a family did not appreciate the efforts of mothers. This was the case in 1706, when Bridget Hyde attempted to arrange the marriage of her son. As her father-in-law, the 1st Duke of Leeds was still the head of the family, his desires had to be taken into account as is shown in this letter from Bridget to the Duke:

My Lord, I hope your Grace will forgive my not writing sooner because I could not get an opportunity to speak to the Lady till last night to propose the business to her as your Grace directed and as I could not expect her consent the first time so I was not refused she said I wonder what your Ladyship means, how can you think of such a thing there being such a disproportion in our age. I told her Ladyship my son was very brave and yet he admired her extremely and if her Ladyship could like him I should think myself very happy and yet I believed your grace would think it a great happiness to be so nearly related to her Ladyship but had not time to ask her leave yet I might speak to your grace about it but since I have spoke I think twill do very well for your grace to send and make some proposals or twill look like a slight to my lady. She being not less free afterwards and stayed with us til 5 a clock in the morning and danced with my son all the time. My son tells me Mr. Vane asked him if he did not think Lady Betty a very fine woman and yet she had a great estate which makes me believe he expected to be spoke to. I beg your grace's advice in this matter which is all from my lord.⁷⁰

Her father-in-law thought that her choice was ill-founded and did not hesitate to tell her so:

I do not blame you for endeavoring to dispose of your son so happily as to the Lady Elizabeth Hastings of whom the world views so worthy a character, but I cannot but blame both your forwardness in making such a proposal without any encouragement for doing so, and much more for not persuading your son in time from being so far engaged with his affections as you spoke him to be and since by ___ I find she takes(?) so small an objection as the inequality of age for an excuse, it is by no means proper for me after(?) knowledge of to trouble her Ladyship so with an offer which I know before hand is more likely to be refused than accepted.

⁶⁹ Lawson, *Out of the Shadow*, 71.

⁷⁰ BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 73.

I call the excuse a small one because it was my own case (who was the happiest man living notwithstanding the inequality) and so has many others ___ whom I have known. I therefore rather believe that she either does not like him well enough to be her husband, or his Father being alive, she may reasonable think they must wait his life before his fortune can be considerable, of which you know the contrary, and that after my death your son will have a greater part of my estate in his Father's lifetime than his Father will have from me; nor do I believe she takes the whole estate to be so considerable as it will be when both yours and mine are joined, as they will be in him and his children. I would not have you use this last argument to her, because it would look as if we thought her only to be persuaded by ____, but I am acquainted with none of her friends or relations to whom she might think it fit to have anything said of this kind, so that if your ladyship can carry this matter no farther... it must be at an end.⁷¹

Bridget continued to attempt to arrange the marriages of her sons, sometimes with little co-operation from them as she pointed out in this letter, "Dear Son – Tis a great trouble to me that you will not see me yet I have you always in my mind to do you all the good that lies in my power and can now tell you I have a very good match for you that I think you can't but like very well. I saw her yesterday she is extremely pretty very tall and finely shaped about 19 or 20 years old and very modestly bred is a private gentleman's daughter and has a very great fortune. – Your Affectionate Mother." ⁷²

Noble women often played an important role in the arrangement of marriages of members of their larger family. In 1720, such machinations caused Jane Douglas to flee the country to France. She had been engaged to marry Francis, Lord Dalkeith⁷³ but Catherine Hyde, the Duchess of Queensberry intervened and ended that relationship so that Dalkeith could marry her sister-in-law, another Jane Douglas. The first Jane was so mortified that she fled to France and even after her return, refused all proposals for many

⁷¹ BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 110.

⁷² BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 67.

⁷³ Francis Scott (1695-1751), later 2nd Duke of Buccleuch.

years.⁷⁴ In 1774, Therese Parker wrote to her brother Lord Granville about possible matches for their brother Frederick:

There is a little Miss Cross with a large fortune that is very pretty, but I know no further. There is a Miss Duncombe⁷⁵ to spare (one of Lady Radnor's⁷⁶ Daughters) there is a dismal Miss Griesley, Miss Ellways(?) and many more that I should be sorry to see Mrs. Frederick Robinson. I should advise him not to think of so much as booooo and to study nothing but his happiness, beside which, I hope it will be time enough to judge when he comes home. He says nothing of Beauty which I don't understand, indeed I must talk to him fully upon the whole of this subject before I allow him to think of a wife.⁷⁷

The Princess of Wales wrote to Charlotte Bury⁷⁸ in 1811 of the matchmaking plots of one of their acquaintances: "Though Lady Harriet⁷⁹ is very cunning and shy, still I have discovered that she is the match-making Lady to her brother. She brought Lady Elizabeth to dinner and did nothing but prose in praise of her. Lady Georgiana Morpeth⁸⁰ takes her to _____, and Lord Hartington⁸¹ is also of the party, and the final proposal will be made there under the shady trees, or by the placid light of the moor."⁸²

Some aristocratic women developed a reputation for match making and their expertise was consulted by people outside of their family. Elizabeth Vassal, Lady Holland recorded in her journal in 1793 that "Lord Sheffield⁸³ consulted me about marrying. I recommended him to marry Lucy Pelham; he begged me to sound T.P.,⁸⁴ who

⁷⁴ Add. MSS 28569 f. 168; Rosalind K. Marshall, "Douglas, Lady Jane (1698–1753)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/7905>, accessed 3 Feb 2010].

⁷⁵ Anne Duncombe. She married her mother's step-son, the future 2nd Earl of Radnor in 1777.

⁷⁶ Anne Hales.

⁷⁷ BL Add. MSS 48218, ff. 145-147.

⁷⁸ Charlotte Campbell.

⁷⁹ Harriet Cavendish.

⁸⁰ Georgiana Cavendish.

⁸¹ Harriet and Georgiana's brother William Cavendish (1790-1858), later 6th Duke of Devonshire.

⁸² Bury, *Diary*, I:61-62. Or so the Princess thought. Hartington (later Devonshire) never married.

⁸³ John Holyroyd, 1st Earl of Sheffield (1725-1821). This was his second marriage. He had initially married Abigail Way, and then after Lucy Pelham's death in 1797 he married Anne North, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Guilford.

⁸⁴ Thomas Pelham.

appeared much pleased at the possibility of such an event. I think it will happen.”⁸⁵ In the mid-eighteenth century, the 1st Duke of Dorset⁸⁶ wrote to Charlotte, Lady Sundon⁸⁷ requesting her help in arranging a match for his son. He had spoken to her of this before:

Lord Middlesex was then abroad and the lady so young, that I do not know whether she may now be of such an age as not to make any applications to her mother as yet improper. But of that, Madam, you are the best judge; and if your Ladyship is of an opinion that proposals of such an alliance would not be unacceptable to Mrs. Horner, I must beg your leave to ask your advice and assistance in the conduct of this affair.⁸⁸

The outcome of Lady Sundon’s intervention is not apparent as neither of Dorset’s sons married a young woman surnamed Horner. Dorset’s application to Lady Sundon was not the first time that other nobles consulted her concerning the marriages of their relations. In December 1723, the Duchess of Kent⁸⁹ wrote to Charlotte about her aspirations for her [the Duchess’s] daughter: “I am in hopes to have one business this winter, which will indeed be a very agreeable one, which is to marry Jemima;⁹⁰ the person is Lord Ashburnham.⁹¹ One can have nothing in the world made on purpose, and, take this altogether, I am very well pleased with it, but as yet it is not a certain thing...”⁹² In August 1859, George Villiers, the 4th Earl of Clarendon wrote to his good friend Luise von Alten, the Duchess of Manchester:

Pray however like a good Lady as you are tell me something more about Ld C and whether he is really a reputable gentlemanlike youth for that was by no means the

⁸⁵ Elizabeth Vassal Fox, Lady Holland, *The Journal of Elizabeth Lady Holland (1791-1811)*, Earl of Ilchester, ed., (London: Longmans, Green, 1908), 97-98. It did happen, the couple married in December 1794.

⁸⁶ Lionel Sackville (1688-1765).

⁸⁷ Charlotte Dyve.

⁸⁸ Thomson, *Memoirs of Viscountess Sundon*, II:343-344.

⁸⁹ Jemima Crew.

⁹⁰ Jemima Grey. She was the Kents’ youngest child.

⁹¹ John Ashburnham, 3rd Earl of Ashburnham (1687-1737). This would be his 3rd marriage. He was married first to Mary Butler, the daughter of the 2nd Duke of Ormonde, in 1710. His second wife was Henrietta Stanley, Baroness Strange, the daughter of the 9th Earl of Derby. They married in 1714 and she died four years later.

⁹² Thomson, *Memoirs of Viscountess Sundon*, I:311.

character of the preceding generation of that name – if you ever met him you c[oul]d. perhaps discover his inclinations. I long for Constance to be well married for I am sure she w[oul]d make a right good wife and I wd. accept for her joyously any man who you thought worthy of her.⁹³

These matchmaking women arranged marriages that fit within the boundaries of social acceptability. The unions which they facilitated helped to solidify the overall perception of aristocratic rank cohesion and identity.

Because by the nineteenth century Society no longer saw overtly arranged marriages as being appropriate, it was therefore more necessary than ever to circumscribe the social circle of unmarried aristocratic women so as only to allow in men who might be appropriate marriage material and thus prevent disastrous choices. Other aristocratic women, most often, but not always the mothers of the girls in question, exercised this control. To promote appropriate social interaction, they introduced a round of balls and dances at which young women, properly chaperoned, could meet potential mates.⁹⁴ The London club Almacks, under the control of powerful patronesses such as Emily Lamb, Lady Palmerston and Sarah Fane, the Countess of Jersey, served an important role in this control. These women permitted only those people they deemed socially acceptable to join. The club predated the nineteenth century; in 1773 Anne Robinson wrote to her brother Fritz, “You will think Therese [their sister] grown quite Frisky as she told you she was at Almacks last Thursday and last night she went to the Pantheon.”⁹⁵ The club held balls and suppers that functioned as an accepted part of the marriage market. As the patronesses so carefully controlled entry, Almacks was one of the few places where young women were allowed to go without a chaperone. Many of the letters and diaries of

⁹³ Kennedy, *My Dear Duchess*, 72.

⁹⁴ Davidoff, *Best Circles*, 49-50; Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall*, 342.

⁹⁵ BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 36-37.

the period contain references to the club and to those who frequented it. Harriet Fane, the Duke of Wellington's special friend, often went and later in the century, Lady Dorothy Walpole recalled attending dancing school there.⁹⁶ In 1814 a commentator described the club:

Good society at the period to which I refer was. . . wonderfully 'select.' At the present time one can hardly conceive the importance which was attached to getting admission to Almack's, the seventh heaven of the fashionable world. . . the gates of which were guarded by lady patronesses, whose smiles or frowns consigned men and women to happiness or despair. These lady patronesses were the Ladies Castlereagh,⁹⁷ Jersey,⁹⁸ Cowper,⁹⁹ and Sefton,¹⁰⁰ Mrs. Drummond Burrell, now Lady Willoughby,¹⁰¹ the Princess Esterhazy,¹⁰² and the Countess Lieven¹⁰³. . . Very often persons whose rank and fortunes entitled them to entrée anywhere, were excluded by cliqueism of the Lady Patronesses, for the female government of Almack's was a pure despotism. . .¹⁰⁴

One of the primary roles of Society and the Season in the nineteenth century was to serve as an approved marriage market. Dances and balls took place in private homes as well as in select venues such as Almack's and there aristocratic young women tried to catch an appropriate mate. For these young ladies, the events of the Season provided their only real chances to interact with marriageable men. Unlike their brothers, they did not have the freedom that would bring them into contact with those outside of accepted

⁹⁶ Davidoff, *Best Circles*, 23; Lewis, *In the Family Way*, 19-20; Dorothy Nevill, *The Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill*, ed., Ralph Nevill (London: Thomas Nelson and sons, 1906), 72; Bamford, *Journal*, I:19; Lees H. Gronow, *The Reminiscences and Recollections of Captain Gronow, 1810-1860* (London: John C. Nimmo, 1900). I:31-32.

⁹⁷ Amelia Hobart.

⁹⁸ Sarah Fane.

⁹⁹ Emily Lamb.

¹⁰⁰ Maria Craven. Maria may well have been particularly sensitive on the issue of appropriate female behaviour. Her mother was the notorious Elizabeth Berkeley who was divorced from Maria's father the 6th Baron Craven in 1767 amid charges of mutual adultery. Following Craven's death in 1791, Elizabeth married her long-time lover the Margrave Christian von Brandenburg-Anspach. When Elizabeth returned to London following her second marriage, her children refused to see her.

¹⁰¹ Sarah Clementina Drummond.

¹⁰² Princess Teresa of Thurn und Taxis. She was married to the Austrian ambassador to England.

¹⁰³ Dorothea Beckendorff. She was married to the Russian ambassador to England and was the first foreigner to be elected one of the Patronesses.

¹⁰⁴ Gronow, *Reminiscences*, I:31-32.

Society. A woman's entry into the marriage market of the Season began with her coming out, generally when she was about seventeen or eighteen. From that point, she had relatively little time and worked under rigid restrictions in order to avoid the fate of spinsterhood.¹⁰⁵

A young woman's coming out began with her formal presentation at court.¹⁰⁶ Presentation at court was the mark of a young woman's entry into elite Society and the signal that she was officially looking for a husband. Nearly three months of parties and balls that took place in the best parts of London such as Belgravia and Mayfair in elegant houses that were either owned or rented by the families for the occasion followed presentation.¹⁰⁷ The purpose of the Season was the catching of husbands, with a large number of weddings taking place at the end of the summer.¹⁰⁸ Some ladies succeeded more than others at making their names at the entertainments of the Season. In the first half of the eighteenth century, Horace Walpole wrote of Sophia Fermor, "Then there was Lady Sophia, handsomer than ever, but a little out of humour at the scarcity of minuets; however, as usual, she danced more than anybody, and, as usual too, took out what men she liked or thought the best dancers."¹⁰⁹ A young woman understood that she had little time to catch a husband, two or three Seasons at the most, and if she had not become engaged by the end of that period her failure was there for all to see.¹¹⁰ Constance Rothschild wrote that "... a really successful maiden hardly ever [went] unmarried

¹⁰⁵ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 17; Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall*, 344.

¹⁰⁶ The tradition of presenting young aristocratic ladies at court was begun by Queen Charlotte, the wife of George III. It continued until 1958 when the current Queen announced that there would be no more court presentations. Fiona MacCarthy, *Last Curtsey: The End of the Debutantes* (London: Faber and Faber, 2006), 1.

¹⁰⁷ Beard, *English Landed Society*, 5-6.

¹⁰⁸ Constance Battersea, *Reminiscences* (London: Macmillan, 1922), 118.

¹⁰⁹ Thomson, *Memoirs*, I:109-110.

¹¹⁰ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 52.

through more than three seasons.”¹¹¹ Women who remained unmarried for too long excited comment, even when they did eventually marry. In the summer of 1912 Theodosia Acheson and Marjorie Manners, both women from the highest levels of society, were married.¹¹² *The New York Times* covered the events and noted that both women had been out for ten seasons and married younger men.¹¹³

High social rank was the unspoken characteristic that every woman in the room during the London Season was assumed to possess by virtue of admittance, so it took more than that to make a woman stand out. Good looks often served to set a woman apart from her rivals, and the lack of beauty could be a great detriment to success. Harriet Fane, Mrs. Arbuthnot, had great hopes for her younger stepdaughter¹¹⁴ as “she dances very well and is very pretty.”¹¹⁵ She worried about the chances for the elder stepdaughter. When the girl, Caroline, was eighteen, Harriet took her to a London ball, “she succeeded very well, having danced two out of three dances and as she knew no one, it was more than I hoped for. She is not pretty, but she is so lady-like and so very amiable, I cannot help hoping she is as likely to do well and marry happily as many girls who may have more personal beauty than she has.”¹¹⁶ Harriet may have hoped, but realistically Caroline’s chances were poor and indeed, she never married. The women of society looked down on women who lacked beauty, no matter how high their station. Mabel Gore, Countess of Airlie, likened the appearance of both the exiled Empress Eugenie and

¹¹¹ Battersea, *Reminiscences*, 118.

¹¹² To the Hon. Alexander Cadogan and the Marquess of Anglesey respectively.

¹¹³ “Two Fashionable English Weddings,” *The New York Times*, Aug. 4, 1912. It is interesting to note that the Acheson wedding was not covered at all in *The Times*. The Manners nuptials merited a relatively short mention, “Lord Anglesey and Lady Marjorie Manners,” *The Times*, Aug. 5, 1912, pg. 6, #39969.

¹¹⁴ Marcia Arbuthnot.

¹¹⁵ Bamford, *Journal*, I:136. Her hopes were well founded as Marcia married William Cholmondeley, 3rd Marquess of Cholmondeley in 1825.

¹¹⁶ Bamford, *Journal*, I:13.

Queen Elena of Italy to peasants.¹¹⁷ Lord Stanley of Alderly wrote to his wife in 1855, “I met Clanricarde¹¹⁸ and Lady Margaret:¹¹⁹ riding this morning in the street, Muggie looking too hideous and I cannot think how a husband could be found for her anywhere.”¹²⁰ Being the daughter of a Marquess could not offset “looking too hideous.”

The evidence shows that older women wielded a great deal of power during much of the period from the late fifteenth through the twentieth century in the marriage market. Essentially, aristocratic women served as marriage brokers for members of their own families as well as others outside of the family circle. In this capacity, they influenced what constituted an appropriate match for other elite women.

V. Court and Country

Court and the London Season

London dominated the social life of the British aristocracy.¹²¹ In the sixteenth century, much of the important social activity centered around the royal court, generally in the monarch’s palaces in or near London. Elite women exploited these social networks in a number of ways. Jane Guilford, Duchess of Northumberland, utilized a network of court ladies to try to save her husband and children.¹²² People realized that the women of the Tudor court exercised a good deal of influence, a situation that some observers

¹¹⁷ It is possible that there is an element of xenophobia at play here. Arlie, *Thatched with Gold*, 116, 117.

¹¹⁸ Ulick de Burgh, 1st Marquess (1802-1874).

¹¹⁹ Margaret de Burgh.

¹²⁰ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 125-6. Lord Stanley was a bit prematurely snide. Margaret married Wentworth Beaumont, later 1st Baron Allendale in 1856. In his obituary on February 14, 1907 *The Times* characterized him as one of the wealthiest commoners in the country in the 1860s. (“Lord Allendale,” *The Times*, Feb. 14, 1907, #38256, pg. 10).

¹²¹ Another center was in the country houses discussed below.

¹²² Grey, “A Letter,” 1268. Her husband, John Dudley and several of her sons were arrested in 1558 as a result of complicity in the plot to put Lady Jane Grey, who was married to Northumberland’s son Guilford, on the throne instead of Mary I. John and Guilford Dudley, as well as Lady Jane, were executed.

disliked.¹²³ Among other roles, the court served as a significant center for the marriage market. In this context, there was some element of social mobility at work. A knight's daughter could contract a grand marriage if she made the right connections, especially with the women of the court, and possessed good looks and accomplishments.¹²⁴ In the 1530s, the courtier Francis Bryan¹²⁵ attempted to arrange a marriage between his distant kinswoman Jane Seymour and Sir William Dormer,¹²⁶ a prominent man at court from an important family.¹²⁷ The marriage would have been a coup for the relatively unconnected Seymour, a disparity that was not lost on Jane Newdigate, Dormer's mother who foiled the marriage in favour of a match with Mary, the daughter of Sir William Sidney. Bryan resented the meddling of Lady Dormer.¹²⁸ The irony, of course, is that the failure of this marriage kept Jane available for a much more prestigious marriage to King Henry VIII in 1536.

A male courtier might also marry above his station if he impressed the right lady. Honour Lady Lisle's daughter Anne Bassett was a lady-in-waiting to Mary I and in that role, she met Walter Hungerford, a Gentleman Pensioner of an old family with a troubled past.¹²⁹ The couple married when she was approximately thirty-four and he was twenty-two.¹³⁰ She was a far more important personage than her very young husband. Katherine Willoughby, Dowager Duchess of Suffolk, ensured that her son Peregrine Bertie¹³¹ was introduced at court and made the appropriate connections. This was especially important

¹²³ Dulcie M. Ashdown, *Ladies-in-Waiting* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), 28.

¹²⁴ *LL* IV:104.

¹²⁵ His marriage to Joan FitzGerald is discussed in Chapter Two.

¹²⁶ William Dormer (c. 1515-1575).

¹²⁷ He was the son of Sir Robert Dormer and Jane Newdigate. Robert Dormer had been High Sheriff of both Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire.

¹²⁸ Henry Clifford, *The Life of Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria* (London: Burns and Oates, 1887), 40-41.

¹²⁹ He was the son of the First Baron Hungerford who was executed with Thomas Cromwell.

¹³⁰ *LL*, VI:278.

¹³¹ He was the product of her second marriage, to Richard Bertie her steward.

in the case of Bertie because, though his mother was of extraordinarily high rank, he was the product of her second marriage to the lowly born Richard Bertie. Katherine introduced Peregrine into the circle of her good friend William Cecil.¹³² This foresight paid off; Bertie married Mary de Vere, the daughter of the 16th Earl of Oxford¹³³ in 1577. Mary's brother, the 17th Earl, was William Cecil's son-in-law, having married his daughter Anne in 1571. Ironically, Bertie made the match into one of the most distinguished families in the realm due to the court connections facilitated by his mother; however, Katherine did not favour the match.¹³⁴ She believed that the Veres did not treat her family with the proper respect. Despite this familial opposition, the marriage succeeded both in terms of increasing Bertie's rank and facilitating the personal happiness of the couple.¹³⁵

The London Season¹³⁶ developed between 1590 and 1620¹³⁷ and by the end of the seventeenth century many of the elite were spending six months a year in London¹³⁸ where presence at the proper London functions was vital to a woman's success. In January 1766, Sarah Lennox wrote to her sister Susan, "Miss Greville is vastly improved and is prettier than ever; she and her mother go to Munich next spring; Mr. Greville is Envoy there and goes immediately. I hope she will be married tho' for if once she goes abroad nobody knows how long she may stay, and if her beauty goes off her money

¹³² Neville Williams, *All the Queen's Men: Elizabeth I and Her Courtiers* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), 166.

¹³³ John de Vere (1516-1562). She was the sister of Edward de Vere (1550-1604), the 17th Earl of Oxford.

¹³⁴ Nor was the bride's brother.

¹³⁵ D. J. B. Trim, "Bertie, Peregrine, thirteenth Baron Willoughby of Willoughby, Beck, and Eresby (1555-1601)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/2275>, accessed 24 March 2010].

¹³⁶ The Season traditionally coincided with the sitting of Parliament. It generally began after Christmas and ran through mid-summer. Though the Season as a formal entity did not evolve until the 17th century, London had long been the center of national life for the aristocracy.

¹³⁷ Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 387.

¹³⁸ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 37.

won't get her married.”¹³⁹ The plotting of those in Society came to the attention of observers. The fashionable ladies sometimes found themselves the objects of negative comment. Frances Savile wrote to Lady Hatton¹⁴⁰ in about 1680, “The lampoons that are made of most of the town ladys are so nasty that no woman will read them or I would have got them for you.”¹⁴¹

The Season had a definite effect on the atmosphere of the capital as Emily Eden described so vividly:

It is very difficult to get any interruption at this moment to the London turmoil. ‘The creature in its flurry,’ as Tom Coffin says of a whale, and as I always feel of London in May and June. The streets are not wide enough for the carriages, nor the week long enough for its engagements, there is not enough money to spend, nor sufficient time to spend it, not people enough to go to the dinners that are given, yet more than enough to fill the largest house that can be opened for them. In short, such a mess!¹⁴²

Society met and danced and married during the Season.¹⁴³ Ishbel Gordon, the Marchioness of Aberdeen wrote of the Season in the 1870s and 1880s:

The London Season, as it was in those days with its customs, its etiquette, its unwritten laws, that seemed one of those fixed institutions in the life of the country, which give the impression that it would go on indefinitely. There was a sense of solid security about it – it was part of the very life of the people who had the largest stake in the county, who counted for something. Nobody could come to the front without participating in it to some degree.¹⁴⁴

Celebrations associated with the royal family constituted important parts of the London Season. In the eighteenth century, frequent formal occasions marking important milestones in the life of the royals punctuated the social calendar. In 1735, Grace Boyle wrote to Anne Johnson, Lady Strafford an account of a royal birthday ball in which she

¹³⁹ Ilchester, *Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox*, I:182.

¹⁴⁰ Either Frances Yelverton or her daughter Anne Hatton.

¹⁴¹ BL Add. MSS 29558 f. 43.

¹⁴² Blanche Arthur Georgiana Swinton, *A Sketch of the Life of Georgiana, Lady de Ros...* (London: J. Murray, 1893), 44.

¹⁴³ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 342.

¹⁴⁴ The Marchioness of Aberdeen, *More Cracks With ‘We Twa’* (London: Methuen, 1929), 6.

gave an exhaustive description of what each woman was wearing.¹⁴⁵ In December of 1794, London Society greatly anticipated the coming of Caroline of Brunswick, the ill-fated bride of the Prince of Wales.¹⁴⁶ The Crown planned weeks of balls and receptions and invited everyone of importance. Caroline Spencer, Viscountess Clifden, wrote in some excitement to her sister Charlotte detailing all of the preparations.¹⁴⁷ In the mid to late nineteenth century, Edward, Prince of Wales inspired the bulk of royal entertaining.¹⁴⁸ This entertaining had a less exalted feel to it as Edward enjoyed the company of plutocrats more than that of traditional aristocrats.¹⁴⁹ However, despite its relatively relaxed nature, this royal entertaining remained a centerpiece of the London social scene.

For aristocratic women, the venue in which their public lives were lived was Society.¹⁵⁰ There are indications that by the 1830s, Society was becoming far more elite than it had been in previous decades and London hostesses who had not yet embraced that exclusivity found their events attended only by men because aristocratic women would not attend a function at which the company might well be questionable.¹⁵¹ Most historians point to the disruption caused by World War One as having ended traditional

¹⁴⁵ BL Add. MSS 2256 ff. 50-53. She gives her descriptions in the order of social hierarchy: Princesses, the Duchesses, and so on. "The people that danced were the old set as my Lt. Euston the ____ new ones I hear of was a German Count who danced abominably and a Mr. McGuire an Irish man in the Imperial service."

¹⁴⁶ Later George IV.

¹⁴⁷ BL Add. MSS 50261f. 45; BL Add. MSS 50261 f. 61.

¹⁴⁸ Later Edward VII.

¹⁴⁹ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 349.

¹⁵⁰ Leonore Davidoff, in her examination of nineteenth century British Society, defines it thus, "Sociologically, Society can be seen as a system of quasi-kinship relationships which was used to 'place' mobile individuals during a period of structural differentiation fostered by industrialization and urbanization. As such, it can be understood as a feature of a community based on common claims to status honour which were in turn based on a certain lifestyle..." Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 1.

¹⁵¹ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 23.

Society.¹⁵² Lenore Davidoff wrote of the war's effects, "Even more threatening was the escape of girls from the constraints of the Society path to marriage. By the time peace was declared the new fortunes and new peerages created during the war had diluted the upper class almost beyond recognition."¹⁵³ Some who lived through the war echoed this sentiment. The Marchioness of Londonderry¹⁵⁴ wrote, "The war itself broke down many class barriers and the younger generation mix much more at games..."¹⁵⁵ The implication is that if they "mix much more at games" they mix much more elsewhere. Loelia Ponsonby, Duchess of Westminster, wrote that after 1918, "the Season started with a flurry of activities after the armistice. Dancing became a sort of mystical religion. Supported by nothing but tea or coffee (a glass of sherry would have turned it into an orgy), we fox-trotted tirelessly till it was time to dash home and change into evening dress for a real dance."¹⁵⁶ It all changed dramatically once again after the Second World War. The Margaret Set, the group of well-born wealthy people who socialized wildly with George VI's daughter Princess Margaret, dominated the 1950s and 1960s.

Within this restricted group of people and events aristocratic women's lives, at least the public aspects of them, had meaning. Inclusion within the exclusive circle came from being of the appropriate social rank, which, for the women who oversaw Society, was a combination of correct birth and appropriate marriage. Mabel Gore, Marchioness of Aberdeen, described Society in the 1870s and 1880s as being comprised of "a very definite and a very limited class" which included the landed nobility and "the permanent

¹⁵² Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 351; Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 68. It would be interesting to look carefully at the marriage patterns of the aristocracy after the war to see if this observation is in fact accurate.

¹⁵³ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 68.

¹⁵⁴ Edith Chaplin.

¹⁵⁵ Londonderry, *Retrospect*, 11.

¹⁵⁶ Quoted in Beard, *English Landed Society*, 56.

Government officials, a select number of London residents and a few literary people; also artists and musicians whose reputation brought them within the charmed circle . . .

Captains of industry and local magnates were beginning to be recognized, but their appearance at a Society function would still excite comment.”¹⁵⁷ As Leonore Davidoff describes it, “This Society of the 1850s to 1870s was still small enough to be dominated by known individual personalities. In structure it resembled a vast pyramid of interlocking spiders’ webs.” A sense of community existed within each web.¹⁵⁸

A relatively small group of powerful ladies ruled over this community determining who was “in” and who was “out.”¹⁵⁹ One of its most formidable members was Elizabeth Howard, the Duchess of Rutland. When the Duchess died in 1825, Harriet Fane said of her, “She was hated by all the fine ladies of London because she was far above them; conscious of her high rank, a Howard and a Plantagenet, she scorned all the petty arts and nonsense of fashion and feeling that anyone noticed by her was raised into distinction at once, she had none of the feeling which the fine ladies have about dandies and *tigers*.”¹⁶⁰ In the 1870s and 1880s, according to Mabel Gore, “if you were ‘in Society’ it was a necessity to be seen at Holland House (Lady Holland¹⁶¹), Sion House (Duchess of Northumberland¹⁶²), Argyll Lodge (Duchess of Argyll¹⁶³), and Osterly Park (Countess of Jersey¹⁶⁴).”¹⁶⁵ Even as late as 1900, women such as the Duchesses of

¹⁵⁷ Aberdeen, *More Cracks*, 5.

¹⁵⁸ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 31.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁶⁰ A tiger was the fashionable name for an unfashionable man. Bamford, *Diaries*, 430.

¹⁶¹ Constance de Rothschild writes in her diary about visiting Holland House in 1858. Add. 47913, f. 59.

¹⁶² Louisa Drummond.

¹⁶³ Elizabeth Sutherland-Leveson-Gower.

¹⁶⁴ Sarah Fane.

¹⁶⁵ Aberdeen, *More Cracks*, 7.

Buccleuch¹⁶⁶ and Devonshire¹⁶⁷ as well as the Ladies Londonderry,¹⁶⁸ Ilchester,¹⁶⁹ Ellesmere,¹⁷⁰ and Cadogan¹⁷¹ dominated Society.¹⁷² According to Dorothy Walpole, “In the old days society was led by certain recognized rulers who framed its ordinances, against which there was no appeal...”¹⁷³ If one wanted to infiltrate Society, one needed the sponsorship of one of these ladies. Charlotte Bertie saw herself as occupying this position following her marriage. In June 1833, soon after she wed the wealthy industrialist Josiah Guest, she worried that Society no longer accepted her as the wife of a man in “trade” as it had when she was an unmarried Earl’s daughter. She reported her initial attempt to counter this problem: at “Lady Stuart’s¹⁷⁴ suggestion I applied to Lady Willoughby¹⁷⁵ for Almack’s tickets.” But this did not work out as hoped “she will only give me one and that on Ascot night when she knows nobody cares to be there.”¹⁷⁶ This disappointment dampened Charlotte’s confidence but not her determination. Giving up on the help of Lady Stuart, Charlotte enlisted Lady Lansdowne¹⁷⁷ as a social mentor. She rejoiced when her plans came to fruition, “I had a note from Lady Lansdowne to say she would call upon me, which she did, about three o’clock. Nothing could be so kind as she was. She recommended my giving a concert and promised to introduce me to several of

¹⁶⁶ Louisa Hamilton.

¹⁶⁷ Evelyn Petty-FitzMaurice.

¹⁶⁸ Theresa Talbot.

¹⁶⁹ Mary Dawson.

¹⁷⁰ Katherine Phipps.

¹⁷¹ Beatrix Craven.

¹⁷² Wasson, *Aristocracy and the Modern World*, 102; Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 16.

¹⁷³ Nevill, *Leaves*, 22.

¹⁷⁴ Likely Elizabeth Yorke.

¹⁷⁵ Possibly Margaret Williams, Lady Willoughby de Broke, or Sarah Drummond, Lady Willoughby de Eresby. As the latter had a higher profile in Society it seems more likely that it was Sarah that Charlotte was referring to.

¹⁷⁶ Bessborough, *Lady Charlotte Guest*, 39-40.

¹⁷⁷ Louisa Fox-Strangways.

the foreign Ambassadors and some of the first English families...”¹⁷⁸ That the daughter of an Earl and the wife of one of the wealthiest men in Britain felt the need for such sponsorship speaks volumes about the exclusivity of Society and the power wielded by the women who manned its gates.

According to Lenore Davidoff, “Under the impact of industrialization, new forms of wealth as well as newly wealthy groups produced a flood of applicants that threatened to overwhelm the life style itself. The strictly structured access rituals of nineteenth-century Society and etiquette must be seen in this context.”¹⁷⁹ The dances that comprised the Season had vigilant chaperones and strict rules of conduct. Lady St. Helier¹⁸⁰ described the situation in the 1860s, “The unwritten law of etiquette and conduct enjoined that no one should dance more than once with the same partner. Under certain circumstances to dance twice was permissible, but after that a girl was considered fast, and held up as a warning to well-brought-up and well-conducted young ladies.”¹⁸¹ Lady Constance Primrose noted in her diary that her mother was “in a fidget” when she spent too much time talking to a man that the mother did not think was suitable.¹⁸² At these events, women suffered under harsh judgements. Society expected that they would be of appropriate social rank, have a pleasant disposition, be a good dancer, and lovely to look at. If they did not have these characteristics and combine them with suitable behaviour they could expect there to be negative consequences.

Society ostracized women who behaved in ways that it deemed inappropriate. Harriet Mellon felt herself the victim of such cutting, both within the family of her

¹⁷⁸ Bessborough, *Lady Charlotte Guest*, 69.

¹⁷⁹ Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 15.

¹⁸⁰ Susan Stewart-Mackenzie

¹⁸¹ Lady St. Helier, *Memoirs of Fifty Years* (London: Edward Arnold, 1909), 67.

¹⁸² Quoted in Horn, *Ladies of the Manor*, 9.

aristocratic husband and in Society in general. In an account of her life written soon after her death it says, “The ‘order’ to which she was exalted viewed her with jealousy as one who was unentitled by birth to admission to their class...”¹⁸³ Elizabeth Berkeley, the daughter of the 4th Earl Berkeley,¹⁸⁴ whose first marriage broke apart due to mutual infidelity, left her family and took up residence on the Continent. There, following the death of her first husband, she married the Margrave of Anspach. Armed with this new title she returned to England but she found her welcome anything but warm. The Queen and her own children cut her and the press subjected her to repeated attacks.¹⁸⁵ Another of the great Society scandals concerned Lady Holland,¹⁸⁶ who, in the 1790s, eloped with Lord Holland¹⁸⁷ while still married to her first husband,¹⁸⁸ resulting in a shocking divorce. Lady Holland went on to become one of the most important political hostesses of the age, but for many years only men attended her dinners. Respectable women would not attend functions at her house, nor would they acknowledge her in public, let alone invite her to their own houses.¹⁸⁹ The power to cut was one of the major ways in which Society endeavored to impose standards of behaviour on its members.

Country

Though there is no question that London was at the center of the social lives of aristocratic women and there was an active marriage market centered on the capital, there

¹⁸³ Margaret Wilson, ed., *Memoirs of Miss Mellon: Afterwards Duchess of St. Albans* (London: Remington, 1886), II:203, 212-14.

¹⁸⁴ Augustus Berkeley (1716-1755).

¹⁸⁵ Elizabeth Berkeley Craven Anspach, *Memoirs*, I:1, II: 74-83.

¹⁸⁶ Elizabeth Vassal.

¹⁸⁷ Henry Fox, 3rd Baron Holland.

¹⁸⁸ Sir Godfrey Webster, 4th Bart.

¹⁸⁹ Levison-Gower, *Hary-O*, 1-2, 7; Ilchester, *Journal*, vii; Nevill, *Leaves*, 60; Davidoff, *The Best Circles*, 23.

was also a strong country element to their lives as well. Especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the elite tended to marry within a relatively small geographical area. In 1640, 70-80 percent of the gentry of Kent, Suffolk, Norfolk, and Cheshire married within their own county. Only in those counties closer to London, Hertfordshire and Essex, was the proportion well below 50 percent.¹⁹⁰ In 1728, Selina Shirley the daughter of 2nd Earl Ferrers¹⁹¹ married Theophilus Hastings, 9th Earl of Huntingdon.¹⁹² The families were neighbors and held similar political views.¹⁹³ In the sixteenth century, country estates appear to have been places where clandestine relationships could take root. In 1574, Margaret Douglas, the Dowager Countess of Lennox arrived at Rufford, the country estate of Elizabeth Hardwick with her young unmarried son, Charles Stuart, in tow. During this visit, they arranged a marriage without the permission of the Queen¹⁹⁴ between Charles and Elizabeth's daughter Elizabeth Cavendish.¹⁹⁵ This match could happen because the concerned parties were all well away from London and out from the watchful eye of the Queen.¹⁹⁶

In March 1623 James I ordered gentlemen to go to their country estates and keep hospitality there. This order upset much of the aristocracy. Those who remained in London in the service of the court found that there was little social life and those who

¹⁹⁰ Stone, *An Open Elite?*, 36-37.

¹⁹¹ Washington Shirley (1677-1729).

¹⁹² Theophilus Hastings (1696-1747).

¹⁹³ Edwin Welch, *Spiritual Pilgrim: A Reassessment of the Life of the Countess of Huntingdon* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1995), 15-16.

¹⁹⁴ Elizabeth I.

¹⁹⁵ Durant, *Bess of Hardwick*, 83-84; Rawson, *Life and Letters*, 145.

¹⁹⁶ Though, certainly the Queen did hear of it and Margaret and Bess found themselves in significant trouble. The trouble was serious enough that Bess's 4th husband, the Earl of Shrewsbury wrote to the Queen stating that the match had occurred suddenly and that Bess had helped her daughter "without having therein any other intent, or respect, than with the reverent duty towards your Majesty." Quoted in Goff, *A Woman of the Tudor Age*, 307.

returned to the country found that there was even less.¹⁹⁷ Even when the monarchs were not enforcing such rustication, early modern aristocratic wives spent the majority of their time at the country house. There are indications that some of these women felt their exile from London and its attractions quite keenly. As Alice T. Friedman points out, “Though afforded grand vistas across long galleries and lavishly decorated chambers, they found that very little was actually going on there for them to see.”¹⁹⁸

In the nineteenth century, as travel became easier, many aristocrats attended and hosted house parties. These gatherings, where a relatively large number of people arrived at a stately home for a long weekend, provided a venue in which young aristocratic women could meet eligible suitors in a socially sanctioned setting. This form of entertainment began in earnest in the nineteenth century and continues into the present century. In June 1891, Louisa Erskine, Viscountess Wolseley wrote an account of a country house party in a letter to her husband. She divided the company into “Intelligence,” “Wit,” “Girls,” and “Young Men.” She stated, “I think it very cleverly arranged. The young men would find the girls colourless without the two pretty married women to add brilliancy to the party, and I should be furious if there were no young men.”¹⁹⁹ Such house parties continued to be places of courtship for the upper ranks throughout the twentieth century. Most famously, perhaps, it was at a glorified house party at Windsor Castle for Ascot that the romance of Sarah Ferguson and Prince Andrew, later Duke of York, began when they flung profiteroles at one another.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁷ R. Griffin and Lord Bay Brooke, eds., *The Private Correspondence of Lady Jane Cornwallis, 1613-44, from the Originals in the Possession of the Family* (London: Bentley, Wilson, and Fley, 1842), 85.

¹⁹⁸ Alice T. Friedman, “Architecture, Authority, and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House,” *Assemblage* 18 (August, 1992): 46, 47.

¹⁹⁹ Arthur, *Letters*, 298.

²⁰⁰ Edith M. Lederer, “Sarah Ferguson Will Keep Her Job,” *Daily News* (July 20, 1986), 13.

Case Study: The Country House Visits of Theodosia Acheson, 1896-1898

Country house visits were an important part of elite women's lives throughout the nineteenth century. In the 1890s, at the age of fourteen Theodosia Acheson,²⁰¹ the daughter of the 4th Earl of Gosford,²⁰² compiled a scrap and autograph book of her country house visits.²⁰³ The Earldom of Gosford was an Irish title and the main seat of the family was Gosford Castle.²⁰⁴ Theodosia was the youngest daughter of the family and she had two older sisters Alexandra and Mary. On each page in the scrapbook, she noted the date of the visit and included other information as well. In the period between April and October, 1896 she recorded visits to fifteen different houses. These visits included a June visit to Orkney Cottage in Taplow, Buckinghamshire for Ascot and a September visit to Gopsall Hall²⁰⁵ for the Derby. The following year, again beginning in April through Christmas there are pages recording visits to eleven houses. Once more, she went to Gopsall for the Derby and Escrick Hall²⁰⁶ for the Doncaster Races. The visiting season began earlier in 1898 with a January visit to Warter Priory.²⁰⁷

Theodosia Acheson's scrapbook gives a very good picture of the extensive rounds of country house visits undertaken by young aristocratic British women. The signatures on some of the pages also indicate the high rank of the guests. Just as at the Society

²⁰¹ Her wedding is discussed above.

²⁰² Archibald Acheson, 1841-1922.

²⁰³ BL Add. MSS 75295.

²⁰⁴ Gosford Castle was a 19th century neo-Norman residence built by the 2nd Earl when his previous residence burned down. Building began in 1819 and was complete in the 1850s. It is said that the building was paid for by the 2nd Earl's wife, the heiress Mary Sparrow. Theodosia's father, the 4th Earl, was compelled to sell off the library in order to pay off his debts, and finally, in 1921, the rest of the contents were put up for auction. The castle passed into government hands after the Second World War and it was put to various uses. Eventually, in 2006 it was sold to a property development partnership for £1000. The intention is to create 23 luxury residences in the structure. "Views of Gosford Castle," <http://www.gosford.co.uk/castle.html>.

²⁰⁵ The seat of Richard Curzon-Howe, 3rd Earl Howe (1822-1900) and his wife Isabella Anson.

²⁰⁶ Located in North Yorkshire. It was the seat of Bielby Lawly, 3rd Baron Wenlock (1849-1912) and his wife Constance Lascelles.

²⁰⁷ Signatures include Bertie Vane Tempest and Daisy Pless.

functions in the capital, hosts and especially hostesses took great care to ensure that only the proper types of people attended these parties. These weekend visits provided another socially sanctioned and controlled way for aristocratic women to meet and marry men from the appropriate rank.

VI. Conclusion

Aristocratic British women actively participated in the quest for appropriate spouses – both for themselves and for others in their families. The marriage market, both in London and in the countryside, provided the venue in which this search took place. The marriage market was one site in which women, both as potential spouses and more often as mothers of potential spouses, were active and powerful participants. The choices made by these women within this arena give an indication of the shifting importance of characteristics as wealth, personality, and rank. Social functions such as the balls of the London Season and the house party provided places where young people could enter into socially sanctioned relationships that would lead to appropriate marriages.

Chapter Seven: A Woman of Independent Means: Marital Prospects of Heiresses, Widows, Peeresses and Those Who Remained Unmarried

I. Introduction

Though it is a general rule throughout much of the early modern and modern eras that elite women had little or no say in the choice of their mate, exceptions did exist to that rule. Women with a measure of financial independence – and often a bit of age as well – heiresses, widows, and peeresses in their own right (*suo jure*) more frequently (than other aristocratic women) did not conform to this rule. These life circumstances could open the window for women to exercise a good measure of agency in the ordering of their own lives, including the choice of their marital partners.¹ The rules of inheritance² meant that daughters only inherited from their fathers in the absence of sons and in the case of more than one daughter, they all shared equally in the estate as co-heiresses.³ Some, though certainly not all, of these heiresses became peeresses in their own right.⁴ The possibility of women inheriting and thus controlling significant assets and titles troubled some and the government enacted measures to reduce the likelihood of female inheritance. James I altered the descent in some ancient titles to tail male⁵ thus significantly reducing the likelihood that a woman would be a peeress *suo jure*. When Victoria wished to reverse that trend and remove the entail on some titles the government

¹ The rate of exogamous and hypogamous marriages among widows is discussed in Chapter Two.

² The Common Law rules governing inheritance were established shortly after 1066 and were not overridden by statute until 1925. Those rules state that land passes to sons, if there is no son it then passes to daughters. If there were several daughters, they were co-heirs. Originally, the land all passed to one daughter, as it did with sons, but in the mid 12th century that changed. Eileen Spring, “The Heiress-at-Law: English Real Property Law from a New Point of View,” *Law and History Review* 8:2 (Autumn 1990), 274.

³ Eileen Spring in “The Heiress-at-Law” 277. points out that Lawrence Stone in *An Open Elite?* states that approximately 6 percent of inheritances between 1540-1780 went to women.

⁴ Frequently, a portion of the property would be divided among the female co-heiresses, while the title and a substantial estate would pass to a collateral male.

⁵ The limitation of the inheritance of an estate to male heirs.

informed her that it was not within the power of the monarch to make such alterations.⁶ Women inherited property as widows more frequently than in other stages of their lives. As discussed in Chapter Two, a great deal of effort went into crafting marriage contracts designed to safeguard a woman's financial position in the event of her widowhood. Because elite widows frequently had substantial means, their worth on the marriage market increased, enabling them to exert a higher level of control over the choice of their subsequent spouses than had been possible at the time of their first marriages. Due to the restrictions imposed on female inheritance by the law, relatively few women held titles in their own right. These women depended on the shifting rules governing inheritance to determine their rights, and by extension, their privileges. As Eileen Spring states, "No right of inheritance was more significant than the right to succeed to a landed estate; no right was more symbolic of the status of women."⁷ Since the late fifteenth century, women with access to such means had great value and their marriage patterns are worth examining separate from their less-propertied female cohorts.

Women who remained unmarried comprise another group who operated somewhat more independently than most aristocratic women. For much of the period between the late fifteenth and the twentieth centuries, it can be assumed that this group did not remain unmarried out of choice, but rather circumstances denied them a proper husband. This became more evident in the eighteenth century when more noble women remained single. This chapter argues that at that time it became more desirable for these families for their daughters to remain single than to marry inappropriately. That pattern

⁶ Spring, "The Heiress-at-Law," 281.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 273.

remained in place until the First World War when those types of attitudes and restrictions became more liberal.

II. Property Law

The rules of inheritance had a profound impact on the lives of all aristocratic women, but they weighed the heaviest on heiresses and widows. As the centuries progressed, it became more difficult for women to inherit as heiresses in their own right. The firm establishment of the strict settlement in the eighteenth century ensured that women would only inherit as a last resort. The principle of patrilineality became dominant.⁸ The increasing use of the strict settlement threatened the rights of the heiress-at-law. It ensured that the male heir inherited the estate in as complete a form as possible.⁹ The strict settlement's influence emerged most strongly at the time of the marriage negotiations. Marriage contracts frequently set out the inheritance rights of the younger sons and daughters and often they included language mandating strict settlement.¹⁰

Men who married women with some claim to a title often tried to acquire the title for themselves. In 1605, Sir George Carewe was created Baron Carewe of Clopton¹¹ “a title conferred on him in honour of his wife, co-heiress¹² of William Clopton, of Clopton, in the county of Warwick with whom he had acquired great estates.”¹³ In 1619

The Lord Power,¹⁴ in Queen Elizabeth's reign, commenced suit for the whole Lordship against David, late Lord Barry in the right of his wife¹⁵ as heir-general

⁸ Spring, “The Heiress-at-Law,” 280.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 279.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ George Carew (1555-1629). He was later created 1st Earl of Totnes.

¹² Joyce Clopton.

¹³ Brewer, *Carewe MSS*, lvi.

¹⁴ Richard Power, 4th Baron Power and Coroghmore.

to the same FitzJohn Lord Barry,¹⁶ but could not prevail. Yet the Queen, to avoid contention betwixt both the Lords, persuaded that the now Lord Barry's father¹⁷ should marry the Lord Power's daughter,¹⁸ which was done accordingly. Yet, not withstanding the marriage and the entail between the Barrys, the Countess being daughter to the late Lord Barry and mother to the now Lord Power, pretends to entitle the Lord Power as heir general to the lordship of the Barrys.¹⁹

In 1786 *The Times* obituary of the recently deceased 1st Duke of Northumberland²⁰ referred to a similar situation. The late Duke was the son of Langdale Smithson, and had married the daughter of the Duke of Somerset.²¹ When Somerset died, Smithson "succeeded to the title of Earl of Northumberland; the Duke [of Somerset] having been created Earl of Northumberland (upon his daughter's marriage) with the remainder to her husband, and their issue, after the Duke's death." This rather complex situation came about because Somerset's mother²² was the daughter and heir to Jocelyn Percy, 11th Earl of Northumberland and he inherited the title from her. Somerset's son died unmarried so the claim passed to his daughter who married Smithson and thus gained the title.²³

Unfortunately, if a woman's husband died under adverse circumstances, for example, if he were executed, her property claim to property and jointure rights became harder to enforce. This transpired in 1536, when George Boleyn's wife, Jane Parker, petitioned Henry VIII for Boleyn's plate and other property after his execution. She pleaded with Thomas Cromwell stating that at the time of her marriage the King and her father paid 2,000 marks for her jointure to Thomas Boleyn, the Earl of Wiltshire and by that agreement she was only entitled to 100 marks during the Earl's life, "which is very

¹⁵ Katherine Barry.

¹⁶ James Barry, 3rd Viscount Barry.

¹⁷ Hon. David Barry married Elizabeth Power. He was the father of David Barry, 1st Earl of Barrymore.

¹⁸ Elizabeth Power.

¹⁹ Brewer, *Carewe MSS*, 6:392.

²⁰ Hugh Smithson, later Hugh Percy.

²¹ Elizabeth Seymour, daughter of the 7th Duke of Somerset.

²² Elizabeth Percy. See case study below.

²³ "His Grace, the Late Duke of Northumberland..." *The Times*, June 8, 1786 #456, p. 3.

hard for me to shift the world withal.”²⁴ She also had some trouble getting Wiltshire to pay her anything at all, which is perhaps not surprising given the central part she played in the fall of Anne and George Boleyn.

Occasionally, widows attempted to claim more than that which they had a right to. Elizabeth Howard, the widow of the Earl of Banbury²⁵ who died in 1632 used an uncertainty concerning the paternity of her sons to attempt to gain property for herself and the title for her sons. According to *Burke’s Extinct Peerages*:

Upon the death of the Earl of Banbury, the inquisition found that he died without issue, but leaving a widow, Elizabeth, his last wife. His honours were then deemed extinct, and his estates passed to his collateral heirs, excepting such as he had devised to his widow, who remarried Lord Vaux.²⁶ In a few years, this lady produced two sons, [which she claimed were] born during her marriage to Lord Banbury, her first husband. They had at first been called Vaux, but now she set them up as the sons of the Earl of Banbury and gave the eldest the title of that earldom.

Litigation on this continued until 1813, when the court finally rejected the claim.²⁷

Sometimes the circumstances surrounding an inheritance were so convoluted or contentious that the government had to get involved. In 1618, the daughter of the Earl of Ormonde had to solicit government intervention to gain the money that had been left to her in her father’s will:

First having perused letters from divers of the Lords of the Council by the command of our late sister Queen Elizabeth, dated 1602, to the late Earl Thomas [of Ormonde],²⁸ signifying that she is in respect of her favour then lately done to the Earl and his house, and out of the care she had to see the Lady Elizabeth²⁹ his daughter competently by him provided for, lest otherwise she might be driven into some indigent fortune, expected that he should then present assure to her after his decease so much of his fee simple lands as should amount to 800£ per annum in

²⁴ *L&P*, 10:1010.

²⁵ William Knollys (c. 1547-1632).

²⁶ Edward Vaux, 4th Lord Vaux (1588-1661).

²⁷ *Burke’s Extinct and Dormant Peerages* quoted in Newdegate-Newdigate, *Gossip from a Muniment Room*, 47.

²⁸ Thomas Butler, 10th Earl of Ormond (c. 1531-1614).

²⁹ Elizabeth Butler.

good rents; and thereupon in performance of the same in part before the marriage of the Lady Elizabeth with the late Viscount Butler³⁰ her first husband did in his lifetime convey and settle upon her a good part of that value amounting to 400£ per annum or thereabout, whereof the Lord Dingwell³¹ and the Lady Elizabeth have been in quiet possession both before and since the death of the Earl.

The letter goes on to order the current Earl³² to fulfill Earl Thomas' intentions.³³

Some widows coped with their reduced circumstances and chose not to remarry.

They then had to deal with their financial problems on their own. An example of this was

Anne Murray, Lady Halkett who wrote a letter in about 1676 to an unnamed nobleman

whom she addresses as "My Lord" asking for assistance:

My Lord,

Since my last addreses to your Lord I have found what the sad change is from a happy wife to a mournfull widow and though sighs and tears (which is the most suitable entertainment to my condition) be not proper to be represented in a splendid court yet as he (whom I must ever regret) was a most faithful servant to your Lord I hope it will not be unfit for me to mention what you were pleased to promise to him when he was living of being and intercessor with the King's Majesty for a recompense to my former sufferings: and if your Lord thought it then an act of justice it will none have charity joined with it and bring a blessing to yourself for helping the fatherless and widow. I see no possibility for me to find out anything to ask but what others hath prevented me in and therefore I most humbly beg your Lord would obtain a precept upon the Exchequer for what sum of money his Majesty thinks fit to bestow upon me, this with your Lord's recommendation might be effectual and might be a help to my poor child who is only left to my care which I would evidence in doing all that is possible to me to improve him to make him the more capable of being as I can.³⁴

Heiresses and widows had the most financial independence of all aristocratic women, but that independence had very real limitations as the above quotation illustrates.

The development of the strict settlement and other such restrictions worked to check that autonomy and to ensure that the bulk of aristocratic property remained in male hands. On

³⁰ Theobald Butler, 1st Viscount Butler (d. 1613).

³¹ Richard Preston, later 1st Earl of Desmond (d. 1628).

³² Walter Butler, 11th Earl of Ormonde (d. 1632). His disinclination to ensure Elizabeth's well-being may well be due, at least in part, to the fact that he was a distant cousin rather than her brother.

³³ Brewer, *Carewe MSS*, 6:372.

³⁴ MS P450:1, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas.

the one hand, they had more means and more freedom than did most women of their rank and they often took advantage of that means and freedom to marry as they chose. On the other hand, the law and Society worked quite consistently to reduce the independence that they were able to exercise.

III. The Heiress

Marrying an heiress made a man a winner in the aristocratic marriage stakes.³⁵ Many of the heiresses married by aristocratic men were not themselves aristocratic and those marriages, while discussed briefly in this dissertation, are not the concern of this section. The concern here is with women who were doubly desirable; they were heiresses and from titled families. Generally aristocratic women only inherited significant amounts of property or a title if they had no surviving brothers. In those cases, most often the surviving sisters divided the inheritance, serving as co-heiresses. Women who were entitled to inherit are termed heiresses-at-law.³⁶ Commentators generally thought that female inheritance aided in the accumulation of estates if those women married men whose property either equaled or surpassed their own. The more important the family, the more likely they would be able to secure an heiress as a bride for their heir.³⁷

The move in the seventeenth century to create patents of title in tail male curtailed the number of heiresses.³⁸ Many approved of the entailing of estates and titles.

For example, Samuel Johnson wrote, "An ancient estate should always go to a male. It is

³⁵ In this section, heiress is used to indicate two different situations: there are those women who inherited titles or significant lands (either on their own or as co-heiresses with sisters) because they had no surviving brothers and there are those women who had no surviving brothers but the title and at least some of the property went to another male relative.

³⁶ Spring, "The Heiress-at-Law," 273.

³⁷ S.J. Payling, "The Economics of Marriage in Late Medieval England: the Marriage of Heiresses," *Economic History Review* 54 (Aug. 2001), 413.

³⁸ Spring, "The Heiress-at-Law," 281, 280.

mighty foolish to let a stranger have it because he married your daughter...”³⁹ Entail of estates continued to limit the inheritance rights of heiresses well into the twentieth century. On March 20, 1964, *The Daily News* reported the death of the 12th Duke of Leeds⁴⁰ and the fact that thirteen-year-old Lady Camilla Osborne would inherit his wealth. She was the daughter of the 11th Duke⁴¹ who had died the previous year and at that time his title passed to a rather distant cousin, who became the 12th Duke of Leeds, due to entail.⁴² The 12th Duke, however, had no offspring, so the estate passed to Camilla when he died. She did not inherit the title because of the entail and thus the title became extinct in 1964. Observers estimated the fortune at more than a million pounds. When the 11th Duke died in 1963, family members attempted to ensure that his widow⁴³ would not inherit the money by tying the fortune up in trust. Upon the 12th Duke’s death, with no heir,⁴⁴ they broke the trust and the money passed to Lady Camilla.⁴⁵

Frequently, heiresses married younger sons rather than the heirs. The bride’s natal family orchestrated this type of marriage as it helped to safeguard the integrity of her property. If the heiress wed the heir, her property simply became a part of the larger whole, but if she married a younger, landless, son her estate remained intact.⁴⁶ The grooms’ families approved of this matching with the younger sons as well as it permitted

³⁹ Quoted in Spring, “The Heiress-at-Law,” 280.

⁴⁰ Francis Osborne (1884-1964).

⁴¹ John Osborne (1901-1963).

⁴² Both the 11th and 12th Dukes can trace their claim back to the 5th Duke of Leeds. The 11th Duke was from a direct line of sons (the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th Dukes) while the 12th Duke was the grandson of the 5th Duke via his younger son Hon. Sydney Osborne.

⁴³ Caroline Vatcher.

⁴⁴ He never married, and lived much of his life in Italy.

⁴⁵ The clipping is in the British Library, BL Add. MSS 78915.

⁴⁶ Payling, “The Economics of Marriage,” 418.

yet another branch to secure significant property and perhaps titles.⁴⁷ An example of this type of match occurred in April 1529 when the 3rd Duke of Norfolk arranged for the marriage of Elizabeth Marney, the daughter and co-heiress of John Lord Marney to his younger son Thomas, Viscount Binden.⁴⁸

When the family of an heiress made decisions concerning her marital future, the primary goal did not consist of monetary gain, if they were motivated by cash that could be more readily realized by the sale of their lands. Instead, the family saw the marriage as a means to ensure the long-term security of the daughter and the social promotion of the family. Families with heiresses to marry might well hold out for a groom from a social rank above that generally thought to be appropriate to the family and for a larger-than-normal jointure settlement.⁴⁹ The heiress served as a conduit of property from her natal family to her husband.⁵⁰ Given the high value of heiresses in the matrimonial market, one would expect a high rate of endogamous marriages. Table 45 gives the marriage pattern for aristocratic heiresses⁵¹ over the entire period of 1485-2000:

⁴⁷ A great deal of strategizing apparently went into the decision on the part of the family of a prospective groom to pursue a match with an heiress. "The greater a family, the more considerable a sacrifice it would have to make to obtain an heiress of equivalent social rank for their heir. New families rich in cash rather than land – and with a special incentive to hazard the speculative element in heiress marriages – had less to lose than established families because their heirs commanded smaller portions." "Common too, albeit to a lesser extent, was another type of match. . . namely an established landowner with a male heir by a first wife taking an heiress as a second wife. Such matches were welcome to the fathers of potential heiresses for the same reasons as those to younger sons, and they had the additional advantage of offering better dower prospects than a younger son could provide. On the part of widowed grooms, there was a greater readiness to sacrifice social advantage than there had been at their first espousals and to take a wife from the more plentiful supply of heiresses among families of junior rank. Marriages of this kind would have endowed many junior branches among the peerage save for their tendency to end without issue, generally leaving the bride's inheritance to return to a collateral branch of her own family." Payling, "The Economics of Marriage," 418, 425 & 427.

⁴⁸ *L&P* 4:5508; John Debrett, *The Peerage of England, Scotland and Ireland: Or the Ancient and Present Stae of the Nobility, Vol. II: The Peerage of Scotland* (London: W. Owen, 1790), 346.

⁴⁹ Payling, "The Economics of Marriage," 416-417.

⁵⁰ Spring, "The Heiress-at-Law," 277.

⁵¹ For the purpose of these figures, an heiress is a woman whose father had no surviving sons. No attempt has been made to distinguish between those few who actually inherited a title and those who did not. It

Table 45: Marriage Patterns of Heiresses, 1485-2000

	Percentage and Numbers
Endogamous ⁵²	50.73% 209/412
Hypogamous ⁵³	10.92% 45/412
Exogamous ⁵⁴	38.35% 158/412
Unmarried ⁵⁵	8.63% 34/394

Heiresses married endogamously 50.73 percent of the time, a rate only slightly higher than the endogamy rate for all aristocratic marriages over the period which was 46.97 percent.⁵⁶ Surprisingly, these women did not marry men of high rank at a rate markedly higher than did aristocratic women overall.⁵⁷ Since the twentieth century witnessed a sharp increase in exogamy rates among elite women, removing that century from the calculations alters the picture significantly as is shown in Table 46:

does seem clear that all of these women did inherit more of their father's estates than would have been the case if there was a brother to serve as primary heir.

⁵² This figure is generated by dividing the number of heiresses who married endogamously by the total number of heiress marriages.

⁵³ This figure is generated by dividing the number of heiresses who married hypogamously by the total number of heiress marriages.

⁵⁴ This figure is generated by dividing the number of heiresses who married exogamously by the total number heiress marriages.

⁵⁵ This figure is generated by dividing the number of heiresses who remained unmarried by the total number of heiresses.

⁵⁶ The number is based on the figures given in Table 1.

⁵⁷ The difference is not statistically significant.

Table 46: Marriage Patterns of Heiresses, 1485-1900

	Percentage and Numbers
Endogamous ⁵⁸	67.89% 148/218
Exogamous ⁵⁹	22.94% 50/218
Hypogamous ⁶⁰	9.17% 20/218
Unmarried ⁶¹	7.27% 16/220

The endogamy rate for heiresses for the four centuries not including the twentieth century at 67.89 percent is significantly higher than the overall endogamy rate for that period of 52.26 percent.⁶² This high rate of titled marriage among heiresses demonstrates their value in the marriage market. Families took great care taken to ensure that they married well.

Case Study: Elizabeth Percy (1667-1722)

The career of Elizabeth Percy illustrates vividly the risks and opportunities of the marriage market for an aristocratic heiress. Elizabeth Percy was the only child of Jocelyn Percy, 11th Earl of Northumberland,⁶³ and Lady Elizabeth Wriothesley and as such was his sole heir when he died in 1670. This made her the greatest heiress of the century. She

⁵⁸ This figure is generated by dividing the number of endogamous heiress marriages, 1485-1900, by the total number of heiress marriages, 1485-1900.

⁵⁹ This figure is generated by dividing the number of exogamous heiress marriages, 1485-1900, by the total number of heiress marriages, 1485-1900.

⁶⁰ This figure is generated by dividing the number of hypogamous heiress marriages, 1485-1900, by the total number of heiress marriages, 1485-1900.

⁶¹ This figure is generated by dividing the number of unmarried heiresses who could be expected to marry by 1900, by the total number of heiresses who could be expected to marry by 1900.

⁶² The overall number is taken from the figures in Table 1. This difference is statistically significant.

⁶³ Jocelyn Percy (1644-1670); son of Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland and Lady Elizabeth Howard, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Suffolk.

owned Sion House, Petworth, Northumberland House, and five castles in the north.⁶⁴ Elizabeth became the ward of her paternal grandmother, Elizabeth Howard, the Dowager Countess of Northumberland, when her mother remarried in 1673.⁶⁵ As often happened with heiresses, she married very young – she was only twelve – to Henry Cavendish, the fifteen-year-old Earl of Ogle in 1679.⁶⁶ Her grandmother arranged this marriage. The sickly Ogle died in 1680, leaving a very young and even wealthier widow as she now received £2,000 a year in jointure.⁶⁷ This made Elizabeth an attractive target for fortune hunters and under some very questionable circumstances, though apparently with the connivance of her grandmother, she married Thomas Thynne of Longleat. Thynne was nineteen years older than his young bride and immensely wealthy in his own right.⁶⁸ He began courting her shortly after the death of her first husband⁶⁹ and the marriage became public knowledge in November 1681.

Elizabeth appears to have regretted the union almost immediately. Frances Brudenell wrote to Lady Hatton about Elizabeth's scandalous second marriage, "Mr.

⁶⁴ E.S. De Beer, "Historical Allusions in Absalom and Achitophel," *Review of English Studies* 7:28 (October, 1956), 414.

⁶⁵ Elizabeth Wriothesley married Ralph Montagu, 1st Duke Montagu.

⁶⁶ Cavendish (1659-1680) was the son of the 2nd Duke of Newcastle.

⁶⁷ R. O. Bucholz, "Seymour, Elizabeth, duchess of Somerset (1667–1722)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21925>, accessed 17 April 2010]. James Kinsley, "Historical Allusions in Absalom and Achitophel," *Review of English Studies* 6:23 (July 1955), 296. It was reported that she would have to pay her father-in-law, the Duke of Newcastle £20,000 for access to the jointure. It was said that Newcastle would use the payment "now to make his daughters' great fortunes, and they stand in need of it. Sir William Clifton was to have had one of them, but now it is quite off . . . and she is talked of for one of Sir William Goring's, which will do well, he being of her own religion and has a good estate." Edward Maunde Thompson, *Correspondence of the Family of Hatton: Being Chiefly Addressed to Christopher, 1st Viscount Hatton, A.D. 1601-1704* (London: Camden Society, 1878), I:240.

⁶⁸ He was known about town as "Tom of Ten Thousand" which was a reference to his wealth. Kinsley, "Historical Allusions," 296.

⁶⁹ Based on the evidence of a later lawsuit, he had the assistance of a Colonel Brett who acted as matchmaker and received title to some lands for his services. In 1702, in a case settled by the House of Lords, he lost his claim to those lands as it was said that he had acquired them through fraud. Thornton, "Court of Appeals of Kentucky. Johnson, Admr., v Hunt," *The American Law Register* (1852-1891) 31:12 new series volume 22 (December 1883), 780.

Thynne has proved his marriage to the Lady Ogle but her La^{sp} is resolved never to live with him for fear of being rotten before she is ripe, the poor gentleman is very unfortunate for her relations hate him and the rest of the world laughs at him.”⁷⁰ It was reported that

...she railed much at [her friends] of late. . . in that they have abused her in making her believe he had 20,000 a year, was of a better family, and but twenty-three years old. He has never lain with her since he was married, not so much as spoken to her, may scarce seen her, and says she never will. Besides I hear my Lady Trevor will prosecute him as married to her daughter, and says she can prove it. If it be but a contract, they say twill break the marriage with Lady Ogle. They say that Thynne has given bonds for vast sums of money to her friends on this account.⁷¹

Elizabeth herself said to her grandmother “There may be more sin and shame in people’s living together than in parting.”⁷² Elizabeth left for the Netherlands shortly thereafter, but it is unclear as to whether she did so with the permission of her new husband. While there, she asked her mother and stepfather to help her to get out of the marriage and there is evidence that some legal proceedings had been undertaken alleging Thynne’s previous marriage.⁷³

The marriage did not end well. Horace Walpole noted⁷⁴ that Thynne, “had married the young Widow Lady Ogle, but not bedded her when he was murdered by Count Conismark [sic], who wanted to marry her.”⁷⁵ On February 12, 1682, a gang of assailants hired by the adventurer Charles, Count Königsmark murdered Thynne as he rode in his coach down Pall Mall. Apparently, the Count had met Elizabeth the year before at court and had become infatuated. The murderers were tried and executed, but

⁷⁰BL Add. MSS 29558 ff. 45-46.

⁷¹ Quoted in Kinsley, “Historical Allusions,” 296.

⁷² Quoted in Bucholz, “Seymour, Elizabeth, duchess of Somerset (1667–1722).”

⁷³ Bucholz, “Seymour, Elizabeth, duchess of Somerset (1667–1722).”

⁷⁴ In his edition of Pope.

⁷⁵ Quoted in George Sherburn, “Walpole’s Marginalia in ‘Additions to Pope’ (1776),” *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 1:4 (July, 1938): 481.

the court acquitted Königsmark and he left England. Elizabeth always denied any knowledge of the plot, but people continued to gossip about her.⁷⁶

Following the murder of Thynne, Elizabeth returned to England in March 1682, and married Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of Somerset⁷⁷ in May. The marriage contract called for Seymour to change his name to Percy, but Elizabeth released him from this requirement when she attained her majority. The marriage did not bring Elizabeth happiness, largely due to Seymour's imperious nature. William Legge, 1st Earl of Dartmouth wrote that he "treated her with little gratitude or affection, though he owed all he had, except an empty title, to her."⁷⁸ Despite this private unhappiness, the couple worked well together politically. He became Queen Anne's master of the horse and she served as a lady of the bedchamber. In that position, she was the great rival of Sarah Jennings, Duchess of Marlborough. Elizabeth did not badger the Queen for political gain, and thus eventually superseded Sarah in Anne's affections.

IV. Widows

From the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries,⁷⁹ widows had the most freedom to contract marriages to suit themselves. The statistics indicate an increased

⁷⁶ Bucholz, Seymour, Elizabeth, duchess of Somerset (1667–1722)."

⁷⁷ Charles Seymour (1662-1748).

⁷⁸ Quoted in Bucholz, "Seymour, Elizabeth, duchess of Somerset (1667–1722)."

⁷⁹ In the twentieth century, the restrictions on women's marriages lessened and they married whom they chose much more frequently, even if they were not widows.

tendency for women to marry exogamously on their subsequent unions.⁸⁰

Table 47 gives the exogamy rates for the period of 1485-1900:⁸¹

Table 47: Rates of Exogamy

Marriages	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C
First	213/839 25.39%	206/992 20.77%	344/991 34.71%	618/1626 38.07%
Subsequent	67/188 36.64%	64/190 33.68%	49/103 47.57%	52/96 54.17%

As indicated by the table, women in this period were significantly more likely to marry outside of titled ranks on subsequent unions than first marriages. This may well be due to an increased level of agency that their age and income afforded them.

An elite Tudor woman did not necessarily live her entire life with a mate she had no say in choosing. The prevalence of early death meant that over 33 percent of all first marriages among the nobility lasted less than fifteen years. In most cases, the surviving spouse remarried and created a new family.⁸² Thus, in the late sixteenth century approximately 25 percent of all marriages were remarriages for either the husband or the wife.⁸³ According to Barbara Harris 45 percent of elite women married more than once.⁸⁴ Widowhood was so common that it figured as one of the three stages of life for a woman discussed by the humanist Juan Luis Vives (the other two being maidenhood and

⁸⁰ These figures are only for the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, since in the twentieth century the patterns had changed significantly and women were quite free to marry as they wished. Most subsequent marriages in the twentieth century were due to the failure of the first marriage not due to widowhood.

⁸¹ In all of these centuries the differences between the exogamy rates of the first and subsequent marriages were statistically significant.

⁸² Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, 589-90.

⁸³ Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 56.

⁸⁴ She also cites the statistic that 69 percent of the 755 knights and noblemen who married at least once died before their spouse. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 8, 10.

wifhood).⁸⁵ For those women who married more than once the process of contracting subsequent unions provided an opportunity to at least influence the choice of mate.⁸⁶ Early-modern commentators noted that widows married down and out with disturbing frequency; thus, widows who chose not to remarry sometimes received extravagant praise. In 1627, a biographer of Magdalen Dacre, the Viscountess Montagu, lauded her for not remarrying after her husband's death: "This example is not ordinary in England, in this so corrupt an age, where sometimes women of honour, after the death of their husbands, not finding others equal to themselves in dignity, do marry, even their servants, or men of meane condition."⁸⁷ Many thought of these marriages to men of "meane condition" as disruptive to the social order and threatening to aristocratic rank identity.

Desirability of Widows as Wives

Because aristocratic widows often had significant property, they possessed a high value on the marriage market. Even if she could no longer bear children, her wealth made her an attractive marriage prospect for men looking to improve their financial status.⁸⁸ The sixteenth-century courtier Francis Bryan married two wealthy widows and he was not the only well-placed gentleman to exploit the financial desirability of widows.⁸⁹ This mercenary attitude shocked some contemporaries. Preachers exhorted widows to spend

⁸⁵ Betty S. Travitsky, "Reprinting Tudor History: the Case of Catherine of Aragon," *Renaissance Quarterly* 50:1 (Spring 1997), 167.

⁸⁶ Slater, "The Weightiest Business," 51.

⁸⁷ Richard Smith, *The life of the most honourable and vertuous lady the Lady Magdalen Viscountesse Montague / written ... by Richard Smith. And now translated into English, by C. F[ursdon]*. (St. Omer: English College Press, 1627), 10.

⁸⁸ Stone, *Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 89.

⁸⁹ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 133-135, 280 n. 37. Thomas Wyatt, a good friend of Bryan's satirized the desire for wealthy widows in his poem "A Spending Hand," making the spokesman for good behaviour (i.e. not chasing widows) Sir Francis Bryan.

the rest of their lives honouring the memory of their husbands, as in the case of Magdalen Dacre discussed above.⁹⁰ Popular literature attacked the practice of remarriage among widows, encouraging them to remain single.⁹¹ Popular literature portrayed widows as entering into marriage with younger men due to their insatiable lust.⁹² Contemporary proverbs provide examples:

“He that woos a maid, must fain lie and flatter. But he that woos a widow, must down with his breeches and at her.”

“He that woos a maid, must come seldom in her sight. But he that woos a widow must woo her day and night.”

“The rich widow weeps with one eye and casts glances with the other.”⁹³

Popular tracts portrayed men who married widows as being of lesser status than their wives, and often implied that they married only for money. The playwright Thomas Dekker wrote, “Let him that is poor and to wealth would acquire, get some rich old widow and grow wealthy by her.”⁹⁴

Widows did have a great deal of freedom to marry as they wished, but that did not mean that Society would not disapprove. On December 12, 1791, *The Times* carried the following item:

Lady Dudley and Ward – This *matron of Quality*, after a *soleux salt* of four months, from the death of Mr. Jennings, her Ladyship’s third husband, has ventured a FOURTH time to approach the *altar* of HYMEN. On Friday last the sanctimonious knot was tied between her and an athletic son of Neptune, a

⁹⁰ Retha Warnicke, “Private and Public: the Boundaries of Women’s Lives in Early Stuart England,” in *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, ed., Jean Brink (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1993), 136.

⁹¹ Elizabeth Foyster, “Marrying the Experienced Widow in Early Modern England: the Male Perspective,” in *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Sandra Cavallo and Lynden Warner (New York: Pearson, 1999), 109

⁹² Foyster, “Marrying the Experienced Widow,” 110.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 111

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 109-10.

Captain in the Royal Navy and a man of *known service*. There is scarcely any woman who has had a more express and melancholy experience of life's uncertainty than this good Lady, or that the great Lord of the Creation, Man, *getteth up like a lion, and goeth down like a lamb; that he is cut off like a flower, and seen no more!* In all probability, however, the tables will now turn, and she will have the consolation of attending no more funerals...⁹⁵

The vogue for marrying widows appears to have been relatively short-lived, however. The proportion of widows among brides declined sharply over the centuries. In the sixteenth century, 20 percent of brides were widows. That number dropped to 10 percent in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and after 1800 it plummeted to 3 percent.⁹⁶ Increased life spans accounted for much of this decline.

The independence enjoyed by widows allowed them an opportunity to marry outside of the usual constrictions concerning rank. Certainly, many did follow the societal strictures, either by choice or compulsion, and made a profitable career for themselves in the marriage market.⁹⁷ However, there were also widows from the highest levels of society who married men far below them on the social and financial scale. These men were often younger than the women who married them. The high rate of exogamy practiced by these women indicates a level of agency unavailable to other noble women.

The freedom afforded by widowhood provided opportunities for individualistic action. Widows sometimes used this situation to contract less-than-socially acceptable marriages. This independence is expressed by Margaret Poultney⁹⁸ marrying for the second time in 1639. Her family did not approve of her choice of second husband and she responded, “ ’tis true she is my mother and I shall give her what satisfaction as is fit, but

⁹⁵ “Lady Dudley and Ward,” *The Times*, Dec. 12, 1791, #2204, p. 2.

⁹⁶ Stone, *Open Elite?*, 124.

⁹⁷ The best-known woman to fit this model is Bess of Hardwick; a knight's daughter who married four times, each time up the social scale, acquiring vast amounts of land and money in the process.

⁹⁸ Ralph Verney's aunt.

I consider my own freedom in my choice. . . for what fortune I have, I have had it from my [deceased husband] and a widow is free.”⁹⁹ In July 1775, Sarah Lennox wrote of her sister the Duchess of Leinster,¹⁰⁰

You know that being a widow is of itself a reason for making her her own mistress, if her age did not, you know too, that when by Lady Bellamont’s¹⁰¹ impertinence, she was forced to take *un parti*, she told her son, her mother-in-law, and her sister, that she thought it very possible she should marry Mr. Ogilvie.¹⁰² They all agreed in the same thing for answer, that they could not *wish it*, but if she was happy it was all they wished...¹⁰³

The story of Anne Savage, Lady Berkeley illustrates many of the stereotypes concerning widow remarriage. The widow of a peer, Anne’s subsequent marriage interested Henry VIII and his minister Thomas Cromwell. In 1536, they decided she should marry Edward Sutton,¹⁰⁴ the son and heir of John, Lord Dudley. Sutton, chronically short of money, showed great enthusiasm for the match to a widow of means and began the process of wooing Anne. Writing to the King’s Council, however, he had to admit an important obstacle:

She hath made to me a very light answer that she is not minded to marry. . . The truth is, she entertained me after the most loving sort as my first coming to her as I could desire; for, when she was in her chamber sewing, she would suffer me lie in her lap, with many other as familiar fashions as I could desire. . . But at my coming with the King’s letters [recommending the marriage] I was nothing so well welcomed, but where it was so familiar before, it was much stranger since my coming last. . .

Dudley then requested a letter from the King commanding Anne to marry him because he was so much in love with her “that it were impossible to remove it for any pleasure in the

⁹⁹ Slater, “The Weightiest Business,” 51.

¹⁰⁰ Emily Lennox, the Duchess of Leinster, had eighteen children with the Duke and when he died, she married her sons’ tutor and had three more. Lewis, *In the Family Way*, 37.

¹⁰¹ This is a reference to the Duchess of Leinster’s daughter Emily FitzGerald.

¹⁰² Emily married William Ogilvy, her sons’ tutor in 1774.

¹⁰³ Ilchester, *Life and Letters*, I:240.

¹⁰⁴ Edward Sutton, 4th Lord Dudley (d. 1586). He married firstly Katherine Brydges in 1556. He married secondly Jane Stanley in 1567 and thirdly he wed Mary Howard.

world.” Pleasure or no, Anne did not give in to his pleadings and she remained a widow for the rest of her life, writing to Cromwell that she would only marry “if my heart be towards Mr. Dudley, as it is not. . . .”¹⁰⁵

In October 1536, Margaret Bernardiston, the widowed Lady Audley,¹⁰⁶ wrote to Cromwell to protest plans to marry her to George Aylesbury:

But for any intent or purpose of marriage, either to the said Aylesbury or any other living creature, as yet I have none. And if it shall chance me hereafter to have any such fantasy or mind, which I pray God I may not have, I do assure your good lordship it is not he that I can find in my heart to take to my husband, of all creatures alive. And my trust is, that as the king’s highness hath always been a good and gracious lord unto all others his poor widows, his majesty will be so much my good and gracious lord to give me liberty to marry, if ever it be my chance, such as I may find in my heart to match me unto...¹⁰⁷

In 1601, Robert Cecil and Gilbert Talbot, the 7th Earl of Shrewsbury pressured Anne Hoostman, the widowed Lady Palavicini to remarry.¹⁰⁸ In so doing, however, both acknowledged her freedom of choice. Cecil wrote:

Although it is far from my purpose to persuade you to change your present condition, because marriages are made in heaven and never prosper better than when they proceed from free and mutual election, yet having understood that this gentleman, Mr. Oliver Cromwell,¹⁰⁹ hath disposed his heart to seek you and deserve you, not only by true affection, but by offer and performance of all such conditions as may be consonant to the will of the dead and the desire of those that live, whose chiefest care must appear in the hindering all courses which may prove to the prejudice of his children whose memory and trust we cannot forget; I can do no less, being one of these that duty owed him, and one that have been trusted by him, but clearly and truly declare unto you thus much of my knowledge that if you shall resolve to marry and make your choice of him for the companion of your life, you cannot bestow yourself upon a gentleman in every way fitter for you, for his living is such, as I presume you know, do the exceed most men in his county; his sufficiency, his carriage, and the reputation had of him likewise is such as, if it were known to you as well as to me, I assure myself he needed no

¹⁰⁵ It was nearly twenty years later before Edward married. Green, ed. *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain*, III:74-77.

¹⁰⁶ Margaret Bernardiston was the widow of Thomas, 1st Baron Audley of Walden.

¹⁰⁷ Green, *Letters*, II:269.

¹⁰⁸ Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell*. London: G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1787, II:177.

¹⁰⁹ The Lord Protector’s Uncle.

other spokesman unto the same, being an office into which I confess I do not intrude myself as one that would draw you from the state you are in, but only because I would assure you that if he be the person who, by the providence of God, shall obtain your liking, there is no clause in the will which gives me any power or trust which I shall not be much the gladder for his sake being a gentleman whom I much esteem, to apply to your comfort, not doubting but that my good Lord of Shrewsbury or myself shall be before your conclusion acquainted in what particular sort assurance is given for the good execution of his will that is gone, to whom, as when he lived, I confess I was extraordinarily affected, so will I be always a friend to his and you.¹¹⁰

The Earl of Shrewsbury, the other executor of her late husband's will, also attempted to influence her toward the chosen remarriage:

The bearer Mr. Oliver Cromwell, son and heir of Sir Henry Cromwell, desires to be a suitor to you in the way of marriage – But understanding somewhat of the state of things passed by Sir H. Palavicino [sic], and of the trust the latter committed to Mr. Secretary and myself, he has first entreated our allowance of his desire. We are most unfit to make any motion of marriage to you; but *as you are now free to dispose of yourself*, [added italics] I cannot deny to let you understand what I know of Cromwell. His living is like to be very shortly (by reason of his father's great years and infirmities) very great, and he has the reputation of all men to be as sufficient and honest a gentleman as any lives.¹¹¹

Anne eventually acquiesced under the pressure and married Sir Oliver Cromwell on July 7, 1601.¹¹²

Agency

As both Cecil and Shrewsbury acknowledged, a widow did have a degree of freedom. Relations, friends, even politicians could try to influence her but ultimately she could make her own choice. In the mid-sixteenth century, the great heiress/widow on the market was Katherine Willoughby. She first married Charles Brandon, the Duke of Suffolk but became a very wealthy widow by at the age of twenty-five. Many prominent

¹¹⁰Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of Manuscripts of the Most Honourable, the Marquess of Salisbury... Preserved at Hatfield House* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1906), 260.

¹¹¹Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar.... Salisbury*, 260-261.

¹¹²Noble, *Memoirs*, II:177.

men of Europe, including the King of Poland, attempted to woo her, but she chose to remain single for the next seven years before shocking them all by marrying her steward.¹¹³ Katherine's decision, first to reject the overtures of important men and then to marry a man of her own choice far below her on the social scale illustrates the level of agency that money and high birth made available to some aristocratic widows.

Widowhood often presented an opportunity for happiness absent from a first, usually arranged, marriage. In June 1799, Elizabeth Vassal wrote in her journal, "Lord Plymouth¹¹⁴ died; a great release to his wife who will be rewarded by marrying Amherst within the year."¹¹⁵ Vassal referred to Sarah Archer who indeed married William Pitt Amherst, later 1st Earl Amherst in 1800.¹¹⁶ As Elizabeth wrote only eight days after Plymouth's death, the affection between Sarah and Amherst must have been quite well known.

Widows had more freedom than most other aristocratic women to exercise agency when contracting their subsequent unions. The relative lack of constraint in terms of both legality and economics meant that any control over these unions would have to be undertaken through the use of societal coercion. Society did bring this type of pressure to bear on many of these women. Some aristocratic widows bowed to societal demands and married as expected, but others took advantage of the influence that their age, experience, and wealth gave them to make marriages of their own choosing.

¹¹³ Mackin, "The Life of Katherine Willoughby," 33.

¹¹⁴ Other Hickman Windsor, 5th Earl of Plymouth (1762-1799).

¹¹⁵ Holland, *Journal*, 264.

¹¹⁶ Somewhat ironically, following Sarah's death in 1838, Amherst married Mary Sackville, the widow of Sarah's son, the 6th Earl of Plymouth.

V. Peeresses in Their Own Right¹¹⁷

Although outnumbered by heiresses and widows, Peeresses in their own right deserve a brief consideration. Sixty women have been identified in the statistics as peeresses in their own right, *suo jure* and they tended to marry quite well. From 1485-2000, they married endogamously 51.39 percent of the time, compared to 46.97 percent¹¹⁸ for all of the marriages under consideration.¹¹⁹ Table 48 gives the marriage patterns for these peeresses *suo jure* from 1485-2000:

Table 48: Marriage Patterns of Peeresses *Suo Jure*

	Percentage	Numbers ¹²⁰
Endogamous ¹²¹	51.39%	37/72
Hypogamous ¹²²	13.89%	10/72
Exogamous ¹²³	34.72%	25/72
Unmarried ¹²⁴	6.67%	4/60

Table 49 breaks down the marriage patterns of the peeresses by century. From the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries peeresses were more likely to marry endogamously than were noblewomen in general (the difference ranges from a high of

¹¹⁷ These women were peeresses *suo jure* who were also the offspring of a father or a mother who also held a title in their own right.

¹¹⁸ This figure is based on the numbers in Table 1. It does not include the number of women who remained unmarried.

¹¹⁹ This difference is not statistically significant. The comparison is made difficult by the huge difference in the numbers between the groups.

¹²⁰ The sixty *suo jure* peeresses had seventy-two marriages between them.

¹²¹ These figures were generated by dividing the number of endogamous peeress marriages by the total number of peeress marriages.

¹²² These figures were generated by dividing the number of hypogamous peeress marriages by the total number of peeress marriages.

¹²³ These figures were generated by dividing the number of exogamous peeress marriages by the total number of peeress marriages.

¹²⁴ These figures were generated by dividing the number of unmarried peeresses by the total number of peeresses.

17.88 percent in the seventeenth century to a low of 1.12 percent in the eighteenth century).¹²⁵ In the nineteenth century peeresses *suo jure* were slightly less likely to marry endogamously as other noble women of the era (50.46 percent for noblewomen in general versus 46.15 percent for peeresses)¹²⁶ and the difference in the rate for the twentieth century is so small as to fall below the level of significance.

Table 49: Marriage Patterns of Peeress *Suo Jure* by Century

Century	Endogamous	Hypogamous	Exogamous	Unmarried
16th	4/7 57.14%	2/7 28.57%	1/7 14.29%	0/7 00.00%
17th	13/17 76.47%	2/17 11.765%	2/17 11.765%	1/14 7.14%
18th	10/19 52.63%	5/19 26.32%	4/19 21.05%	1/18 5.56%
19th	6/13 46.15%	0/13 00.00%	7/13 53.85%	1/11 9.10%
20th	4/16 25.00%	1/16 6.25%	11/16 68.75%	1/11 9.10%

VI. The Single Aristocratic Woman

In October 1636, the Countess of Leicester¹²⁷ wrote to her step-son the 2nd Earl¹²⁸ about the prospects of one of his daughters, “It grieves me often to see that our poor Doll¹²⁹ is sought by none, and that she will shortly be called a stale maid.”¹³⁰ The next month she wrote with a bit of hope and a great deal of resignation, “And as for the lord which you are in some hope should be offered to Doll, I can say nothing but that I wish

¹²⁵ The difference is not statistically significant due to the huge diversity between the numbers in the two groups.

¹²⁶ The difference is not statistically significant due in part to the huge diversity between the numbers in the two groups.

¹²⁷ Sarah Blount.

¹²⁸ Robert Sydney (1595-1677).

¹²⁹ Dorothy Sydney (1617-1684). The panic here seems a bit premature. Dorothy married Henry Spencer, 1st Earl of Sunderland (1620-43). He served on the King’s side during the Civil War until he was killed by a cannon ball.

¹³⁰ HMC *De L’Isle*, 6:60-61.

with all my heart she were so bestowed, and do desire you to omit nothing that is possible to further it, for I have no hope of any other.”¹³¹ Doll was only nineteen when her grandmother so despaired of her chances, even by seventeenth-century standards she seems hardly to be past her sell-by date.

For aristocratic women between 1485 and the end of World War One, failure to marry meant a lifetime as the old maid living first in her father’s house and then in a sibling’s establishment. In order to avoid this fate, aristocratic families worked hard to see to it that their daughters married. The Countess of Leicester’s comments demonstrate the imperative to get daughters to the altar in a timely manner. Though the drive to marry did not abate and the great majority of these women did marry, the eighteenth century witnessed a sharp increase in the number of elite women remaining unmarried, coupled with an equally sharp decline in the rate of hypogamy (These findings are presented in Table 50). Though no elite woman during this period ever openly advocated the single state, Mary Pierrepont writing to her daughter the Countess of Bute in 1753 stated, “I will not say it [being single] is happier; but it is undoubtedly safer than marriage.”¹³² This increase in unmarried aristocratic women continued through the nineteenth century as did the drop in hypogamy.¹³³ In 1865, Louisa Bowater wrote, “I wish for two things – a little more money, and a husband. But I often wonder, whether, after all, I shall be called to a single life. It requires courage, but St. Paul tells us that it is the most blessed. I do not

¹³¹ Ibid., 6:68.

¹³² Montagu, *The Works*, 376.

¹³³ The drop in the hypogamy rate was statistically significant between all centuries with the exception of the 1.76 percent decline between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

It seems possible that aristocratic status became vested in the female members of the family and as long as they married well (no matter whom their brothers were marrying) or barring that did not marry badly, the family could be comfortable in its elite status.

wish for it, but still I trust I may never be led, from fear of it, to make a marriage without affection. That must be lowering to the whole tone of mind.”¹³⁴

Table 50: Rates of Hypogamy and Unmarried

Century	Hypogamous ¹³⁵	Unmarried ¹³⁶
16th	243/1003 ¹³⁷ 24.22%	29/850 3.41%
17th	224/1193 18.78%	74/1071 6.91%
18th	137/1095 12.51%	124/1115 11.12%
19th	185/1722 10.75%	299/1925 15.53%
20th	111/1386 8.01%	151/1322 11.42%
20th through 1920	39/356 4.38%	It is not possible to determine a decade in which someone did not marry

Several factors explain this increase in the number of women remaining single through the nineteenth century.¹³⁸ Some parents deliberately kept at least one daughter, very often the youngest one, unmarried so that she could take care of them in their old age. The requirement on the part of many aristocratic women that there be love before marriage appears to have prompted some who did not find a man of appropriate rank whom they loved to remain single.¹³⁹ The reduction in the number of totally arranged marriages contributed the most to the increase in the number of women remaining unmarried. As has been shown in Chapter Three, parents became less overtly mercenary in their attitudes toward their children’s marriages in the seventeenth century and openly

¹³⁴ Louisa need not have worried; she married Rainald Knightley, 1st Baron Knightley, in 1869. Cartwright, *Journals of Lady Knightley*, 105.

¹³⁵ The denominator is the total number of marriages and unmarrieds.

¹³⁶ The denominator is the total number of women (as opposed to marriages plus unmarrieds) contained in the data set.

¹³⁷ In the 16th century, hypogamy was not as much of a problem as marriage to a man with the title Sir had not yet been devalued by the creation of the baronet for sale.

¹³⁸ Those increases are statistically significant between each of the centuries.

¹³⁹ This desire for love is discussed in Chapter Three.

arranged marriage began to go out of style.¹⁴⁰ All of this meant that aristocratic women had to take more factors into consideration before a successful union would take place.

Sometimes circumstances conspired against a woman in her quest to marry. The loss of reputation could be utterly devastating. Laura Manners became enmeshed in a scandal not of her own making and ultimately found herself without a mate. John Dalrymple, the 7th Earl of Stair, married Johanna Gordon in 1804.¹⁴¹ He then disregarded his first union and married the higher-ranked Laura in 1808. The Consistory Court deemed the second marriage null and set it aside in 1811, declaring the Earl legally married to Johanna.¹⁴² Laura Manners, who changed her name to Laura Tollemache¹⁴³ in 1821, never remarried. Charlotte Campbell commented with disgust, “And so Miss Jacky Gordon is really clothed with a husband at last, and Miss Laura Manners left without a mate! She and Lord Stair should marry and have children, in mere revenge. As to Miss Gordon, she’s a Venus – well suited to such a Vulcan, whom nothing but money and a title could have made tolerable, even to a kitchen wench.”¹⁴⁴ Though no one ever held Laura to blame in the situation, it is telling that she did not remarry. While she may well have had enough of matrimony, she could not have escaped from her association with a bigamist.

¹⁴⁰ This loosening of the parental constrictions is shown very clearly in the marriage patterns of aristocratic men who married exogamously in ever increasing numbers. Chapter One discusses this change in attitude and its implications.

¹⁴¹ James Muirhead, “The Law of Marriage and Divorce,” *The Westminster Review* 82 (July and October, 1864), 212. He was then stationed with his regiment in Edinburgh where he met her. They entered into a marriage that was lawful under Scottish law, where they each signed a declaration stating that they accepted the other as their legal spouse. They agreed, in writing, to keep the marriage a secret until the time was convenient for him to divulge it. No one other than the couple was aware of the marriage and they did not cohabit. Within three months, the Earl was sent abroad. When he returned to England, he then married Laura Manners according to English law and Miss Gordon filed suit in the Consistory Court of London.

¹⁴² The marriage was annulled in 1820.

¹⁴³ Her mother was Louisa Tollemache, Countess of Dysart.

¹⁴⁴ Bury, *Diary*, I:70&n.

Options for a Single Life: The Single Woman as Helpmeet

There were few life options for unmarried aristocratic women from 1485-1920. They could enter the religious life, some chose a career at court, and others became little more than nursemaids and housekeepers for their relations. Noble British families, at least until 1920, raised their daughters to marry and few viable alternatives existed to the life of matrimony.¹⁴⁵ Not until the last quarter of the nineteenth century did women begin to participate in higher education, giving them a possibility of crafting an independent life. Prior to that, on rare occasions aristocratic women received educations intended to take the place of a more traditional family life. Louisa Stuart, the youngest (of eleven) child of the 3rd Earl of Bute and his wife Mary Wortley Montagu never married, something that her family apparently planned from her childhood. There are letters from her grandmother, Mary Pierrepont, advising Louisa's mother to allow Louisa the advanced education that she desired so that she would be satisfied with her allotted role in life:

You will tell me I did not make it a part of your education: your prospect was very different from hers. As you had much in your circumstances to attract the highest offers, it seemed your business to learn to live in the world, as it is hers to know how to be easy out of it. . . Thus every woman endeavors to breed her daughter a fine lady, qualifying her for a station in which she will never appear, and at the same time incapacitating her for that retirement to which she is destined. Learning, if she has a real taste for it, will not only make her contented, but happy in it.¹⁴⁶

Louisa demonstrated remarkable precocity at a very early age, beginning work on a French novel and a Roman play at the age of ten. Throughout her life, she wrote a great

¹⁴⁵ Of course, the same can largely be said for women lower down on the social scale. They did, however, have some commercial opportunities that do not appear to have been open to noblewomen.

¹⁴⁶ Montagu, *Works*, 373.

deal, including a memoir of her friend Lady Douglas,¹⁴⁷ and poetry. True to the expectations of the age, Louisa never intended to have her name attached to her writing.¹⁴⁸ For Louisa, her family intended education to take the place of a husband and children.

Even before the Protestant Reformation of the 1530s, British noble families did not place their daughters in convents in great numbers, but it did provide a role for some women who did not marry.¹⁴⁹ Barbara Harris has shown that in the period between 1470 and 1540 only about 2.5 percent of elite daughters became nuns.¹⁵⁰ This trend continued through the twentieth century.¹⁵¹ This life choice was a much more common occurrence among the Irish peers. In the seventeenth century, all four of the daughters of Lucius Carey, 2nd Viscount Falkland¹⁵² entered the convent.¹⁵³

The early-modern royal court provided employment for aristocratic women who did not live with husbands. Many queens preferred to have unmarried women in their service. Elizabeth I surrounded herself with women who were either single or separated from their husbands.¹⁵⁴ According to Joan Goldsmith, there were twenty-three women in Elizabeth's inner circle throughout the reign, and of those, three were single. Those three

¹⁴⁷ Frances Scott.

¹⁴⁸ Karl Miller, "Stuart, Lady Louisa (1757–1851)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42015>, accessed 23 March 2011].

¹⁴⁹ Hood, "The Impact of Protestantism," 47.

¹⁵⁰ Barbara Harris, "A New Look at the Reformation: Aristocratic Women and Nunneries, 1450-1540," *The Journal of British Studies* 32:2 (April 1993): 92-93.

¹⁵¹ In the statistics gathered for this study, there are twenty-four women who are labeled as being nuns. This number is undoubtedly too small as many families would have failed to report these daughters in their genealogical records as they would not have produced offspring.

¹⁵² 1610-1643.

¹⁵³ Their chances for a good marriage may well have been scuttled by their father's prominent role in the royalist cause during the Civil War. As it became clear that the King was not going to win the conflict, Carey volunteered for what was essentially a suicide mission.

¹⁵⁴ Joan Goldsmith, "All the Queen's Women: the Changing Place and Perception of Aristocratic Women in Elizabethan England, 1558-1620," (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1987), 67-68.

were Blanche Parry, Mary Radcliffe, and Katherine Howard. Frances Howard served as a Maid-in-Waiting for fifteen years before marrying Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Hertford.¹⁵⁵ Margaret Clifford and Frances Newton lived separately from their husbands and thus were permanent residents of court, living with the single women who served the Queen.¹⁵⁶

Among the aristocracy, unmarried daughters often lived in a sibling's household. Though this pattern is more often associated with the Victorian era (some commentators assert that the unmarried woman provided child care in case the wife died),¹⁵⁷ it occurred in earlier eras as well. In October 1737, Anne Countess of Salisbury¹⁵⁸ wrote to her son-in-law Lord Perceval¹⁵⁹ concerning her unmarried daughter Margaret¹⁶⁰ living with Perceval and his wife Catherine.¹⁶¹ The sisters apparently did not get along. Their mother laid the blame at the feet of the married sister and asked Perceval to remind his wife of her duty to be kind to her relatives.¹⁶² Unmarried women often lived a somewhat itinerant existence, visiting relatives and friends. Louisa Stuart, the unmarried daughter of the 3rd Earl of Bute, often commented about visiting different women such as the Duchess of Buccleuch.¹⁶³

It is apparent that some elite families deliberately kept some of their daughters unmarried; often, it seems, so that they could take care of their parents in their old age. In

¹⁵⁵ Edward Seymour (1539?-1621). He had entered into a clandestine marriage to Katherine Grey previously. Secret unions appear to have been a pattern with the Earl, his marriage to Frances was also clandestine so its precise date is unknown. They were a couple by 1575 but the Queen did not consent to the union until 1585. Following Frances's death in 1598, his third marriage was also clandestine.

¹⁵⁶ Joan Goldsmith, "All the Queen's Women," 155-156.

¹⁵⁷ Anderson, "The 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill' Controversy," 73,

¹⁵⁸ Anne Tufton.

¹⁵⁹ John Perceval, son of the 1st Earl of Egmont. (1711-1770), later 2nd Earl of Egmont.

¹⁶⁰ Margaret Cecil.

¹⁶¹ Catherine Cecil.

¹⁶² BL Add. MSS 47013A f. 40.

¹⁶³ Stuart, *Lady Louisa Stuart, passim*.

the late 1730s and early 1740s, Anne Tufton, the Dowager Duchess of Salisbury, made use of her unmarried daughter Margaret Cecil as a secretary (that is, when Margaret was not providing assistance in her sister Anne's household). Family papers contain several letters from Margaret to her siblings on behalf of her mother.¹⁶⁴ The practice of keeping a daughter single became more marked in the nineteenth century. Very often, the youngest daughter was destined for spinsterhood. Marcia Cholmondeley, the youngest daughter of the 3rd Marquess of Cholmondeley did not marry, nor did Victoria Herbert, the youngest daughter of the 4th Earl of Carnarvon. Other examples are Emily Kinnaird daughter of the 10th Earl of Kinnaird, the 1st Viscount Guillamore's daughter Isabella O'Grady, and Alice Trefusis, the 19th Lord Clinton's daughter. Nineteenth-century aristocrats appear to have followed the example of Queen Victoria, who intended that her youngest daughter Princess Beatrice remain unmarried and serve as her mother's companion.¹⁶⁵

Better to be Unmarried than to Marry Hypogamously

The percentage of elite women who remained unmarried increased in the eighteenth century. As shown in Table 51 below, the unmarried rate nearly doubled from 6.94 percent in the seventeenth century to 11.12 percent in the eighteenth¹⁶⁶ and then continued to grow to 15.53 percent in the nineteenth century.¹⁶⁷ At the same time, the level of non-endogamous marriage fell. It dropped from a pre-twentieth-century high of 51.55 percent in the sixteenth century to a relatively steady rate of between 41.41 percent

¹⁶⁴ For example: BL Add. MSS 47013A f. 71.

¹⁶⁵ Beatrice did not fall into line with her mother's wishes, however. She married Prince Henry of Battenberg in 1885. Victoria gave her permission with the condition that the couple continue to live with her.

¹⁶⁶ This difference is statistically significant.

¹⁶⁷ This difference is statistically significant.

and 49.54 percent in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.¹⁶⁸ As has been discussed, the rates of hypogamous marriage, that is marriage to a knight or a baronet, drop sharply after the sixteenth century. Those titles had become devalued as the Stuart dynasty created far too many knights and created the title of baronet in order to raise money. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the rates of unmarried elite women equaled or outpaced the rate of hypogamy.¹⁶⁹ It had become more acceptable for a woman not to marry at all than to marry a baronet.

Table 51: Rates of Non-Endogamous Marriage and Unmarriedness

Century	Hypogamous	Exogamous	Unmarried
16	243/1003 24.22%	274/1003 27.32%	29/850 3.41%
17	224/1193 18.78%	270/1193 22.63%	74/1071 6.91%
18	137/1095 12.51%	394/1095 35.98%	124/1115 11.12%
19	185/1722 10.75%	668/1722 38.79%	299/1925 15.53%
20	111/1386 8.01%	917/1386 66.16%	151/1322 11.42%

Table 52 shows the number of unmarried women in each century classified by the titles (that is baron, viscount, earl, marquess, or duke) of their fathers. Across all titles, there was a distinct increase in the number of women remaining unmarried. The unmarried rate of the daughters of barons increased significantly between the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries and the nineteenth century showed a significant difference from the centuries that surrounded it. The daughters of viscounts, earls, and dukes had

¹⁶⁸ The difference between the sixteenth-century rate of 51.55 percent and the seventeenth-century rate of 41.41 percent is statistically significant. The difference between the seventeenth-century rate and the eighteenth-century rate of 48.49 percent is statistically significant. The difference between the eighteenth-century rate and the nineteenth-century rate of 49.54 percent is not statistically significant.

¹⁶⁹ The difference between the two rates in the eighteenth century is not statistically significant while that in the nineteenth is.

experienced one such increase in the eighteenth century that continued into the nineteenth. With the exception of the daughters of marquesses,¹⁷⁰ the unmarried rate declined in the twentieth century.¹⁷¹

Table 52: Unmarried Women Classified by the Title of Their Father

Title ¹⁷²	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C
Baron	5/416 1.22%	31/305 10.16%	24/220 10.91%	66/378 17.46%	34/330 10.30%
Viscount	1/32 3.13%	8/130 6.15%	17/128 13.28%	24/165 14.55%	24/171 14.04%
Earl	17/340 5.00%	33/559 5.90%	66/562 11.74%	156/973 16.03%	70/582 12.03%
Marquess	0/26 0.00%	2/36 5.56%	2/55 3.63%	23/205 11.22%	14/123 11.38%
Duke	6/36 ¹⁷³ 16.67%	0/41 0.00%	15/150 10.00%	30/198 14.71%	9/116 7.76%

Effect of Disgrace in the Family

In a group so conscious of rank and reputation as the peerage, a disgrace in a family would have an impact on the marital prospects of aristocratic women, perhaps even leaving many of them unmarried. In Table 52 above nearly 14 percent of the daughters of sixteenth-century dukes were unmarried, a number that is surprisingly high when compared with the percentages in the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries. Closer examination however, reveals that five out of the six women concerned were the

¹⁷⁰ The increase between the nineteenth and the twentieth century was not statistically significant.

¹⁷¹ This figure is somewhat problematic, as has been pointed out repeatedly in this study, marriage patterns changed significantly after 1920. It is difficult to know how to determine the decade in which a woman did not get married, but if such a procedure could be developed [a possibility would be to calculate the mean age at which aristocratic women in the twentieth century were getting married and then assign decades to unmarrieds based on that figure], it would most likely show a rate quite similar to that of the nineteenth century.

¹⁷² Of woman's father.

¹⁷³ This number is disproportionately large due to the fact that for some reason, perhaps his disgrace, five of the six women in this category were the daughters of the 1st Duke of Somerset.

daughters of Edward Seymour, the 1st Duke of Somerset.¹⁷⁴ These women, all born roughly in the first half of the 1540s were too young to marry while their father still retained power.¹⁷⁵ Seymour was a new noble,¹⁷⁶ having come to prominence when his sister Jane married Henry VIII in 1537, so his daughters did not have the benefit of an ancient title to help soften the blow of their father's disgrace.¹⁷⁷ So when he fell and was executed they likely found themselves considered damaged goods on the marriage market. The daughters of Lucius Carey, discussed above, all entered a Catholic nunnery following their royalist father's death in the Civil War (thus under the Commonwealth they may have been associated with the losing side and their religious preferences would not have been in vogue during the reign of Cromwell). These women are the exceptions to the rule, however. Marital patterns of the daughters of noblemen who were executed indicates little if any effect on the prospects of their daughters.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ See Chapter Two for a discussion of the marital history of Seymour's wife, Anne Stanhope, and the effects of his execution on her.

¹⁷⁵ Their sister Anne, just a bit older, did marry Ambrose Dudley, the eldest son of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland; the man who superseded her father in power. However, that happened before Somerset's fall. Anne's second marriage was distinctly down, she married Sir Edward Unton in 1555. Other sisters who married did not do so well either; Mary married Francis Cosbie and Elizabeth wed Sir Richard Knightley, certainly not the matches that their familial connections would ordinarily make possible.

¹⁷⁶ See Chapter Five on the differing marriage patterns for daughters of new nobles.

¹⁷⁷ The other Duke's daughter who remained unmarried in the 16th century was Anne Howard, the daughter of the executed 4th Duke of Norfolk (d. 1572). Her sister Margaret married Robert Sackville, 2nd Earl of Dorset in 1579. So in this case the balance between attainder and ancient title seems to be even.

¹⁷⁸ The rather tentative language here is important as unmarried daughters were often not included in the genealogical records. The noblemen who had daughters who married following their fathers' execution were Archibald Campbell, 1st Marquess of Argyll (executed 1661); Archibald Campbell, 9th Earl of Argyll (executed 1685); Arthur Capell, 1st Baron Capell (executed 1649); Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex (executed 1601); George Gordon, 2nd Marquess of Huntly (executed 1649); Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (executed 1547); Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk (executed 1572); Alexander Home, 3rd Lord Home (executed 1546); James Radclyffe, 3rd Earl of Derwentwater (executed 1716); Henry Pole, Baron Montagu (executed 1539); William Ruthven, 1st Earl Gowrie (executed 1584); and John Dudley, Earl of Northumberland (executed 1553). Most of the daughters of these men appear to have married endogamously.

VII. Conclusion

Like all aristocratic women, heiresses, widows, and peeresses *suo jure* operated within constraints imposed upon them by Society and the law. That being said, these women did have opportunities not afforded to other elite women. The independence that they gained due to their status permitted them to exercise more agency in the choice of their mates. This can be seen most clearly in the case of widows who, despite the fact that their financial status made them attractive marriage partners, often chose to marry exogamously. The desirability of heiresses and peeresses permitted them to marry well, often to a man of higher social rank than would ordinarily be appropriate for a woman from their natal family. Aristocratic women who never married were also, to some extent, excused from the overweening constraints of society. Unfortunately, for these women, there appears to have been no really viable life choice for them and frequently they found themselves relegated to an itinerant life moving from household to household among their relatives and serving as unpaid nursemaids and hostesses.

Conclusion

On July 29, 1981, Diana Spencer, the barely twenty-year old youngest daughter of Earl Spencer,¹ walked down the aisle of St. Paul's Cathedral in London to marry Charles, Prince of Wales. Witnessing the beginning of this ill-fated fairy tale were Diana's two elder sisters, Sarah² and Jane.³ These daughters of the upper echelons of the aristocracy serve as a fitting illustration of the marriage patterns of late twentieth-century aristocratic women. According to the statistics gathered for this study, only 25.83 percent of elite British women married endogamously in the twentieth century. The Earl's eldest daughter Sarah entered into an exogamous union, just as 66.16 percent of her twentieth-century contemporaries did, marrying Neil McCorquodale, a Lincolnshire landowner⁴ in 1980. Jane, the Earl's second daughter, married Robert Fellowes, then Assistant Private Secretary to Queen Elizabeth II, in 1978. This union was also exogamous. Both Sarah and Jane, while marrying outside of titled ranks, married men of significant social standing, a pattern that is typical for twentieth century women of their social rank.⁵ The Spencer daughters' marriages to a large land owner, a court official, and a member of the royal family⁶ fits well with the fundamental argument of this project, that the marriages

¹ Edward Spencer (1924-1992), 8th Earl Spencer.

² She is generally known by her middle name Sarah, though her actual given name is Elizabeth.

³ She is generally known by her middle name Jane, though her actual given name is Cynthia.

⁴ McCorquodale's father was a well-known cricketer.

⁵ Their brother Charles, now 9th Earl Spencer, also followed a fairly typical marital path in that he has not shown a tendency to marry aristocratic women, but instead has a fondness for models. In 1989, he married the model Catherine Lockwood. The marriage ended in divorce in 1997 amid charges of serial adultery on the part of the Earl and alcoholism and eating disorders on the part of the Countess. They had four children. The 9th Earl then married Caroline Hutton, a former nursery school teacher in 2001. That marriage also ended in divorce in 2007 when he left her and their two children for an American TV host. He is currently engaged to marry Bianca Ciambriello, a former model and the widow of Jago Eliot, Lord Eliot. Lord Eliot was the son of the 10th Earl of St. Germans and the Hon. Jaquetta Lampson, the daughter of 1st Baron Killlearn. "Earl Spencer to Marry for Third Time," *Daily Telegraph*, March 26, 2010, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/theroyalfamily/7527371/Earl-Spencer-to-marry-for-third-time.html>.

⁶ In this context I see the royal family as the apex of the titular aristocracy.

of aristocratic women were an important means by which noble families solidified and expressed their sense of rank identity.

This study argues that despite great changes in British society during the period between 1485 and 1880-1920, the basic self-conception of rank identity changed little for the aristocracy. During that period, membership in that community⁷ was a remarkably durable idea.⁸ This project has analyzed the marriage patterns of the daughters of the titled aristocracy as a means to understand the concept of British aristocratic rank identity. From the last years of the fifteenth century through the first two decades of the twentieth, endogamous marriage remained the consistent goal for aristocratic women in Britain. This emphasis on the importance of endogamy demonstrates that the membership in the British aristocracy was a fundamental, and enduring, component of their identity.

When I began the statistical research for this project, I expected that upon analysis of the numbers I would find a time (I suspected that it would be in the eighteenth century) when the patterns radically shifted and that I would have two epochs of aristocratic rank identity to discuss. In short, I was looking for a revolution in the marital behaviour of aristocratic women and the self-perception of the nobility. I did not find

⁷ I am thinking here of Benedict Anderson's conception of the imagined community. In his examination of the roots of nationalism he sets out the idea of a community in which most of the members will never know one another, but "regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal comradeship." Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 2006): 6-7. This comradeship that Anderson speaks of transcends the generations and provides this conception of identity. Though he is writing of nationalism, it seems to me that his contentions have some pertinence for the understanding of the question of identity among the British aristocracy and go some way to explaining the durability of the self-definition that is shown in this project, at least for the period of 1485-1920.

⁸ This strategy does not appear to have been used only by the elite. Peter N. Stearns in his article "Gender and Working Class Identity in Britain During the 1950s," (*Journal of Social History* 34:4 (Summer, 2001): 773-795) argues that the working class used a nostalgia about traditional gender roles to maintain their own sense of a distinct identity.

such a revolution, certainly not where I expected it.⁹ What I found instead was more than four and a half centuries of continuity. That finding gave me pause, revolution is much easier to write about (or at least to make interesting) than is stasis. Because of those statistical findings however, continuity is an important theme in this study, and indeed, I make the assertion in the Introduction that historical continuity is as important as historical change in understanding the past.¹⁰ This assertion, it seems, is particularly true in the history of women. Judith M. Bennett asserted: “the overall status of women has not changed nearly as much as we might like to imagine.”¹¹ She quickly points out that this relative stasis does not imply an anti-historicism, rather it calls for a different approach to doing history. This study, while pointing out times and places of some change, emphasizes the continuity of the marital patterns of aristocratic women and by extension the continuity of aristocratic rank identity.

Throughout this project, the basic patterns held relatively steady until 1880-1920.¹² As it did for much of British society, World War One changed the marriage trends of aristocratic women. The stasis that characterized the marital patterns until that

⁹ There is a change after 1920 which may well represent such a revolution. However, it may not. Certainly the numbers are clear, marriage patterns did shift. But a real revolution should be reflected in the attitudes of aristocratic families and I am not sure that those have changed. A relatively few memoirs of mid to late twentieth century aristocratic women have been published (the genre appears to have gone out of style), but in those memoirs (for example, Liza Campbell’s *A Charmed Life* and Deborah Mitford’s *Wait for Me*) there are frequently statements that indicate that noble families continue to value endogamous marriage.

¹⁰ Continuity and Change are frequently used as a dyad in the titles of historical articles and books (and at least one journal). However, a close look at works that bear this phrase in their title reveals that the emphasis is more on change than on continuity. Indeed, in an article such as Judith Sharpe’s “Continuity and Change: Women’s History and Economic History in Britain,” [*The Economic History Review*, new series 48:2 (May, 1995): 353-369] the word continuity does not appear in the text of the article at all.

¹¹ Judith M. Bennett, “Women’s History: A Study in Continuity and Change,” *Women’s History Review* 2:2 (June 1993): 175.

¹² The word seemingly is used deliberately here. More research is needed in this area to determine the actual scope of that change. Since 1920, there have not been new creations in the hereditary peerage (with the exception of the family of the sovereign), instead life peerages have been awarded. It would be interesting to examine the marital patterns within those families. More information about the grooms of aristocratic daughters is also needed to determine what sort of men are marrying into the old families as this is likely to give insight into the changing conceptions of self-identity.

point was irrevocably broken.¹³ There are several reasons that explain this great shift. Young men of the noble families of Britain answered the call to serve in great numbers and with marked enthusiasm.¹⁴ Because they served in great numbers, they also died in great numbers,¹⁵ leaving far fewer appropriate men for aristocratic women to marry after the war. Many elite women were also widowed during the war and as has been seen in Chapter Seven, widows were more likely to marry exogamously than were first-time brides. Another likely cause of the change in the marriage patterns was that aristocratic women took advantage of the opportunity afforded by the war to expand their life experiences well beyond what had been possible before. The Duchess of Westminster,¹⁶ Lady Dudley,¹⁷ and the dowager Duchess of Sutherland¹⁸ all set up hospitals or ambulance services.¹⁹ Younger noble women also contributed to the war effort, often serving as nurses. This expansion of their horizons allowed them to see a world beyond

¹³ At least as of this writing the trend to endogamy has not reasserted itself.

¹⁴ Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall*, 72, 73.

¹⁵ For example: the youngest son of the 1st Earl of Ancaster and Lady Evelyn Gordon, Lt. Cmdr. Peter Willoughby was killed in 1914. Major William Caodogan, son of the 5th Earl of Cadogan and Lady Beatrix Craven was killed in action in 1914. Lt. Geoffrey Lambton, son of the 4th Earl of Durham died in 1914. Capt. Arthur Hamilton, son of the 2nd Duke of Abercorn and Lady Mary Curzon was killed in action in 1914. Major Lord George Stewart-MacMurray, son of the 7th Duke of Atholl was killed in 1914. The eldest son of the 3rd Viscount Hardinge of Lahore and King's Newton, Lt. Henry Hardinge was killed at the age of 19 in 1915. Lt. William Wyndham, the son of 2nd Baron Leconfield and Lady Constance Primrose died in action in 1914. Lord Arthur Hay, son of 10th Marquess of Tweeddale was killed in 1914 at the age of 28. The son of the 4th Duke of Wellington, Captain Richard Wellesley died in 1914 as a result of wounds received in battle. Captain Heneage Finch, Lord Geurnsey, the eldest son of the 8th Earl of Aylesford was killed in 1914 (he left as a widow Gladys Fellowes whom he had married in 1907 and a son, the future 9th Earl of Aylesford who had been born in 1908). The eldest son of the 4th Earl of Yarborough and Marcia Lane-Fox, Baroness Conyers, Charles Pelham was killed in action in 1914 (he left Alexandra Vivian widowed). The heir of the 2nd Baron O'Neill and Lady Annabel Crewe-Milnes, Capt. Arthur O'Neill, was killed in 1914. Charles Lister, only son of the 4th Baron Ribblesdale was killed in August 1915. The youngest son of the 11th Earl of Wemyss, Ivo Charteris, was killed in 1915 at the age of 19.

¹⁶ Constance Cornwallis-West. In 1916, Michael Hicks-Beach, Viscount Quenington, only son of the 1st Earl of St. Aldwyn was killed. John Thynn, Viscount Weymouth, son and heir to the 5th Marquess of Bath died in action in 1916. Charles Duncombe, 2nd Earl of Feversham, died in 1916 at the age of 37. The 19th Earl of Suffolk, Henry Howard, was killed in 1917. Richard Boyle, 7th Earl of Shannon, was killed at the age of 19 in 1917.

¹⁷ Rachel Gurney.

¹⁸ Millicent St. Claire-Erskine.

¹⁹ Cannadine, *Decline and Fall*, 73.

the previously constricted view of Society. Their service also allowed them to mix with men of far more varied backgrounds than they had met before the conflict. There had long been a tendency to include military officers as *de facto* members of the elite²⁰ (one just has to think of the novels of Jane Austen) and this escalated after World War One. Men who served their nation were seen as being honourable and found their way into elite Society. Unlike the broadening of the boundaries of Society that occurred when the plutocrats were admitted in the nineteenth century, most of these men did not receive titles. Once they had made it through the doors, even without a title, they became acceptable spouses for aristocratic women. The war appears to have changed the lived experience of the women of the British aristocracy in such a way that they no longer accepted the old constrictions that bolstered the traditional self-identity of the rank.

This project argues that it is possible to increase our understanding of the British aristocracy and the persistence of rank by examining the marriage patterns of one of their most important assets, their daughters. Young aristocratic women understood from a very early age the importance of marrying men who improved the standing of their natal families and the evidence presented in the chapters above indicates the power of that indoctrination. This attitude shifted significantly after 1920, as the statistics indicate a large increase in the number of exogamous marriages after that date. However, even in the wake of that shift there is still a high level of continuity in the self-perception concerning the rank identity of the British aristocracy.²¹ The trappings of the pre-War

²⁰ Of course, the origins of the nobility as a rank are found in their role as a military caste.

²¹ There are not a great many collections of writings by aristocratic women in the late twentieth century available at the present time. It would be fascinating to know if the quest for endogamy is still present but simply not being accomplished.

Society did not fall away immediately. The presentations of debutantes at Court continued until 1958 and though the proportion of aristocratic women who marry aristocratic men has plummeted, dropping from a rate of 29.14 percent in the decade of 1921-1930 to 11.63 percent between 1991 and 2000,²² it does still happen as the opening vignette about the marriage of Lady Diana Spencer to Charles, Prince of Wales illustrates.²³

The British aristocracy placed the well-being of the collective whole of the family and of the rank above that of the individual.²⁴ For well over four centuries, in the face of massive social, religious, and political change, this identity remained stable. The British aristocracy always perceived itself as a rank in which lineage determined membership. Because of this emphasis on the importance of bloodline, they carefully controlled the marriages of their offspring. The deeply patriarchal nature of British society is shown by the importance placed on securing appropriate husbands for these women. If a person's

22

Decade	Endogamous		Hypogamous		Exogamous	
1901-1910	90/216	41.67%	43/216	19.90%	83/216	38.43%
1911-1920	72/186	38.71%	17/186	9.14%	97/186	52.15%
1921-1930	44/151	29.14%	14/151	9.26%	93/151	61.60%
1931-1940	46/164	28.05%	11/164	6.71%	107/164	65.24%
1941-1950	27/152	17.76%	12/152	7.90%	113/152	74.34%
1951-1960	24/119	20.17%	15/119	12.60%	80/119	67.23%
1961-1970	18/118	15.25%	5/118	4.24%	95/118	80.51%
1971-1980	17/114	14.91%	8/114	7.02%	89/114	78.07%
1981-1990	14/122	11.45%	4/122	3.30%	104/122	85.25%
1991-2000	5/43	11.63%	1/43	2.32%	37/43	86.05%

²³ For the purposes of this study, this marriage is nothing more than a rather grand endogamous union. The daughter of an Earl married to a man of titled rank. The extended royal family has married into the landed aristocracy with some regularity in the twentieth century. In addition to the union of Charles and Diana, in 1993 Serena Stanhope, the daughter of the 12th Earl of Harrington married David Armstrong-Jones, Viscount Linley, the son of Princess Margaret (the current Queen's younger sister) and the 1st Earl of Snowdon. In previous generations, Prince Albert (later King George VI) married Elizabeth Bowes-Lyon, daughter of the 14th Earl of Strathmore. Alice Montagu-Douglas-Scott, the daughter of the 9th Duke of Queensbury married Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester (son of King George V) in 1935.

²⁴ The willingness of the young men of the elite to serve in World War One exemplifies this same attitude of sacrifice of the self for the greater good.

father belonged to the upper ranks then that person automatically also belonged to the elite; the same was not inevitably true if only a person's mother came from the noble rank. Thus, noble British families could allow their sons to marry exogamously for a variety of reasons and still rest easy in the secure knowledge that the children of that union belonged in their ranks. However, if their daughter did not marry endogamously, her children did not have the same security. Charlotte Bertie's great concern about the social standing of her children demonstrates this attitude. This study argues that understanding the marriage patterns of aristocratic British women permits a greater understanding of the self-perceived identity of the British aristocracy and that further, that perceived identity remained remarkably stable from 1485 to 1880-1920, only really changing following the great disturbance of World War One.

Appendix I: Changing concepts of femininity and masculinity

It is an obvious statement that marriage and the choice of a spouse are highly gendered activities. Both the women who got married and the men that they married operated within societal expectations, both for themselves and for their potential mates. The characteristics of an ideal aristocratic female did not change drastically in the centuries from 1485-1920. The aristocracy expected that she be essentially a passive personification of rank identity. The ideal noble woman subordinated herself to the good of her family and rank. The characteristics of an ideal noble man (as a spouse for an aristocratic woman) changed much more during the period from 1485-2000. Initially, he had to have little more than a title and the wealth to support that title. By the nineteenth century, however, title and wealth remained desirable characteristics, but noble women also sought a man with good character. These elements of femininity and masculinity within the aristocratic rank were closely linked to the overall conception of rank identity.

I. Femininity

Margaret P. Hannay sums up the essentially unchanging conception of elite women from 1485 until at least 1920, “Aristocratic girls were necessarily judged in terms of their marriageability, based primarily on criteria over which they had little control – lineage, dowry, and beauty.”¹ Although Society expected these women to conform to strict rules of deportment, they were fundamentally passive carriers of characteristics valued by others. Conceptions of what constituted appropriate feminine behaviour

¹ Hannay, “O Daughter Heare,” 38-39.

remained remarkably stable over those five centuries. The discourse that surrounded elite marriages found in documents such as letters, memoirs, and diaries also sheds light on issues of femininity. During the early modern and modern centuries, elite women learned appropriate behaviour, in part, from instruction manuals.² According to Joanne Bailey “aristocratic women drew on [the language of the prescription manuals] which emphasized their obedience to men, to demonstrate their own virtue and thus their moral authority.”³ The ideal early modern woman was meek and submissive. The advice literature repeated this stricture so often that one is left with the distinct impression that very many of the women were anything but meek and submissive⁴ (and the careers of such women as Anne Boleyn, Bess of Hardwick, and Margaret Douglas bear out that impression). The social expectations of the Tudor age left room for maneuver. If a woman remained “married, chaste, and obedient,” she could largely do as she pleased.⁵ However, as Tim Stretton points out in his important book, *Women Waging Law*, that freedom had an ambiguous result. He asserts that the patriarchal system created a space between ideal behaviour and reality by seeing to it that even if women did not live up to the idealized image, they at least attempted not to sink to the depths of the negative images found in the texts.⁶ Early modern aristocratic women served as a compliment and

² The goal of the education of these women was to make them good, competent wives. It was important that they be capable of running the day-to-day business of their households. The rules for her household set out by Jane Stanhope, the wife of the 7th Lord Berkeley are a clear indication of her skills as an administrator. BL Add. MSS 33588 f. 44-49.

³ Bailey, *Unquiet Lives*, 135.

⁴ Paula L. Scalingi, “The Scepter or the Distaff: the Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516-1607,” *The Historian* 41 (1978), 60; Linda Pollock, “Teach Her to Live Under Obedience: the Making of Women in the Upper Ranks of Early Modern England,” *Continuity and Change* 4 (1989), 231; Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage*, 198; Alice T. Friedman, Portrait of a Marriage: the Willoughby Letters of 1585-1586,” *Signs* 11 (Spring 1986), 543.

⁵ Pollock, “Teach Her to Live Under Obedience,” 232.

⁶ Bailey, *Unquiet Lives*, 9.

a foil to their husbands.⁷ In the seventeenth century Margaret Lucas described what her husband the Marquess of Newcastle⁸ found attractive in her, “For my Lord the M of Newcastle did approve of those bashful fears which may be condemned⁹ and would choose such a wife as he might bring to his own humours...”¹⁰

Society expected a noble woman to conform not only to her husband’s humours; very often her natal family had similar expectations. Women sometimes aimed significant criticism at other women whose behavior did not conform to the meek and mild ideal. In 1707, Anne Churchill, Countess of Sutherland wrote to her mother Sarah Jenkins, the formidable Duchess of Marlborough, about Anne’s sister Mary, “I am happy for what you write me of my Sister Montagu¹¹ for tho I don’t pretend to justify her at all in what she does I know nobody can be more troubled than she is whenever she has said or done anything that is not right to you, but tho she has not the mildest temper, I should hope my dear mama would not quite abandon her, tho it is not reasonable to be so tenderly kind to her as if she had not angered you.”¹²

The aristocracy frequently saw piety as an important characteristic in a good wife. In 1573 Henry Hastings the 3rd Earl of Huntingdon¹³ wrote to John Manners, the 4th Earl of Rutland¹⁴ to congratulate the latter upon his marriage,¹⁵ “I trust you have chosen well and I am sure of it, if the report be true that she fears God, loves the Gospel and hates

⁷ Pollock, “Teach Her,” 232.

⁸ William Cavendish, later 1st Duke of Newcastle.

⁹ She is claiming that she was unfashionably shy.

¹⁰ Cavendish, *The Life*, 288.

¹¹ Mary Churchill.

¹² BL Add. MSS 61422, f. 34.

¹³ 1536-1595.

¹⁴ Died 1588.

¹⁵ He married Elizabeth Charlton.

Popery.”¹⁶ Richard Boyle, 1st Earl of Cork¹⁷ noted that one of his wife’s¹⁸ best traits was that she was “most religious.”¹⁹ In 1647, J. Duncan wrote a life of Lettice (Letitia) Morison, Viscountess Falkland in which he set out her admirable qualities, the majority of which were spiritual: “Such a clarity of understanding and such a mildness are rarely found together, so far she was from being puffed up with knowledge, that she much edified herself by it, even in humility.”²⁰ In her widowhood, she dedicated herself to religion and did not give in to her “anguish of spirit.”²¹ She, to the extent it was possible, only spoke of spiritual matters. She also practiced moderation in her eating and drinking.²²

From the sixteenth through the early twentieth century, Society expected that women would be charming and entertaining conversationalists, but certainly not overly flirtatious. It was not a compliment if a noble woman had the reputation of being a coquette, as Mary Howard, Duchess of Richmond did in the early sixteenth century.²³ In the nineteenth century, Constance Rothschild characterized the Viennese ladies eager to meet the visiting British Princes with that term in a letter to her sister Annie, “They are the most cheese-faced coquettes. But very pretty!!”²⁴ The real complaint against those described as coquettes was that they tended to be foolish and frivolous. Mary Pierrepont, in her essay “The Nonsense of Common Sense” published in January 1738, decried the treatment of many women that damaged their characters:

¹⁶ Meads, *Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, 7.

¹⁷ 1566-1643

¹⁸ Catherine Fenton

¹⁹ Cannay, *The Upstart Earl*, 85.

²⁰ BL Add. MSS 45388, f. 6.

²¹ BL Add. MSS 45388, f. 10.

²² BL Add. MSS 45388, f. 11.

²³ Casady, *Henry Howard*, 180.

²⁴ BL Add. MSS 47963, ff. 98-99.

Among the most universal errors, I reckon that of treating the weaker sex with a contempt which has a very bad influence on their conduct. How many of them think it excuse enough to say they are women, to indulge any folly that comes into their heads! This renders them useless members of the commonwealth and only burdensome to their own families, where the wise husband thinks he lessens the opinion of his own understanding, if he at any time condescends to consult his wife's. Thus, what reason nature has given them is thrown away, and a blind obedience expected from them by all their ill-natured masters, and, on the other side, as blind a complacence shown by those that are indulgent, who say often, that women's weakness must be complied with, and it is a vain troublesome attempt to make them hear reason.²⁵

Women seen as the opposite of the coquette quite frequently received praise as can be seen in the letter that Therese Parker wrote to her brother Fritz in March 1774 about an important Society wedding:

The Duke of Devonshire's²⁶ match with Lady G. Spencer²⁷ is all declared and settled. She is vastly well spoken of indeed, by everybody that knows her at all... her manner is remarkably open, good humoured and unaffected and her education has been carefully directed. She is rather too young as I cannot help thinking a misfortune to any Woman to marry at 16, but it will be of less consequence to her, being upon such a good footing with her Mother²⁸ and meeting with what I really fancy will make a good husband, tho his appearance is against him.²⁹

As much praise as non-coquettishness received from aristocratic women, they also sadly understood that sometimes that kind of woman did not possess the lively personality that could hold the love of her husband. Mary Pierrepont wrote in a letter to her daughter Mary Wortley Montagu, the Countess of Bute in 1751, "My poor friend the Duchess of Bolton³⁰ was educated in solitude, with some choice of books, by a saint-like governess, crammed with virtue and good qualities; she thought it impossible not to find gratitude, though she failed to give passion; and upon this plan she threw away her estate, was

²⁵ Montagu, *Works*, 532.

²⁶ William Cavendish (1748-1811), 5th Duke of Devonshire.

²⁷ Georgiana Spencer.

²⁸ Margaret Poyntz.

²⁹ BL Add. MSS 48218, f. 199.

³⁰ Anne Vaughan.

despised by her husband, and laughed at by the public.”³¹ Beleaguered aristocratic women thought that often the coquette attracted and held the man more effectively than did a respectable woman.

A woman needed more than just rank in order to stand out in Society. The characteristic that most often made women noticeable was their looks. In 1773, Therese Parker wrote to her brother Lord Grantham an account of some of the notable women in London at the time. Her assessment of them rests nearly entirely on their appearance:

Lady Irwin³² was there, being come to town this winter after eleven years Banishment, she is very entertaining, but not so well looking as I imagined. Lady Craven³³ is by far the Handsomest of any body about – Lady Augusta Campbell³⁴ will be, by the time you return, if she grows tall enough, and her face remains as it is, but I think Lady Louisa Fitzpatrick is what you would approve of most, at present (not upon the footing of a Beauty, tho very pretty) but for Behaviour, Countenance, Manner and the Style you like.³⁵

On January 21, 1857, the *Times* wrote of “the Lady Mary Isabella Somerset, youngest daughter of Charles, 4th Duke of Beaufort, who died in 1831, long after she had outlived her reputation as the most beautiful woman of her age.”³⁶ Great beauty could overcome a lesser rank and families often counted on this as in the case of Edith Jocelyn, Mabella Gore’s mother, whose beauty came to people’s notice in the schoolroom and whose mother intended her to make a brilliant match in her first season.³⁷ Harriett Fane in 1822 had great hopes for her younger stepdaughter as “she dances very well and is very

³¹ Montagu, *Works*, 355.

³² This is likely Frances Shephard, the wife of 9th Viscount Irwin. Lady Irwin had a marked preference for life in the country at Temple Newsam over London. Judith S. Lewis, “When a House is not a Home: Elite English Women and the Eighteenth Century English Country House,” *Journal of British Studies* 48 (April 2009): 348.

³³ Elizabeth Berkeley.

³⁴ Likely Augusta Campbell, daughter of the 5th Duke of Argyll.

³⁵ BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 128-29.

³⁶ “The Late Duke of Rutland, K.G.” *The London Times*, Jan. 21, 1857, #22583, p. 9.

³⁷ Arlie, *Thatched with Gold*, 19.

pretty.”³⁸ The lack of beauty could at times be overcome; Mary Clavering, Countess of Cowper, in a journal entry from 1716 wrote, “My Lady Dorchester’s³⁹ wit makes amends for her Ugliness. She always has more to say for herself than Anybody.”⁴⁰ As Lady Dorchester had gained her title by being the mistress of James II (both before and after he came to the throne), this comment may well have been a back-handed compliment.

In the late nineteenth century,⁴¹ Annie Rothschild, while in service with the court and travelling a great deal in that capacity, included in her letters back to her family many comments that give a good picture of what a well-bred woman of the era was supposed to be like: “Lady ___⁴² and Lady Dunmore⁴³ are decidedly dull, the latter is especially difficult to get on with, and has a little dreary voice, which on the rare occasions it is heard is rather soporific. Lady Anne⁴⁴ is by far the nicest, she is really very dear and jolly: her great [passion] is theology, and she is at present deep in Josephus.”⁴⁵ She described another woman at court, “She is a bright, clever little woman . . . perfectly natural and unaffected.”⁴⁶ In another letter she stated, “The Duchess is really charming, one of the most agreeable women I have ever met and as simple and natural as possible.”⁴⁷ In yet another letter, “Lady Harriett is very amiable and clever without being very lively.”⁴⁸

³⁸ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:136.

³⁹ Catherine Sedley.

⁴⁰ Cowper, *Diary of Mary, Countess Cowper*, 74.

⁴¹ Most likely this letter was written before Anne Coke’s marriage in January 1874.

⁴² The name was unreadable in the manuscript. It is most likely Julia Coke, Viscountess Powerscourt or Winifred Coke, Countess of Leitrim.

⁴³ Gertrude Coke.

⁴⁴ Anne Coke.

⁴⁵ BL Add. MSS 47963, ff. 53-56.

⁴⁶ BL Add. MSS 47963, ff. 68-71.

⁴⁷ BL Add. MSS 47963, f. 73.

⁴⁸ BL Add. MSS 47963, ff. 126-127.

Proper behaviour was always the hallmark of an elite woman. The rules that governed their social interactions were often quite inflexible and one misstep could destroy a woman's chances. They had to guard against even the perception of illicit behaviour. In 1715, Peregrine Osborne, Marquess of Carmarthen⁴⁹ wrote to his mother Bridget Hyde, Duchess of Leeds "... to acquaint you with a report now in town which is that my sister Bridget⁵⁰ is with child. . . because she's no company Your Grace will consider and let us know what you think proper for my sister to do on this occasion. I must own I would have her see company with my Sister Beaufort⁵¹ to convince the world of the fallacy of the report."⁵² Society saw women with damaged reputations as lucky if they managed to make an appropriate marriage. In May 1824, Harriet Fane wrote, "Lady Elizabeth Conyngham is to be married to Lord Strathaven."⁵³ At least he has made an offer and I think they will accept him. He is a very good natured rattle and I think, considering all her adventures,⁵⁴ she will be fortunate to end in this manner."⁵⁵ Relatively small transgressions could call a woman's reputation into question. Louisa Bowater described a dance in her youth in the 1860s where she was troubled with a too attentive admirer: "I danced twice with him but refused to give him a third dance, saying that I was never allowed to dance more than twice with anyone and that I felt bound to be careful in my mother's absence."⁵⁶ Isabel Marjoribanks noted the proscription against dancing too often

⁴⁹ Later 3rd Duke of Leeds (1691-1731).

⁵⁰ Bridget had entered into a clandestine marriage with a Rev. Williams. This initially caused discord in her family, but she was eventually reconciled to them and they obtained preferment for her husband. "A Gossiping Letter of the Eighteenth Century," *Notes and Queries* 6th ser, vol. 11 (Jan-June, 1895): 443n.

⁵¹ Mary Osborne.

⁵² BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 128.

⁵³ Charles Gordon (1792-1868). He became the Earl of Aboyne in 1836 and the Marquess of Huntley in 1853. He married Elizabeth in March 1826.

⁵⁴ It was rumoured that she was to marry George IV.

⁵⁵ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:317.

⁵⁶ Cartwright, *The Journals of Lady Knightley*, 53-54.

with one man. She said of the 1870s and 1880s, “We did not fox-trot nor Charleston, and it was a marked thing to dance more than twice with the same partner. . .”⁵⁷ The 4th Earl of Clarendon⁵⁸ wrote in 1863 to the Duchess of Manchester⁵⁹ a wonderfully acerbic assessment of a woman in their circle, “I suppose you have heard that Lady D. . . t has thrown over her beautiful Mr. Mitford – quantity rather than quality of lovers seems to be her object and it is always pleasant to succeed in what one attempts.”⁶⁰ As all of these comments across the centuries illustrate, an aristocratic woman had to possess a good reputation and behave in accordance with the dictates of Society.

A woman could not be simply beautiful and well-behaved. She needed accomplishments as well. Lady Betty Berkeley, writing in 1760 to Lord George Sackville⁶¹ gave a rather ambivalent description of a laudable young woman of the era, “The Miss Coats Lady Temple⁶² brought is a mighty pretty woman, well-bred and sensible; sings both French and English, though never learnt either French or to sing; has prodigious fine black eye-brows, and half her eye lashes are white, the other half black.”⁶³ It is apparent that Lady Betty thought little of the girl’s accomplishments (or appearance). *The Times*, in 1868, described Harriet Howard, the Dowager Duchess of Sutherland, in glowing terms, “The late Duchess devoted much of her attention to architecture and horticulture; but it is not only as a leader of the world of taste and fashion, but also as a philanthropist, that her name will be long remembered, for many a project for the relief of distress among the poorer classes of the metropolis and the

⁵⁷ Aberdeen, *More Cracks*, 10.

⁵⁸ George Villiers.

⁵⁹ Luise von Alten.

⁶⁰ Kennedy, *My Dear Duchess*, 23.

⁶¹ Most likely 1st Viscount Sackville (1716-1785).

⁶² Possibly Anne Chambers.

⁶³ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Mrs. Stopford-Sackville of Drayton House, Northamptonshire* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1904), I:45.

country at large, and more especially among her own sex, has been initiated at meetings held under her auspices at Stafford house.”⁶⁴

In 1679, Edward Conway, the 1st Earl of Conway became a widower. Immediately he came under pressure to remarry, and he did not lack advice as to the type of woman others considered appropriate. The Viscount Massereene⁶⁵ recommended the “daughter of a family unquestionably noble, ancient and very sober in their education, the young lady is well qualified, her fortune plentiful.”⁶⁶ Sir Edward Horle wrote to the Earl, “I lately received two letters, desiring me to represent to your thoughts Lord Crewe’s daughter. She is mentioned as a very desirable character, her portion to be 500 £. I must also say that Lady Clare⁶⁷ would be extremely satisfied if your inclination might be turned toward one of her family with the like portion.”⁶⁸ Even his secretary had advice to tender:

Seeing you have made so little progress I propounded another lady. I have not seen her, but take the following relation to be as true as if I had been an eyewitness. She is virtuous and discreet, a knight’s daughter. Her sister is married to a Lord. She is about 22, and has 10,000 £ portion besides the possibility of a share in the estate her father intends for an only son who is weakly and will probably scarce live to be a man. She is also represented to be so handsome that no man need be ashamed to own her for his lady.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ “The Dowager Duchess of Sutherland,” p. 9.

⁶⁵ John Skeffington (d. 1695), 2nd Viscount Massereene. His advice is particularly noteworthy as his title came to him through his wife Mary Clotworthy, the only child of 1st Viscount Massereene.

⁶⁶ Quoted in Sarah Hutton and Marjorie Hope Nicholson, eds, *The Conway Letters: the Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry Moore and their Friends* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 464.

⁶⁷ Grace Pierrepont.

⁶⁸ Quoted in Hutton, *The Conway Letters*, 464.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

Conway's agent also chimed in supporting this match, "The lady is a relative of Lord Townshend's. Her portion will be 10,000 £ down, and another 10,000 £ after her father and mother, if her brother, who is a weak youth by default of his nurse, miscarry."⁷⁰

As Judith M. Bennett stated, one of the truisms of women's history is that the overall status of women changed very little until the modern era.⁷¹ This accurately describes the position of aristocratic British women from the fifteenth to the twentieth century. The characteristics deemed desirable in these women changed little until World War One, when the characteristics of noble Society itself changed drastically. The aristocratic woman functioned in a sense as the personification of the rank identity of the nobility. Her behaviour and personal characteristics reflected on the rank as a whole and violation of the agreed upon norms incurred social sanctions.

II. Masculinity

During the period from 1485 to 2000, the characteristics that made a man a fitting match for an aristocratic woman in the eyes of Society changed more drastically than did the expectations for women. In the early modern period, men needed rank, power and influence, and money. In 1680, Frances Savile wrote to Frances Yelverton, Lady Hatton, "I believe my sister Mary will be married within this month I hope very happily to one of 2000 pounds a year."⁷² By the nineteenth century, men still had to have rank and money, but character had become an important consideration as well. In 1850, Sir A. Edmonston wrote that a man achieved true gentility through "a rigid course of self-denial, by a severe

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Bennett, "Women's History,"

⁷² BL Add. MSS 29558 f. 45-46.

reign on every appetite and affection.”⁷³ The late Victorians had a real skepticism that highly educated and refined elite men could develop the aggressive natures needed to compete in the hostile world of business and industry. Christian rectitude and self-restraint no longer characterized a manly man. Rather, a true man needed to be capable of dominating the world around him. Institutions such as boys-only schools, organized sports, and male clubs evolved to arouse and direct this burgeoning masculinity.⁷⁴ In the late Victorian era, aristocrats found their masculinity challenged. They were easy targets in that period of hyper-masculinity of charges of being effete and non-productive.⁷⁵

Andrew Adonis in *Making Aristocracy Work* has described the reduction of the power of the House of Lords in the nineteenth century as an emasculation of the nobility. Critics argued that members no longer had a purpose.⁷⁶ Jonathan Rutherford gives a list of the characteristics of Victorian upper class men who were raised in “highly gendered, maternally focused households.” These characteristics include “loneliness and a sense of inner longing; an impossibly idealized mother... encased in a fantasy home steeped in tender love and care; alternating misogynistic rejection and emotional need” of women; a fond, almost feminine attitude toward the father or father figure; a cult of boyishness and sentimental attachment to brotherhoods; a search for identity in nostalgically imagined communities of class, nation, or race.”⁷⁷

In the late fifteenth and the sixteenth century, it was vital that a prospective groom for an aristocratic woman own a significant amount of land. In 1496, Sir Robert

⁷³ Quoted in Rothery, “The Reproductive Behavior,” 687.

⁷⁴ Nancy W. Ellenberger, “Constructing George Wyndham: Narratives of Aristocratic Masculinity in Fin-De-Siecle England.” *Journal of British Studies* 39:4 (Oct 2000), 491.

⁷⁵ Ellenberger, “Constructing George Wyndham,” 491.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 515.

⁷⁷ Quoted in Ellenberger, “Constructing George Wyndham,” 493.

Radcliffe⁷⁸ stipulated that his daughters must marry men with land worth 200 marks a year or more.⁷⁹ Charles Somerset, Earl of Worcester⁸⁰ insisted that his daughter's⁸¹ husband be worth 300 marks if his income derived from inherited land, and 400 marks if he did not possess heritable land.⁸² Land meant position (very often title), wealth and security in early-modern Britain.

Elite men often competed for the hand of an especially desirable bride and the characteristics that these men chose to showcase in their competition indicate what an aristocratic man was supposed to be. In the early 1540s, Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox,⁸³ and Patrick Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell⁸⁴ made spectacles of themselves at the Scottish court trying to win the hand of the Dowager Queen, Mary of Guise. They strutted, preened, and danced, much to the amusement of onlookers, in a bid to convince her to choose one of them. Ultimately, both failed and Mary remained unmarried.⁸⁵ They had no need to prove that they had the money or the breeding to deserve Mary; everyone knew that. Their goal was to be attractive and amusing.

In the seventeenth century noble women's letters begin show a greater concern with character, especially of the prospective groom, and compatibility that became

⁷⁸ Radcliffe was knighted for his service to the Tudor dynasty at the Battle of Stoke in 1487.

⁷⁹ Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 53.

⁸⁰ C. 1460-1526. He was the illegitimate son of Henry Beaufort, 2nd Duke of Somerset.

⁸¹ Mary Somerset.

⁸² Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 53.

⁸³ Matthew Stuart (1516-1571), 4th Earl of Lennox. There is some irony in that despite his failure to woo Mary of Guise, Lennox's son, Henry Lord Darnley married Mary's daughter, Mary Queen of Scots.

⁸⁴ Patrick Hepburn (c. 1512-1556), 3rd Earl of Bothwell. The irony of this competition is increased when one realizes that the son of Bothwell was likely involved in the murder of Lennox's son and then married Mary of Guise's daughter Mary, Queen of Scots.

⁸⁵ William Fraser, *The Lennox, vol. I: Memoirs* (Edinburgh: C.T. and A. Constable, 1874), 368; Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: G. Philip, 1988), 129; Clifford, *The State Papers of Ralph Sadler* (Edinburgh: Constable, 1809), I:265.

prominent in the nineteenth century.⁸⁶ In 1610, Cecilia Ridgeway wrote to Lady Willoughby concerning the upcoming marriage of their children, “But our acquaintance with your son himself makes us all love him above all; and of troth, I truly say he is just the same, if I should wish, that I would choose for a husband to her whom I dearly love. His pleasing manner and sweet disposition works more in my affections than the greatness of his rank. Wherefore, sweet Madame, accept my best thanks for your kind assent to his happy motion...”⁸⁷ This concern with character appeared in the 1636 letter from Dorothy Percy, Countess of Leicester to her husband⁸⁸ in which she somewhat snidely commented concerning the behaviour of some young men: “My sister⁸⁹ came hither the last week and is greater in her own conceit than ever she was, for to her gallants are more her slaves then I think ever men were to any women.”⁹⁰ The next year she wrote to her husband concerning possible matches for their daughter Dorothy Sydney:

One of those two lords [the Earl of Holland⁹¹ and the Earl of Northumberland⁹²] you think likely husbands for [Dorothy] are disposed on after a long debate and if [the Earl of Holland] do entreat himself for the other he is a very false unworthy creature, which I am not extreme far from believing, for I fear he is a juggler as far as his will will permit. I know there are very few ways of disposing well of our dear child, which I consider often with much trouble, and though more of her

⁸⁶ This is true even on the less elite level. In 1693 May Stanning wrote, “Dear Sister, I suppose you have heard that my sister Mary Barker is married, or ____ to be married, to our Mr. Br(ig?) of Coolbroke, a baronet fine, or ____ miles from this, he has but a small estate, but he is a very mild man...” She then gives an approving account of his breaking up a fight in town. BL Add. MSS 48218, f. 4.

⁸⁷ Cassandra, Duchess of Chandos, *The Continuation of the History of the Willoughby Family*, A.C. Wood, ed. (Eton: The Shakespeare Head Press, 1958), 74.

⁸⁸ Robert Sydney, 2nd Earl of Leicester.

⁸⁹ Lucy Percy, who was widowed that year.

⁹⁰ HMC, *De L'Isle*, 6:67-68.

⁹¹ It is unclear to whom she is referring here. In 1636 the Earl of Holland was Henry Rich, 1st Earl of Holland (1590-1649). His wife, Isabel Cope, did not die until 1655.

⁹² Algernon Percy, (1602-1668) 10th Earl of Northumberland. He was widowed in 1637, when his first wife Anne Cecil died. He married Elizabeth Howard in 1642.

quality be in like condition, yet is that no ease to my affliction but to the will of God I will submit...⁹³

Nearly fifty years later, Dorothy Sydney herself, now the Dowager Duchess of Sunderland, described what she considered an undesirable man to son-in-law, George Savile, the Marquess of Halifax:⁹⁴ “Here is my secret; I fear Mr. Pierrepont⁹⁵ will not prove a good husband: he is yet fond of her,⁹⁶ but so unquiet in his house, and so miserable the servants say, in all that is not for show, that they are all weary and coming away. He calls the women all the ill names that are, and meddles with everything in the kitchen much.”⁹⁷ Proper character, of course, was not sufficient; property mattered as well. In 1641, Mary Boyle, the daughter of the 1st Earl of Cork defied her family and decided to marry Charles Rich, the second son of the 2nd Earl of Warwick. At that time, no one expected that he would succeed his brother as the 4th Earl and his lack of prospects and fortune concerned the romantically inclined Mary, “I considered my mind was too high, and I too expensively brought up to bring myself to live contentedly with Mr. Rich’s fortune, who would never have, when his father was dead, above 13 or 14 (at the most) hundred pounds per year.”⁹⁸

⁹³ HMC, *De L’Isle*, 6: 92-93. A month later she is still writing about finding a husband for their daughter, “... I told you all I know about Lord Lovelace (John Lovelace, [1616-1670], 2nd Baron Lovelace). I cannot find that Doll has any dislike to him, though she will not commend him, and since they saw one another I have heard nothing of him, but when he returns to this town we shall certainly know more of his mind, if he continues to desire her.” HMC, *De L’Isle*, 6:103. Dorothy married Henry Spencer, 1st Earl of Sunderland in 1639.

⁹⁴ George Savile (1633-1695), 1st Marquess of Halifax. Halifax was married first to Dorothy Spencer and after her death in 1670 he married Gertrude Pierrepont.

⁹⁵ Gervaise Pierrepont, 1st Baron Pierrepont of Ardglass.

⁹⁶ Lucy Pelham. She was Dorothy’s cousin (she was the daughter of Dorothy’s aunt Lucy Sydney).

⁹⁷ Lady Rachael Russell, *Letters of Lady Rachael Russell; from the manuscript in the library at Woburn Abbey. To which is Prefixed, an Introduction, Vindicating the Character of Lord Russell Against Sir John Dalrymple, &c.* (London, 1801), 339-340. The letter was written in July 1680.

⁹⁸ Rich, *Autobiography*, 7-8.

In the eighteenth century, the ideal man possessed a combination of substantial fortune, good birth, and high character.⁹⁹ A friend of Lady Suffolk's¹⁰⁰ wrote to her in about 1719 describing the sort of man she did not enjoy spending time with:

I am very pleased to find you are of my opinion I have always thought the men who will be nothing but a man of wit, often disoblige than entertains the company. There is nothing tries our patience more than that person who arrogantly is ever showing his superiority over the company he is engaged in. He, and his [sort] I think very like the woman whose whole ambition is only to be handsome. She is in continual care about her own charms and neglects the world and he is always endeavoring to be more witty than all the world which proceeding makes them both disagreeable companions.¹⁰¹

Anne Robinson, writing to her brother in 1725 had this opinion about a match: "Miss Palk is going to be married very soon, to Sir Bouchier Wrey,¹⁰² a Devonshire Baronet, younger and much better in appearance and manner than Sir John Chichester, for whom she was once talked of."¹⁰³ In 1766 Sarah Lennox wrote to her sister: "Lord Ossory¹⁰⁴ I doat upon, tho' he is not handsome or conceited, but I know him to have so amiable a character from Sir Charles, whose greatest friend he is, that I like everything he does."¹⁰⁵ That same year Sarah disparaged John, Lord Mount Stuart¹⁰⁶ as "tall, well-made, and very handsome; he is sensible, and 'tis the fashion to cry him up; I think he is very conceited and seems to me to be very proud and vain, but yet is very well bred and does vastly well for a beau."¹⁰⁷ Men who lived beyond their means and got their just deserts were the subject of jeering comments such as this from Frances Thynne, Countess of

⁹⁹ Tague, "Love, Honour, and Obedience," 90.

¹⁰⁰ Henrietta Hobart.

¹⁰¹ BL Add. MSS 22626, f. 28.

¹⁰² Bouchier Wrey, (1683-1726), 5th Bart.

¹⁰³ BL Add. MSS 48218, f 71-72.

¹⁰⁴ John, 2nd Earl of Upper Ossory. He married Anne Liddell, the daughter of Lord Ravensworth in 1769. She was the divorced wife of the Duke of Grafton. Ossory died in 1818.

¹⁰⁵ Ilchester, *Life and Letters*, I:180.

¹⁰⁶ John Stuart (1744-1814), later 1st Marquess of Bute. He held the title Viscount Mount Stuart (Stewart) as a courtesy title in the lifetime of his father. He married Charlotte Windsor in November 1766.

¹⁰⁷ Ilchester, *Life and Letters*, I: 180.

Hartford to Henrietta St. John, Lady Luxborough in 1744, “Harry Harvey is a parson because when an officer he ran too much in debt that he was forced to sell his commission, and was therefore forced to change his Habit in order to eat.”¹⁰⁸ Flighty or flirtatious men also attracted great criticism. In 1735, Grace Boyle wrote to Lady Strafford¹⁰⁹ an account of a dance that she had attended. The letter contained the following line: “Sir Thomas Robinson who is making love to somebody I forget who, was in blue and gold strutting like a crow in a gutter.”¹¹⁰ If excessive flirtation was frowned upon, behaviour that went well beyond that caused a scandal. A male guest at Dumfries House in 1762 had to leave rather abruptly when the household discovered him “behind window curtains with the Countess [of Dumfries].”¹¹¹ In 1772, Therese Robinson wrote to her brother Fritz about an outrage committed by the heir of the 4th Duke of Leeds who was behaving inappropriately with a young lady:

Lord Carmarthen¹¹² who about six weeks ago, took so strong a fancy to Lady Emily,¹¹³ without her having taken the least pains to attract him (as a certain Lady Betty did before he went abroad) who entirely of his own accord broke the matter to his Father, earnestly requesting him to see her, and if it met with his approbation to carry a proposal the next day as his happiness depended upon his being accepted, who was accordingly accepted by Ld and Ldy Holderness¹¹⁴ – thinking him unobjectionable and could only object to Lady Emily’s great youth¹¹⁵ which made them wish it had been delayed a few years. This same Lord C___n___ [sic] in the space of six weeks, betrayed so great a change in his inclinations and alteration in his behaviour to Lady Emily which nothing but another attachment could occasion and that being the case, Ld Holderness could not avoid informing the Duke of Leeds and desiring the whole affair between

¹⁰⁸ BL Add. MSS 23728 f. 10-11.

¹⁰⁹ Anne Johnson.

¹¹⁰ BL Add. MSS 22256, f. 50-53.

¹¹¹ Greig, *Diaries of a Duchess*, 25-26n. This would have been Anne Duff, who had only married the Earl in June of that year. Interestingly, the Earl of Dumfries’ first wife was Anne Gordon, the daughter of the 2nd Earl of Aberdeen and following the death of Dumfries, Anne Duff married Alexander Gordon, the son of the 2nd Earl of Aberdeen.

¹¹² Francis Osborne (1751-1799), later 5th Duke of Leeds.

¹¹³ Amelia Darcy.

¹¹⁴ The 4th Earl and Countess.

¹¹⁵ She was about 18 years old.

their children might be at an end. The Duke of Leeds is affected with it to the greatest degree. Ld. Carmarthen the most unhappy man in the world, but at the same time acknowledges the change in his affections and poor Lady Emily as of notwithstanding she must feel pique and be offended beyond measure, had set her heart too much upon him and having ____ her Father and Mother sometime so to do, it is not to be supposed that she can get the better of it sometime. All that remains now to be known is, who can the Rival be – which I suppose we shall soon hear from Ld or Lady Pelham, all that I can make our from her is that it is a new attachment, no _____ one _____, which would have been much more pardonable in my opinion. Miss Vernon, younger sister to the maid of honour, is the only person, that in public at least, has appeared to engage him and that no further than his dancing with her at Almacks in Lady Emily’s absence, but otherwise not taking much notice of her.¹¹⁶

The Times in July 1791 carried an account of a dispute at the Haymarket Theatre with the Earl of Belfast,¹¹⁷ who “it is said, had been particular in his attention to Miss Ogilvie,¹¹⁸ daughter of the Duchess Dowager of Leinster,¹¹⁹ but since appeared attached to Lady S. Stewart,¹²⁰ eldest daughter of the Earl of Galloway,¹²¹ which gave rise to the present dispute.”¹²² Aristocratic women valued men who behaved with decorum and dignity.

In the nineteenth century, aristocratic women frequently commented on men’s character. In 1805, Lady Hawkesbury¹²³ wrote, “Nelson’s brother will be an Earl. But alas, *He* is not worthy, perhaps *his* son will be – at least he is *Horatio*.”¹²⁴ In March 1822, Harriet Fane wrote disapprovingly of the behaviour of a young nobleman of her acquaintance: “Lord Worcester¹²⁵ has broken off his marriage with Lady Jane Paget, he gives no reason except that he does not like her so much as her husband ought to. This he

¹¹⁶ BL Add. MSS 48218, ff. 178-179. Rival or no, Amelia Darcy married Carmarthen in 1773, though the union was not successful and the couple divorced in 1779.

¹¹⁷ George Chichester (1769-1844), later 2nd Marquess of Donegall. He held the title Earl of Belfast as a courtesy title during the lifetime of his father.

¹¹⁸ Emily Ogilvie.

¹¹⁹ Emilia Lennox.

¹²⁰ This is most likely Susan Stewart.

¹²¹ John Stewart (1736-1806), 7th Earl of Galloway.

¹²² “News in Brief,” *The Times*, July 11, 1791. #2072, p. 2.

¹²³ Louisa Hervey.

¹²⁴ Grosvenor, *The First Lady Wharncliffe*, I:113.

¹²⁵ Possibly Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort.

stated in a very flippant note to Lord Anglesey,¹²⁶ who returned him for answer that, considering all the circumstances, he thought his daughter extremely fortunate in escaping such a connection. Poor Lady Jane is in great despair as it is said she really likes him...¹²⁷ The Stanleys had decided views about what constituted an appropriate character in a young man. Maria Holyroyd, Dowager Lady Stanley, wrote in May 1851 about her granddaughter, “I do not rejoice in Blanche surrounded by clever men – it is setting up for a character which seldom ends well for matrimony – for I think I know the sort of clever men you mean.”¹²⁸ In 1857, Lord Stanley¹²⁹ sent his wife¹³⁰ a letter about the behaviour of a young man of their acquaintance, “Arthur Davenport is in London and gets drunk every day and I am sorry to say scandalizes the world, they say if he continues to expose himself the marriage may not come off after all. It seems the girl is rather popular with the young men and they say it is a shame marrying her to him.”¹³¹ Even very exalted men had their character, or lack thereof, critiqued by nineteenth century women. Annie Rothschild wrote to her sister Constance, Lady Battersea: “I quite agree with you upon the unfortunate and untimely flippancy of the Prince of Wales. It is dreadful to see a man so utterly devoted to pleasure and self-gratification.”¹³² On November 11, 1868, the *Times* reported the early death of Henry Hastings, Marquess of Hastings with a tone of unmitigated moral satisfaction, “We have to record the death of a

¹²⁶ Henry Paget, 1st Marquess of Anglesey.

¹²⁷ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:153.

¹²⁸ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 5.

¹²⁹ Edward Stanley, 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderly.

¹³⁰ Henrietta Dillon-Lee.

¹³¹ Mitford, *The Stanleys of Alderly*, 161. Arthur Davenport appears to have become aware of the talk that his behaviour was causing. Lord Stanley wrote: “I saw Arthur Davenport last night, he is rather in a fright about his marriage – says he has not heard from Lady Agnes for two days and that people have been telling stories about him that he has been screwed in London. He says the Duke is an old Beast. The fact is I believe the Duke does not above half like it, but A. Davenport says he has the Duchess on his side. I told him he should be more careful and live quietly before his marriage.” The situation surrounding Davenport is discussed at some length in Chapter Two.

¹³² BL Add. MSS 47963, ff. 139-143.

youthful nobleman of high rank and extensive property, of whom it may unfortunately be written that he was his own worst enemy. His connection with the turf was disastrous in its results; his health, which was never very strong, broke fairly down during the last few months; and his premature decease, which has for some days been expected, occurred early yesterday morning.”¹³³ In the nineteenth century, rank was important, but it could be negated by lack of character.

Just as a title could not offset a lack of money or a poor character in the nineteenth century; neither could it offset more serious personal deficiencies. Charlotte Bertie’s¹³⁴ eldest brother George, 10th Earl of Lindsey, was considered to be somewhat mentally deficient. The young man’s guardian thought that the solution to the problem might well lie in a marriage with a wealthy heiress whose father would be dazzled by the idea of his daughter becoming a Countess. Unfortunately, the scheme failed when the prospective father-in-law met the proposed groom.¹³⁵ The 10th Earl died unmarried at the age of sixty-two.

Nineteenth-century Society could be scathing when the character of a prospective groom was questionable. In May 1823, Emily Lamb, Viscountess Melbourne, wrote several letters concerning the proposed marriage of Lady Elizabeth Conyngham and Lord Burford,¹³⁶ the son of the Duke of St. Albans. Harriet Fane wrote, “Lady Elizabeth Conyngham is to marry Lord Burford, he is some years younger than her, and all but an idiot and has been confined!”¹³⁷ Lamb finally came to the conclusion that Burford was

¹³³ “Death of the Marquess of Hastings,” *The Times*, Nov. 11, 1868, #26279, p. 10.

¹³⁴ The daughter of the 9th Earl of Lindsey, later married to Josiah Guest the wealthy iron-master.

¹³⁵ Bessborough, *Lady Charlotte Guest*, 1-2.

¹³⁶ William Aubrey de Vere Beauclerk, Earl of Burford (1801-1849). He became 9th Duke of St. Albans in 1825.

¹³⁷ Bamford, *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:237.

not an idiot, just a terribly uncultivated man: “They will have only 2,000 a year to live upon at present so that really the advantages are not so very great as to bribe her to bear with such a man. The Duke of St. Albans is, of course, delighted to get such a nice girl to act as Bear Leader to his Cub...”¹³⁸ But alas, Burford’s deficiencies were too much for such a “nice girl” to endure.¹³⁹ It was reported that “[h]e became so unmannerly and cross that the lady sent him a letter of dismissal...”¹⁴⁰ The next month Emily Lamb wrote:

The Burford Marriage is publicly declared off. His friends and his father are excessively angry... but the world in general are all delighted... The world as they are called are a strange set, first abusing her and saying that she would find no husband, then abusing this marriage as not worthy of her and all open-mouthed against him, and nobody knows why, for nobody knows him, and instead of his being an idiot or a fool, it appears he is more of the sharper than the fool, but obstinate, ill-tempered and underbred, thinking only of getting money, and the Duke, they say, tried to cheat them about settlements to take her £40,000 and give them only 800 a year, taking them to live in his own den, with all his wild girls.¹⁴¹

At times, nineteenth-century commentators seemed quite ambivalent about some marriages. In February 1825 Elizabeth Vassall, Lady Holland wrote to her son, “Lord Apsley¹⁴² is to marry that lovely Miss Forrester! the young pretty one; an alliance of hunting families. A great love of coronet, as tho’ I like him best of his family, yet he is not a beau a’ voir, nor clean and wholesome looking...”¹⁴³ In July 1829, James Stuart Wortley wrote, “I have been a little shocked at the actual announcement of Maria Copley’s marriage and have not yet made up my mind to be glad of it: he¹⁴⁴ is so ugly and deformed and has such an ugly temper, that I think poor girl she is taking a very

¹³⁸ Tresham Lever, ed., *The Letters of Lady Palmerston: Selected and Edited from the Originals at Broadlands and Elsewhere* (London: John Murray, 1957), 126-127.

¹³⁹ Burford, then Duke of St. Albans, in 1827 married the wealthy widow of Thomas Coutts the banker, Harriet Mellon a marriage that caused a fair amount of talk in its own right.

¹⁴⁰ Bamford, *The Journals of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, I:237.

¹⁴¹ Lever, *The Letters of Lady Palmerston*, 129-130.

¹⁴² Henry Bathurst, later 4th Earl of Bathurst (1790-1866).

¹⁴³ The marriage did not actually come off, Apsley died unmarried in 1866. Ilchester, *Elizabeth Lady Holland to Her Son*, 39 & n.

¹⁴⁴ Henry Grey, Lord Howick, later 3rd Earl Grey (1802-1894).

questionable step. However, it is a great match and such a pied a' terre is of immense importance both to her and her sister.”¹⁴⁵ Sarah Spencer, Lady Lyttelton, wrote in 1845 of another man who was a mixture of characteristics, “Don’t be angry with Miss Gore.¹⁴⁶ I can understand any girl being almost in love with Lord Howe¹⁴⁷ though he is ugly and child-ridden¹⁴⁸ and you must think old. But he is so excellent a man and has so delightful a manner – so exceedingly gentlemanlike and sensible and a fine voice too, that I give my consent.”¹⁴⁹ Some men did not have the personal characteristics of Lord Howe to offset their physical shortcomings. In 1866, Lucy Lyttelton recorded in her journal this rather painful account, “Poor squinny dwarfish little Lord Milton¹⁵⁰ is desperately in love with Lady Mary,¹⁵¹ daughter of Lady Ormonde,¹⁵² who won’t have him.”¹⁵³

Just as nineteenth-century Society disapproved of flirtatious women, men who pursued too many women were also looked down upon as they had been in the eighteenth century. In 1807, Harriet Cavendish reported to her sister about a visit with the Hollands where they “talked a little of Lord Henry Petty’s¹⁵⁴ marriage¹⁵⁵ and seemed pleased with it, but I am afraid he has been a gay deceiver to more than one, as Lady Holland¹⁵⁶ said

¹⁴⁵ Elizabeth Copley. Grosvenor, *The First Lady Wharncliffe*, 2:151.

¹⁴⁶ Anne Gore.

¹⁴⁷ Richard Curzon-Howe (1796-1870), 1st Earl Howe. He was married first to Harriet Brudenell, who died in 1836.

¹⁴⁸ He and his first wife had at least ten children.

¹⁴⁹ Wyndham, *Correspondence of Sarah Spencer*, 353.

¹⁵⁰ William Fitzwilliam, Viscount Milton (1839-1877), son of the 6th Earl of Fitzwilliam. He married Laura Beauclerk, daughter of Lord Charles Beauclerk in August 1867.

¹⁵¹ Mary Butler, daughter of the 2nd Marquess of Ormonde. Interestingly she married Lord Milton’s brother (also named William, as were all eight sons of the 6th Earl of Fitzwilliam) in July 1877 following the death in January of that year of the Viscount.

¹⁵² Frances Paget.

¹⁵³ Bailey, *Diary of Lady Frederick Cavendish*, II:19.

¹⁵⁴ Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice (1780-1863), 3rd Marquess of Lansdowne.

¹⁵⁵ He married Louisa Fox-Stangeways.

¹⁵⁶ Elizabeth Vassall.

rather crossly ‘I am heartily glad he is going to be married, for he was beginning to make himself too ridiculous with his loves.’”¹⁵⁷

Though there is no question that securing a titled husband became less important to elite women in the twentieth century, there was still some concern with it. Deborah Mitford was described by her sister Nancy in her autobiographical novel, *The Pursuit of Love*, “whereas most girls dream of marrying that ‘Mr. Right,’ she had her sights set firmly on ‘The Duke of Right.’”¹⁵⁸ If indeed, that is where her sights were set, she succeeded admirably, marrying Andrew Cavendish, later 11th Duke of Devonshire, in 1941.¹⁵⁹

III. Conclusion

Throughout the period from the late fifteenth through the twentieth century, the expectations for women’s behaviour actually changed relatively little. Women were to be meek, submissive, and to put the needs of their natal family above their own. This relative stasis reflects their unchanging position within the rank. As aristocratic women functioned largely as passive carriers of rank identity in the matter of their marriages, the ideal woman was also passive. Conceptions about appropriate noble masculinity changed far more than did those about femininity. A man was to possess high rank and ample possessions, but beginning in the seventeenth century, his character became very important and aristocratic women had a great deal to say about the disposition and moral fiber of the men of their acquaintance. At that time, Society expected men to be cultured

¹⁵⁷ Levison-Gower, *Hary-O*, 270.

¹⁵⁸ Pearson, *The Serpent and the Stag*, 275

¹⁵⁹ At the time of the marriage, Andrew was not the heir to the Dukedom, his older brother died in a plane crash during the war.

but by the nineteenth century, a more robust ideal had come into being. Marriage has always been a gendered undertaking and changing notions about roles played an important role in the construction of aristocratic British marriage and thus by extension, in the maintenance of noble rank identity.

Appendix II: ‘British’ marriages

This project has investigated marriage patterns of aristocratic women from England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. However, for much of the period under consideration (and perhaps still today) these regions did not see themselves as a part of a monolithic whole. Investigating the rate at which the aristocracies of the different nations married one another sheds light on the extent to which they saw themselves as “British” rather than simply “Irish,” “English,” or “Scottish.” The rate at which the British nobility married across national boundaries adds a new perspective to the issue of British identity. Table 53 shows that in the sixteenth century, the English, Irish and Scottish elites married inside their own nation well over 90 percent of the time.¹ The proportion drops in the seventeenth century for England and Ireland,² though well over half of the daughters of the nobility still married within their own nation. The Scots married at home 91.33 percent of the time.³ The eighteenth century shows a rather sharp drop in the percentage of within-nation marriages.⁴ In the nineteenth century, there was a distinct shift in the trends: the English still married other English nearly 64 percent of the time,⁵ but the Irish and the Scottish showed a greater inclination to marry English nobles than their own nationality.⁶ In the first two decades of the twentieth century, the English remained far

¹ The Welsh seem always to be more likely to marry English nobles than Welsh. This may be due to the longer-lasting ties between England and Wales as well as the relative paucity of Welsh nobles.

² To 74.51 percent for England, a difference that is statistically significant and 71.50 percent for Ireland, which is also statistically significant.

³ While this difference is much less dramatic than the drop for the English and Irish, it is statistically significant.

⁴ The English women married English grooms 69.97 percent of the time (this decline from the seventeenth century rate is not statistically significant) and the Irish 65.66 percent of the time (not a statistically significant decline from the seventeenth century) and the Scots 66.67 percent of the time (statistically significant drop from the seventeenth century).

⁵ This decline from the eighteenth century rate is statistically significant.

⁶ The Irish are marrying the English 45.83 percent of the time and other Irish only 38.89 percent of the time (the difference between the Irish inclination to marry within their own nation and to the English is not

more likely to marry other English⁷ while the Irish were more likely to marry English as well, instead of other Irish.⁸ The Scots were more likely to marry English than to marry Scots.⁹

Table 53: “British” Marriages

Bride to Groom	16th C	17th C	18th C	19th C	20th C thru 1920
English to English	356/378 94.18%	307/412 74.51%	261/373 69.97%	410/641 63.96%	69/109 63.30%
English to Foreign		2/412 0.49%	3/373 0.81%	15/641 2.34%	3/109 11.89%
English to Irish	6/378 1.59%	58/412 14.08%	62/373 16.62%	106/641 16.54%	13/109 10.49%
English to Scottish	5/378 1.32%	37/412 8.98%	41/373 10.99%	90/641 14.04%	21/109 19.23%
English to Welsh	11/378 2.91%	8/412 1.94%	6/373 1.61%	20/641 3.12%	3/109 2.80%
Irish to English	5/74 6.76%	42/207 20.29%	41/166 24.70%	132/288 45.83%	23/43 53.49%
Irish to Foreign			3/166 1.81%	6/288 2.085%	2/43 4.65%
Irish to Irish	69/74 93.24%	148/207 71.50%	109/166 65.66%	112/288 38.89%	7/43 16.28%
Irish to Scottish		10/207 4.83%	11/166 6.63%	32/288 11.11%	7/43 16.28%
Irish to Welsh		7/207 3.38%	2/166 1.2%	6/288 2.085%	4/43 9.30%

statistically significant) while 43.56 percent of the Scots marry English and only 37.13% marry Scots nobles (the difference between Scottish marriage within their own nation and with the English is not statistically significant).

⁷ The rate of 63.30 percent for English to English marriage is statistically significantly higher than the English marriage rate to any other group.

⁸ The difference between the 53.49 percent rate for Irish to English marriages as compared to the Irish to Irish rate of 16.28 percent is statistically significant.

⁹ The difference between the 52.38 percent rate for Scottish to English marriages as compared to the Scottish to Scottish rate of 35.71 percent is not statistically significant.

Scottish to English	8/332 2.41%	22/346 6.36%	53/222 23.87%	88/202 43.56%	22/42 52.38%
Scottish to Foreign			3/222 1.35%	4/202 1.98	1/42 2.39%
Scottish to Irish	2/332 0.9%	7/346 2.02%	18/222 8.11%	31/202 15.35%	4/42 9.52%
Scottish to Scottish	321/332 96.69%	316/346 91.33%	148/222 66.67%	75/202 37.13%	15/42 35.71%
Scottish to Welsh		1/346 0.29%		4/202 1.98	
Welsh to English	8/9 88.89%	6/7 85.71%	5/9 55.56%	26/36 72.22%	7/13 53.85%
Welsh to Foreign					
Welsh to Irish			1/9 11.11%	5/36 13.89%	2/13 15.38%
Welsh to Scottish			3/9 33.33%	2/36 5.56%	3/13 23.08
Welsh to Welsh	1/9 11.11%	1/7 14.29%		3/36 8.33%	1/13 5.69%

The strong regional affiliations shown in the sixteenth century are not at all surprising. Except for those relatively few nobles who were continually at court, most nobles spent the vast majority of their time on their estates and certainly, their families spent most of their time there as well. These numbers support what other scholarship has indicated – there were distinct geographical limitations to the sixteenth-century marriage market. The increase in cross-border marriages during the seventeenth century reflects the advance of the English colonization of Ireland.¹⁰ It is somewhat unexpected that the number of Scottish-to-Scottish marriages remained so high. James I actively set out to encourage marriage between the peerages of the two nations. It does not appear that he

¹⁰ James I undertook a “plantation policy” in Ulster through which families from England and Scotland were brought to Ireland to replace native land owners. This is also the period in which prominent Englishmen were given Irish titles as a reward for service to the crown. The most striking example of this is perhaps Richard Boyle, 1st Earl of Cork.

had a great deal of success in this endeavor (only 9 percent of the English marry Scots while 6 percent of Scottish marriages are to English grooms).¹¹ The Scottish nobility in the seventeenth century was the only one to continue to have more than 90 percent of its marriages occurred within its own borders, a percentage significantly higher than in either England or Ireland.¹² Some English nobles resented the incursion of the Scots under the Stuarts,¹³ which probably had a chilling effect on cross-border unions. Trends of the seventeenth century continued through the eighteenth century with a majority of marriages taking place between men and women of the same nationality, but the percentage was shrinking. In the nineteenth century, the Irish and Scottish noble women married English grooms more often than they married within their own borders.¹⁴ England, however, continued to favour in-country unions. In the first part of the twentieth century the tendency for Scottish and Irish elite women to marry English grooms increased.¹⁵

The patterns when looking at strictly endogamous marriages in a British context across the five centuries under discussion are shown in Tables 54 and 55. Endogamous marriages often were more British in nature than were marriages overall.¹⁶ Given that

¹¹ The increase of English to Scottish marriages from 1.32 percent in the sixteenth century to 8.98 percent in the seventeenth century is statistically significant as is the jump from 2.41 percent in the sixteenth century to 6.36 percent in the seventeenth century for Scottish to English unions.

¹² The difference between the Scottish to Scottish marriage rate and the Irish to Irish and the English to English rates in the seventeenth century is statistically significant.

¹³ Lawson, *Out of the Shadow*, 54.

¹⁴ The difference for the Irish noble women is not statistically significant nor is the result for the Scottish women.

¹⁵ This may well be due to the increasing importance of London as a social center. The aristocracy of all of the British nations spent a considerable amount of their time in London (see Chapter Six) attending the same entertainments. This would have increased the likelihood of cross-national marriage and since there were more English nobles than Irish or Scottish, they would have been disproportionately represented. It is also possible that since London was so important in the lives of these people, there was a tendency among the Scottish and Irish to marry English men so that they could live in England rather than on more remote estates in the other nations.

¹⁶ These figures only include those marriages for which the nationality of the groom is known.

endogamous marriages were more likely to be the result of careful planning by families, rank tended to be more important than geographical proximity. Among new nobles, the Scottish¹⁷ married within their own borders most frequently.¹⁸ The Irish¹⁹ and English²⁰ were less likely to marry their countrymen. Both the English²¹ and the Irish²² old nobility were less likely to marry endogamously within their own borders than were the new nobility. The daughters of old Scottish nobles, however, were significantly more likely to marry other Scots.²³

Table 54: Endogamous Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles²⁴

	16th C	17th C	18thC	19th C	20th C
English to English	44/46 95.66%	59/78 75.64%	20/40 50.00%	28/52 53.85%	13/18 72.22%
English to Foreign				1/52 1.92%	
English to Irish	1/46 2.17%	11/78 14.10%	12/40 30.00%	13/52 25.00%	3/18 16.68%
English to Scottish		6/78 4.00%	7/40 17.50%	10/52 19.23%	2/18 11.10%
English to Welsh	1/46 2.17%	2/78 2.56%	1/40 2.50%		

¹⁷ Marrying endogamously.

¹⁸ There were 49 Scottish-to-Scottish marriages among the 62 total marriages of the daughters of Scottish new nobles. This is a rate of 79.03 percent.

¹⁹ There were 61 Irish-to-Irish marriages among the 91 total marriages of the daughters of Irish new nobles. This is a rate of 67.03 percent. When compared with the Scottish rate given above the difference is not statistically significant.

²⁰ This figure comes from 164 English-to-English marriages out of a total of 234 marriages among daughters of new English nobles. This is a rate of 70.09 percent. When compared with the Scottish rate given above the difference is not statistically significant.

²¹ There were 861 daughters of old English nobles marrying endogamously to English grooms out of a total of 1299 endogamous marriages among the old English nobility. This is a rate of 66.28 percent. This rate compared to the rate of 70.09 percent for the daughters of the new English nobility is not statistically significantly different.

²² There were 227 daughters of old Irish nobles marrying endogamously to Irish grooms out of a total of 444 endogamous marriages among the old Irish nobility. This is a rate of 51.13 percent. This rate compared to the rate of 67.03 percent for the daughters of the new Irish nobility yields a difference that is statistically significant.

²³ There were 545 daughters of old Scottish nobles marrying endogamously to Scottish grooms out of a total of 745 endogamous marriages among the old Scottish nobility. This is a rate of 73.15 percent. This rate is not statistically different from the rate of 79.03 percent for the daughters of the new Scottish nobility.

²⁴ The denominator is the total number of new noble daughters marrying endogamously for a nation.

Irish to English	1/1 100.00%	3/32 9.38%	7/31 22.58%	14/27 51.85%	
Irish to Foreign				1/27 3.705%	
Irish to Irish		26/32 81.25%	24/31 77.42%	11/27 40.74%	
Irish to Scottish		3/32 9.38%		1/27 3.705%	
Irish to Welsh					
Scottish to English		4/38 10.52%	1/9 11.11%	2/4 50.00%	2/2 100.00%
Scottish to Foreign					
Scottish to Irish		2/38 5.26%	1/9 11.11%	1/4 25.00%	
Scottish to Scottish	9/9 100.00%	32/38 84.21%	7/9 77.78%	1/4 25.00%	
Scottish to Welsh					
Welsh to English	5/6 83.33%		1/2 50.00%	1/2 50.00%	
Welsh to Irish				1/2 50.00%	
Welsh to Scottish			1/2 50.00%		
Welsh to Welsh	1/6 16.67%				

Table 55: Endogamous Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles²⁵

	16th C	17th C	18thC	19th C	20th C
English to English	170/183 92.90%	152/229 66.38%	174/261 66.67%	266/441 60.32%	99/185 53.51%
English to Foreign		2/229 0.88%	3/261 1.15%	13/441 2.945%	14/185 7.57%
English to Irish	4/183 2.20%	41/229 17.90%	47/261 18.01%	86/441 11.11%	22/185 11.89%
English to Scottish	3/183 1.64%	29/229 12.66%	33/261 12.64%	63/441 14.29%	44/185 23.78%
English to Welsh	6/183 3.28%	5/229 2.18%	4/261 1.53%	13/441 2.945%	6/185 3.25%

²⁵ The denominator is the total number of old noble daughters marrying endogamously for a nation.

Irish to English	1/50 2.00%	24/92 26.10%	21/70 30.00%	75/171 43.86%	30/61 49.18%
Irish to Foreign			3/70 4.29%	4/171 2.34%	7/61 11.48%
Irish to Irish	49/50 98.00%	62/92 67.39%	39/70 55.71%	66/171 38.60%	11/61 18.03%
Irish to Scottish		6/92 6.51%	7/70 10.00%	23/171 13.45%	10/61 16.39%
Irish to Welsh				3/171 1.75%	3/61 4.92%
Scottish to English	3/185 1.62%	6/217 2.76%	36/135 26.67%	62/137 45.26%	34/71 47.89%
Scottish to Foreign	1/185 .54%		3/135 2.22%	2/137 1.44%	5/71 7.04%
Scottish to Irish		2/217 .93%	11/135 8.15%	24/137 17.52%	8/71 11.27%
Scottish to Scottish	181/185 97.84%	209/217 96.31%	85/135 62.96%	46/137 33.58%	24/71 33.80%
Scottish to Welsh				3/137 2.20%	
Welsh to English	2/2 100.00%	4/5 80.00%	4/7 57.14%	14/20 70.00%	6/9 66.67%
Welsh to Irish			1/7 14.29%	4/20 20.00%	1/9 11.11%
Welsh to Scottish			2/7 28.57%	1/20 5.00%	2/9 22.22%
Welsh to Welsh		1/5 20.00%		1/20 5.00%	

As indicated by the numbers above, cross border marriages in the sixteenth century were rare, though not unheard of. In September 1520, Henry VIII ordered Thomas Howard, the Earl of Surrey,²⁶ who was serving in Ireland, to determine if the Irish noble, the Earl of Ormonde²⁷ favoured a match between his heir James and the Englishwoman Anne Boleyn. Henry was willing to intercede with Anne's father, Sir

²⁶ Later the 3rd Duke of Norfolk.

²⁷ Piers Butler, 8th Earl of Ormonde.

Thomas Boleyn, to further the match.²⁸ In the following month, Surrey and the Council of Ireland reported to Cardinal Wolsey indicating approval for the match between Anne Boleyn and James Butler, who that point lived in England.²⁹ In 1530, Gerald ‘Og’ FitzGerald, 9th Earl of Kildare married Elizabeth Grey the daughter of the 1st Marquess of Dorset³⁰ “and thus obtained alliances and friendships in England.”³¹

James I enthusiastically promoted Anglo-Scottish weddings.³² He was a prime mover behind the marriage of Christian Bruce, the daughter of the 1st Baron Bruce, and William Cavendish, the 2nd Earl of Devonshire. James increased the twelve-year-old bride’s dowry to the astronomical sum of £10,000 in order to entice Cavendish. This match gave the Bruces a chance to ally themselves with a rising English family as a reward for their help in establishing James on the throne.³³ Statistics, while indicating a modest increase in such unions, do not bear out James’ hope for more Anglo-Scottish matches. Among the new nobles marrying endogamously, the rate of marriage between an English bride and a Scottish groom rose to 4.00 percent in the seventeenth century up from none in the sixteenth.³⁴ In the same grouping, the rate of marriage between a Scottish bride and an English groom rose to 10.52 percent also from none in the previous century.³⁵ English brides from old families married Scottish titled grooms 12.66 percent

²⁸ *L&P*, 3:1, 1004.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1011. The marriage obviously did not take place. James Butler married Joan FitzGerald, daughter of the 10th Earl of Desmond.

³⁰ Thomas Grey (1451-1501)

³¹ Brewer, *Carewe MSS*, 144.

³² Goldsmith, “All the Queen’s Women,” 197.

³³ Pearson, *The Serpent and the Stag*, 44.

³⁴ The growth escalated in the following centuries, to 17.5 percent in the eighteenth century, 19.23 percent in the nineteenth century, and then falling to 11.10 percent in the twentieth. Only the increase from 4 percent in the seventeenth to 17.5 percent in the eighteenth is statistically significant.

³⁵ This rate also grew in the following centuries: to 11.11 percent in the eighteenth century, 50 percent in the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century there were only 2 marriages of the daughters of Scottish new nobles and both were to English grooms. These differences are not statistically significant due primarily to the very small numbers of women involved.

of the time in the seventeenth century, an increase from 1.64 percent in the sixteenth³⁶ while Scottish brides married English grooms 2.76 percent of the time also an increase from 1.62 percent.³⁷

Like his father, Charles I attempted to engineer cross-border marriages in order to tighten the bonds between the nations under his control. He too had limited success. In 1631, he wrote in favour of the union of Richard Boyle, Lord Dungarvan³⁸ and Lady Anne Fielding, the daughter of Lord³⁹ and Lady Denbigh.⁴⁰ Stating that “now that he is grown a man. . . it is pleasurable to us to think of a fit marriage for him,” Charles pointed out that her family background made her an appropriate choice. Despite the support of the King, the union did not take place.⁴¹ One of the reasons that English women might have been somewhat reluctant to marry outside of English can be found in one of the tracts of the era. William Bird, in his discourse on the issues surrounding noble rights, *A Treatise of the Nobilitie of the Realme*⁴² published in 1642 wrote: “[If] an Englishwoman doth take the Earl of Kildare in Ireland to her Husband, or if a Lord in Scotland, though he be of *post natus & c* their wives shall not participate in their Husband’s dignities.”⁴³

³⁶ The rate also showed a bit of a growth tendency, but not like that of the new nobility: eighteenth century, 12.64 percent; nineteenth century, 14.29 percent, and twentieth century, 23.78 percent. Only the increases from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century and from the nineteenth to the twentieth century are statistically significant.

³⁷ Interestingly, this rate grew far more quickly than that for the English brides, a reverse of the trend of the daughters of the new nobles. In the eighteenth century 26.67 percent married English, in the nineteenth century, 45.26 percent, and in the twentieth, 47.89 percent. The increases from the seventeenth to the eighteenth centuries and from the eighteenth to the nineteenth are statistically significant.

³⁸ Later the 2nd Earl of Cork.

³⁹ William Fielding, 1st Earl of Denbigh (1582-1643).

⁴⁰ Susan Villiers.

⁴¹ BL Egerton MSS 2552 f.24b. The marriage does not appear to have happened. Anne married Edward Noel, 2nd Viscount Campden in 1632 and Richard Boyle married Elizabeth Clifford in 1635. The families were later united through the marriage of Elizabeth Fielding and Louis Boyle.

⁴² Full title is *A Treatise of the Nobilitie of the Realme Collected Out of the Body of the Common Law, with Mention of Such Statutes as are Incident Hereunto, Upon a Debate of the Barony of Aburgavenny: With a Table of the Heads Contained in this Treatise*

⁴³ William Bird, *A Treatise*, 141.

That is, the English wife of an Irish Earl would not have the standing that she would if she were either the wife of an English Earl or if she were an Irish wife of an Irish Earl. An English woman had no reason to marry a non-English noble if she could not “participate” in her husband’s dignities.

The English held prejudices against the other nationalities, especially it seems, the Irish. Anti-Irish sentiment occurred in all centuries⁴⁴ and continued well into the nineteenth century. Lucy Lyttleton wrote of the love match between Lilah Grosvenor⁴⁵ and Lord Ormonde⁴⁶ in 1875. Her father, the Duke of Westminster,⁴⁷ was not happy about the match, complaining “much of his daughter of nineteen getting engaged in a week’s time to an Irishman behind his back.”⁴⁸

Tables 56 - 75 present the statistics concerning the tendency of the daughters of new and established nobles to marry outside of their own nation in each century. With the exceptions of the daughters of established nobles in the twentieth century (both the century as a whole and just the first two decades), these women always married within their nation more often than they married across the borders. The findings are somewhat complicated by the large number of grooms for whom it is not possible to determine a nationality. Thus, there are tables that include those grooms who are unknown and those which exclude those grooms.

⁴⁴ For example, J.G.E. *Englands hope, against Irish hate* (London : Printed by VV.VV. for Thomas Heyes, 1600); Anon., *Arguments inviting all faithfull marriners to ingage cheerfully in Englands honourable and just cause, against the Irish rebels and their adherents, now robbing at sea, and about to invade this nation.* (London, 1649); Anon., *An abstract of the bloody massacre in Ireland. Acted by the instigation of the Jesuits, priests, and friars, who were chief promoters of those horrible murthers; prodigious cruelties, barbarous villanies, and inhumane practices, executed by the Irish Papists upon the English Protestants, in the year 1641. And intended to have been acted over again, on Sabbath Day, December the 9th 1688. But by the wonderful providence of God was prevented.* (Scotland, 1700). Jonathan Swift famously satirized this attitude in his *A Modest Proposal* published in 1729.

⁴⁵ Elizabeth Grosvenor.

⁴⁶ James Butler, 3rd Marquess of Ormonde (1844-1919).

⁴⁷ Hugh Grosvenor, 1st Duke of Westminster (1825-1899).

⁴⁸ Bailey, *Diary*, II:198.

Table 56: 16th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁴⁹

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British ⁵⁰ Marriages	10/162	6.17%
Non-British Marriages ⁵¹	103/162	63.58%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	49/162	30.25%
English to English	84/134	62.17%
English to British	3/134	2.82%
English to Unknown ⁵²	47/134	35.10%
Irish to Irish	6/8	75.00%
Irish to British	1/8	12.50%
Irish to Unknown	1/8	12.50%
Scottish to Scottish	12/12	100%
Scottish to British	0/12	0%
Welsh to Welsh	1/7	14.285%
Welsh to British	5/7	71.43%
Welsh to Unknown	1/7	14.285%

Table 57: 16th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁵³

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	10/112	8.04%
Non-British Marriage	103/112	91.96%
English to English	84/87	96.55%
English to British	3/87	3.45%
Irish to Irish	6/7	85.71%
Irish to British	1/7	14.29%
Scottish to Scottish	12/12	100%
Scottish to British	0/12	0%
Welsh to Welsh	1/6	16.67%
Welsh to British	5/6	83.33%

⁴⁹ Including Unknown.

⁵⁰ British indicates a marriage across the borders of the four nations, eg. English to Irish

⁵¹ Non-British indicates a marriage with the borders of a nation, eg. Irish to Irish

⁵² The groom's nationality is unknown.

⁵³ Excluding Unknown

Table 58: 16th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁵⁴

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	32/829	3.86%
Non-British Marriages	640/829	77.20%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	157/829	18.94%
English to English	271/411	65.94%
English to British	19/411	4.62%
English to Unknown	121/411	29.44%
Irish to Irish	63/73	86.30%
Irish to British	4/73	5.48%
Irish to Unknown	6/73	8.22%
Scottish to Scottish	306/341	89.74%
Scottish to British	6/341	1.76%
Scottish to Unknown	29/341	8.50%
Welsh to Welsh	0/4	0.00%
Welsh to British	3/4	75.00%
Welsh to Unknown	1/4	25.00%

Table 59: 16th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁵⁵

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	32/672	4.76%
Non-British Marriages	640/672	95.24%
English to English	271/290	93.45%
English to British	19/290	6.55%
Irish to Irish	63/67	94.03%
Irish to British	4/67	5.97%
Scottish to Scottish	306/312	98.10%
Scottish to British	6/312	1.9%
Welsh to Welsh	0/3	0.00%
Welsh to British	3/3	100.00%

The tendency of the sixteenth-century aristocratic women to marry within their own borders is striking. When the grooms whose nationality is unknown are not included in the numbers, the rate is solidly above 90 percent. Even when the unknown grooms (most of whom almost certainly are from the same nation as their bride) are included in the figures the rate is approximately 70 percent. The Scottish nobility, not surprisingly given

⁵⁴ Including Unknown

⁵⁵ Excluding Unknown.

the findings discussed above, were the most likely to marry within Scotland. This result is less pronounced among the daughters of the old nobility.

Table 60: 17th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁵⁶

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	51/296	17.23%
Non-British Marriages	184/296	62.16%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	61/296	20.61%
English to English	102/150	68.00%
English to British	20/150	13.33%
English to Unknown	28/150	18.67%
Irish to Irish	40/77	51.95%
Irish to British	21/77	27.27%
Irish to Unknown	16/77	20.78%
Scottish to Scottish	42/69	60.87%
Scottish to British	10/69	14.50%
Scottish to Unknown	17/69	24.63%
Welsh to Welsh		
Welsh to British		

Table 61: 17th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁵⁷

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	51/235	21.70%
Non-British Marriages	184/235	78.30%
English to English	102/122	83.61%
English to British	20/122	16.39%
Irish to Irish	40/61	65.57%
Irish to British	21/61	34.43%
Scottish to Scottish	42/52	80.77%
Scottish to British	10/52	19.23%
Welsh to Welsh		
Welsh to British		

⁵⁶ Including Unknown.

⁵⁷ Excluding Unknown.

Table 62: 17th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁵⁸

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	146/895	16.32%
Non-British Marriages	586/895	65.47%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	163/895	18.21%
English to English	205/368	55.71%
English to British	83/368	22.55%
English to Unknown	80/368	21.74%
Irish to Irish	107/181	59.12%
Irish to British	37/181	20.44%
Irish to Unknown	37/181	20.44%
Scottish to Scottish	273/334	81.74%
Scottish to British	20/283	03.77%
Scottish to Unknown	41/283	14.49%
Welsh to Welsh	1/12	8.33%
Welsh to British	6/12	50.00%
Welsh to Unknown	5/12	41.67%

Table 63: 17th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁵⁹

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	146/732	19.95%
Non-British Marriages	586/732	80.05%
English to English	205/288	71.18%
English to British	83/288	28.82%
Irish to Irish	107/144	74.31%
Irish to British	37/144	25.69%
Scottish to Scottish	273/293	93.17%
Scottish to British	20/283	06.83%
Welsh to Welsh	1/7	14.29%
Welsh to British	6/7	85.71%

The seventeenth century shows little change from the previous century, despite the efforts of the first two Stuart Kings. The overwhelming majority of aristocratic daughters, from both new and old families, continued to marry men from their own nation. Scottish women remained more likely to marry Scottish men than were English women to marry English men, or Irish women to marry Irish men.

⁵⁸ Including Unknown.

⁵⁹ Excluding Unknown.

Table 64: 18th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁶⁰

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	36/188	19.74%
Non-British Marriages	97/188	51.60%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	55/188	29.26%
English to English	39/78	50.00%
English to British	20/78	36.36%
English to Unknown	19/78	24.36%
Irish to Irish	39/81	48.15%
Irish to British	10/81	12.34%
Irish to Unknown	32/81	39.51%
Scottish to Scottish	19/25	76.00%
Scottish to British	4/25	16.00%
Scottish to Unknown	2/25	8.00%
Welsh to Welsh	0/4	0.00%
Welsh to British	2/4	50.00%
Welsh to Unknown	2/4	50.00%

Table 65: 18th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁶¹

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	36/133	27.07%
Non-British Marriages	97/133	72.93%
English to English	39/59	66.10%
English to British	20/59	33.90%
Irish to Irish	39/49	79.59%
Irish to British	10/49	20.41%
Scottish to Scottish	19/23	82.61%
Scottish to British	4/23	17.39%
Welsh to Welsh	0/2	0.00%
Welsh to British	2/2	100.00%

⁶⁰ Including Unknown.

⁶¹ Excluding Unknown.

Table 66: 18th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁶²

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	208/894	23.27%
Non-British Marriages	421/894	47.09%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	267/894	29.64%
English to English	222/429	51.75%
English to British	89/429	20.74%
English to Unknown ⁶³	118/429	27.51
Irish to Irish	70/177	39.55%
Irish to British	44/177	24.85%
Irish to Unknown	63/177	35.60
Scottish to Scottish	129/278	46.40%
Scottish to British	66/278	23.74%
Scottish to Unknown	83/278	29.86%
Welsh to Welsh	0/10	00.00%
Welsh to British	7/10	70.00%
Welsh to Unknown	3/10	30.00%

Table 67: 18th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁶⁴

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	208/627	32.85%
Non-British Marriages	421/627	67.15%
English to English	222/311	71.38%
English to British	89/311	28.62%
Irish to Irish	70/114	61.40%
Irish to British	44/114	38.60%
Scottish to Scottish	129/195	66.15%
Scottish to British	66/195	33.85%
Welsh to Welsh	0/7	00.00%
Welsh to British	7/7	1000.00%

British marriages increased in the eighteenth century. The daughters of new nobles remained closer to home [that is they did not marry outside of their nation] than did those of more established families. This may well be because the old nobles spent more time in London and thus had a wider circle of acquaintance from which to find a spouse. Among the established nobles, English women married English men more often than the other

⁶² Including Unknown.

⁶³ The groom's nationality is unknown.

⁶⁴ Excluding Unknown.

nationalities married their own countrymen. Among the daughters of the new nobles, the Scots still were more likely to marry at home.

Table 68: 19th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁶⁵

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	61/179	34.08%
Non-British Marriages	67/179	37.43%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	51/179	28.49%
English to English	44/99	44.44%
English to British	28/99	28.29%
English to Unknown	27/99	27.27%
Irish to Irish	18/53	33.97%
Irish to British	19/53	35.84%
Irish to Unknown	16/53	30.19%
Scottish to Scottish	4/16	25.00%
Scottish to British	5/16	31.25%
Scottish to Unknown	7/16	43.75%
Welsh to Welsh	1/11	9.09%
Welsh to British	9/11	81.82%
Welsh to Unknown	1/11	9.09%

Table 69: 19th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of New Nobles⁶⁶

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	61/128	47.66%
Non-British Marriages	67/128	52.34%
English to English	44/72	61.11%
English to British	28/72	88.89%
Irish to Irish	18/37	48.65%
Irish to British	19/37	51.35%
Scottish to Scottish	4/9	44.44%
Scottish to British	5/9	55.56%
Welsh to Welsh	1/10	10.00%
Welsh to British	9/10	90.00%

⁶⁵ Including Unknown.

⁶⁶ Excluding Unknown.

Table 70: 19th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁶⁷

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	480/1511	31.77%
Non-British Marriages	532/1511	35.21%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	499/1511	33.02%
English to English	365/776	47.04%
English to British	187/776	24.06%
English to Unknown	224/776	28.90%
Irish to Irish	94/381	24.67%
Irish to British	150/381	39.37%
Irish to Unknown	137/381	35.96%
Scottish to Scottish	71/320	22.18%
Scottish to British	119/320	37.19%
Scottish to Unknown	130/320	40.63%
Welsh to Welsh	2/34	5.88%
Welsh to British	24/34	70.59%
Welsh to Unknown	8/34	23.53%

Table 71: 19th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁶⁸

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	480/1012	47.43%
Non-British Marriages	532/1012	52.57%
English to English	365/552	66.12%
English to British	187/552	33.88%
Irish to Irish	94/244	38.52%
Irish to British	150/244	61.48%
Scottish to Scottish	71/190	37.37%
Scottish to British	119/190	62.63%
Welsh to Welsh	2/26	7.69%
Welsh to British	24/26	92.31%

Patterns changed quite drastically in the nineteenth century. The propensity to marry outside of national borders increased among all elite women. This is the century in which the ranks of the aristocracy are generally seen to have broadened to include an increasing number of plutocrats. The openness to cross-border marriages may well be a part of this increased permeability. Scottish aristocratic women, who had been the most prone to non-British marriages, were the most likely to marry a groom from another nation in the

⁶⁷ Including Unknown.

⁶⁸ Excluding Unknown.

nineteenth century. This too may have been due to the changing nature of the British aristocracy. Many of the newer titled families had made their fortunes in Scotland. It may also have been due to something as simple as improvement in transport making it easier for the daughters of Scottish nobles to travel to London to take part in the Season and thus meet eligible, non-Scottish men.

Table 72: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles, 1901-1920⁶⁹

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	94/340	27.64%
Non-British Marriages	82/340	24.12%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	164/340	48.24%
English to English	60/174	34.38%
English to British	36/174	20.79 %
English to Unknown	78/174	44.83%
Irish to Irish	7/89	7.80%
Irish to British	33/89	37.10%
Irish to Unknown	49/89	55.10%
Scottish to Scottish	15/66	22.75%
Scottish to British	20/66	30.30%
Scottish to Unknown	31/66	46.97%
Welsh to Welsh	0/11	0.00%
Welsh to British	5/11	45.45%
Welsh to Unknown	6/11	54.55%

Table 73: Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles, 1901-1920⁷⁰

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	94/176	53.41%
Non-British Marriages	82/176	46.59%
English to English	60/96	62.50%
English to British	36/96	37.50 %
Irish to Irish	7/40	17.50%
Irish to British	33/40	82.50%
Scottish to Scottish	15/35	42.86%
Scottish to British	20/35	57.14%
Welsh to Welsh	0/5	0.00%
Welsh to British	5/5	100.00%

⁶⁹ Including Unknown

⁷⁰ Excluding Unknown.

Table 74: 20th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁷¹

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	202/1220	0.74%
Non-British Marriages	193/1220	31.64%
Groom's Nationality Unknown	825/1220	67.62%
English to English	142/704	20.17%
English to British	36/704	12.50%
English to Unknown	474/704	67.33%
Irish to Irish	16/233	2.58%
Irish to British	59/233	25.32%
Irish to Unknown	168/233	72.10%
Scottish to Scottish	35/250	14.00%
Scottish to British	53/250	21.20%
Scottish to Unknown	162/250	64.80%
Welsh to Welsh	0/33	0.00%
Welsh to British	12/33	36.36%
Welsh to Unknown	21/33	63.64%

Table 75: 20th Century Marriage Patterns of the Daughters of Old Nobles⁷²

	Total Numbers	Percentages
British Marriages	202/395	51.13%
Non-British Marriages	193/395	48.87%
English to English	142/230	61.74%
English to British	36/230	38.26%
Irish to Irish	16/65	9.23%
Irish to British	59/65	90.77%
Scottish to Scottish	35/88	39.77%
Scottish to British	53/88	60.23%
Welsh to Welsh	0/12	0.00%
Welsh to British	12/12	100.00%

Due to the policy of creating life rather than hereditary peers, there were fewer new nobles in the twentieth century than ever before. Analysis, therefore, of their marital patterns does not yield any meaningful results. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, the trend toward cross-national marriages continued. In this period the Irish were the least likely to marry within their own nation. Both of these findings remain consistent when looking at the whole of the twentieth century.

⁷¹ Including Unknown.

⁷² Excluding Unknown.

In *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*⁷³ Linda Colley argues that a sense of British national identity developed in the eighteenth century in response to wars against Catholic France and out of a shared Protestantism. Colley deliberately leaves the Irish out of her analysis as they do not fit the model of an identity based on Protestant faith. Social rank also plays little role in her thesis. The analysis of national aristocratic marriage patterns offered above would seem to both support and complicate the Colley thesis. It is a logical supposition that if a British national identity was created, the number of cross-national marriages would increase among the social group that had easy access to travel (so that they could come into contact with people from the other nations). An increase in the Britishness of aristocratic marriages did occur in the eighteenth century. Moreover, this upsurge in cross-border unions includes the Irish. This study then, supports Colley's assertion of the development of a British national identity, but extends that definition to include the Irish. This inclusion of the Catholic Irish does pose a challenge to Colley's argument that "[w]ar played a vital part in the invention of a British nation after 1707, but it could never have been so influential without other factors, and in particular without the impact of religion. It was their common investment in Protestantism that first allowed the English, the Welsh and the Scots to become fused together..."⁷⁴ Looking at the issue of national identity through an examination of the marital patterns of aristocratic women indicates that there was something more than shared Protestantism causing the development of a British identity, at least for the upper rank of society.

⁷³ First published in 1992 by Yale University Press. Citations hereafter will be to the 2nd edition, 2005.

⁷⁴ Colley, *Britons*, 367-368.

Appendix III: Biographical Information

Below is basic biographical information for the women mentioned in the text.

Name	Dates	Biographical Information
Abney-Hastings, Flora	1854-1887	Daughter of Charles Abney-Hastings, 1st Baron Donington and Edith Rawdon-Hastings, Countess of Loudon. She married Henry FitzAlan Howard, 15th Duke of Norfolk in 1877.
Acheson, Alexandra	1878-1958	Daughter of Archibald, 4th Earl of Gosford and Louisa Montagu (daughter of the 7th Duke of Manchester and Luise von Alten). She married Hon. Frederick Stanley, son of the 16th Earl of Derby in 1905.
Acheson, Mary	b. 1881	Daughter of Archibald, 4th Earl of Gosford and Louisa Montagu (daughter of the 7th Duke of Manchester and Luise von Alten). She married Hon. Robert Ward, son of the 1st Earl of Dudley in 1906.
Acheson, Theodosia	1882-1977	Daughter of Archibald, 4th Earl of Gosford and Louisa Montagu (daughter of the 7th Duke of Manchester and Luise von Alten). Married Hon. Alexander Cadogan, son of 5th Earl of Cadogan, in 1912. Cadogan was a diplomat in the foreign service. Her portrait was done by John Singer Sargent and a charcoal study of her that had been owned by her husband was sold by Christies in December 2009 for \$182,500 (http://www.christies.com/Lotfinder/lot_details.aspx?intObjectID=526696). Her scrapbook of country house visits is in the British Library, Add. 75295.
Alten, Luise von	1832-1911	Daughter of Karl von Alten. She married William Montagu, 7th Duke of Manchester in 1852. Following his death, she married Spencer Cavendish, 8th Duke of Devonshire in 1892. Grandmother of Alexandra, Mary, and Theodosia Acheson.
Annesley, Catherine	d. 1865	Daughter of Arthur, 1st Earl of Mountnorris. She married Lord John Somerset, son of the 5th Duke of Beaufort in 1814.
Annesley, Katherine	c. 1700-1736	Daughter and only child of James Annesley, 3rd Earl of Anglesey and Catherine Darnley (illegitimate daughter of James II and Catherine Sedley, Countess of Dorchester). She married William Phipps in 1718.
Anson, Anne	1796-1882	Daughter of Thomas Anson, 1st Viscount Anson and Anne Coke (daughter of the 1st Earl of Leicester of Holkham). She married Archibald Primrose, 4th Earl of Rosebery in 1819 following his divorce from Harriett Bouverie.
Anson, Isabella	d. 1922	Daughter of Hon. George Anson (son of 1st Viscount Anson and Anne Coke, daughter of the 1st Earl of Leicester of Holkham) and Isabella Forester (daughter of Cecil Weld-Forester, 1st Baron Forester and Lady Katherine Manners).

Arbuthnot, Caroline	b. c. 1802	She married Richard Curzon-Howe, 3rd Earl of Howe in 1858. Daughter of Rt. Hon. Charles Arbuthnot. She was the step-daughter of Harriet Fane. She did not marry.
Arbuthnot, Marcia	1804-1878	Daughter of Rt. Hon. Charles Arbuthnot. She was the step-daughter of Harriet Fane. She married William Cholmondeley, 3rd Marquess of Cholmondeley in 1825.
Archer, Sarah	1762-1838	Daughter of Andrew Archer, 2nd Lord Archer. She married firstly Other Hickman Windsor, 5th Earl of Plymouth in 1778. Following his death in 1799, she married William Pitt Amherst, later 1st Earl of Amherst in 1800. She was known for her work as a naturalist.
Armitage, Elizabeth		Parenthood is unknown, though it is thought that her birth name was Elizabeth Cane. She married Hon. Charles James Fox in 1795. She was a famous courtesan and had been Fox's mistress for some time. Though she was accepted by society in her role as his mistress, she was shunned as his wife.
Arundell, Mary	d. 1557	Daughter of Sir John Arundell. She married Robert Ratcliffe, 1st Earl of Sussex as his 3rd wife in 1537. She then married Henry Fitzalan, 19th Earl of Arundel in 1545.
Ashburnham, Jemima	1762-1786	Daughter of John Ashburnham, 2nd Earl Ashburnham. She married James Graham, later 3rd Duke of Montrose in 1785.
Ashley, Edwina	1901-1960	Daughter of Wilfred Ashley, 1st Baron Mount Temple. She married Louis Mountbatten, 1st Earl Mountbatten of Burma in 1922.
Ashley-Cooper, Mary Anne	1766-1854	Daughter of Anthony Ashley-Cooper, the 4th Earl of Shaftesbury. She married Charles Sturt in 1788. The marriage was unhappy and she entered into an affair with George Spencer-Churchill, Marquess of Blandford (later 5th Duke of Marlborough). Sturt attempted to sue for damages, but when his own adultery was revealed his suit failed.
Aston, Barbara	1744-1786	Daughter and co-heir of James Aston, 5th Lord Faston of Forfar. She married Hon. Henry Clifford, son of 3rd Baron Clifford of Chudleigh in 1762.
Baillie, Mary	d. 1900	Daughter of George Baillie. She married George Hamilton-Gordon, 5th Earl of Aberdeen in 1840. She was the mother-in-law of Isabel Marjoribanks.
Bannister, Henrietta	d. 1796	Daughter of John Bannister. She married Rev. Hon. Brownlow North, son of the 1st Earl of Guilford in 1771.
Barry, Katherine		Daughter and heiress of James Barry, 3rd Viscount Barry. She married Richard Power, 4th Baron le Power and Coroghmore in the 16th century.
Bassett, Anne		Daughter of Sir John Bassett and Honor Grenville. She was the step-daughter of Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle. She married Walter Hungerford in the 16th century.
Bassett, Mary		Daughter of Sir John Bassett and Honor Grenville. She was the step-daughter of Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle. In

- 1536 a clandestine marriage she had entered into with a French gentleman came to light.
- Bentinck, Elizabeth d. 1765 Daughter of Hans Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland. She eloped with Henry Edgerton, son of the 3rd Earl of Bridgewater in 1720. Sister of Harriet.
- Bentinck, Harriet 1705-1792 Daughter of Hans Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland. She married James Hamilton, Viscount of Limerick (later 1st Earl of Clanbrassil) in 1728. Her marriage contract is in the British Library, Egerton MSS 111. Sister of Elizabeth.
- Berkeley, Elizabeth d. 1769 Daughter of Charles Berkeley, the 2nd Earl of Berkeley. She married Sir John Germaine, 1st Bt. (d. 1719). She was a friend of Jonathan Swift. She was the sister-in-law of Henrietta Hobart.
- Berkeley, Elizabeth 1750-1828 Daughter of Augustus Berkeley, 4th Earl of Berkeley. She married William, 6th Baron Craven in 1767. She was unfaithful to him, by 1786 her affair with Henry Vernon was public knowledge and Craven discouraged her children from writing to her. Elizabeth and Craven had separated in 1783 (he settled £1500 per year on her) and upon his death in 1791 (September) she promptly remarried (in October) Christian von Brandenburg-Anspach. Her memoirs were published as Anspach, Elizabeth Berkeley Craven. *Memoirs of the Margravine of Anspach Written by Herself*. London: Henry Colborn, 1826. She has an entry in the ODNB
- Bertie, Catherine d. 1636 Daughter of Robert Bertie, 1st Earl of Lindsey. She married Sir William Paston, 1st Bart. in 1631. A marriage contract for a match with William Vaughan is in the British Library, Add MSS 2747, f. 274.
- Bertie, Charlotte 1812-1895 Daughter of Albermarle Bertie, 9th Earl of Lindsey. She married Josiah Guest, a wealthy Welsh industrialist. She taught herself Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and Middle Welsh. Following Guest's death, she married Charles Schreiber who was 14 years younger than she and was her eldest son's tutor at Cambridge. In later life she became famous as a china collector. Her writings are printed in Bessborough, Earl of, ed. *Lady Charlotte Guest: Extracts from her Journal, 1833-52*. London: John Murray, 1950. Biographical studies include Bessborough, Earl of (ed). *Lady Charlotte Guest*, Guest, R. and A. John. *Lady Charlotte: A Biography of the Nineteenth Century*. 1989; Guest, Rachael. *Lady Charlotte Guest: An Extraordinary Life*. 2007.
- Bertie, Priscilla 1761-1828 Daughter of Peregrine Bertie, 3rd Duke of Ancaster and Kesteven. She was Baroness Willoughby de Eresby in her own right. She married Peter Burrell, 1st Baron Gwydyr in 1779. She was a leading figure in early 19th century Society.

- Bladen, Harriet d. 1821 Daughter of Colonel Bladen. She married William Capel, 4th Earl of Essex as his second wife in 1767.
- Blood, Gertrude 1857-1911 Daughter of Edmund Blood. She married Lord Colin Campbell, the youngest son of the 8th Duke of Argyll in 1881. On the grounds that he had infected her with syphilis she was granted a separation from him in 1884. In 1886, they were the principals in one of the most salacious divorce cases of the 19th century in which charges of mutual adultery were slung. One of the most important men accused of adultery with her was George Spencer-Churchill, later 8th Duke of Marlborough who had recently been divorced from his wife Albertha Hamilton. Gertrude was an accomplished writer. A biography of her was published as Fleming, Gordon. *Lady Colin Campbell: Victorian 'Sex Goddess.'* Gloucester: Windrush, 1989.
- Blount, Sarah d. 1656 Daughter of William Blount. Married Sir Thomas Symthe. After his death she married as his second wife Robert Syndey, 1st Earl of Leicester.
- Blunt, Judith 1873-1957 Daughter of Wilfred Blunt and Lady Anne King (daughter of the 1st Earl of Lovelace). She was the great grand daughter of the poet Lord Byron. She married Hon. Stephen Lytton (son of the 1st Earl of Lytton) in 1899; the couple divorced in 1923. In 1917, she became Baroness of Wentworth in her own right, inheriting the title from her mother. She was known for her work in raising Arabian horses. She entered into a very public quarrel with her aunt-by-marriage, Mary Wortley, over the publication of a biography of Lady Byron, the poet's wife. Correspondence associated with this is housed in the British Library, Add. MSS 72094.
- Boleyn, Anne c. 1501-1536 Daughter of Thomas Boleyn, Earl of Wiltshire and Elizabeth Howard, the daughter of the 2nd Duke of Norfolk. Married Henry VIII in 1533. Anne was sympathetic to the Protestant cause. She was accused of adultery with five men, including her brother and was executed in 1536. She is the mother of Elizabeth I and sister of Mary. She has been the subject of innumerable biographies and other scholarly studies. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Boleyn, Mary d. 1543 Daughter of Thomas Boleyn, Earl of Wiltshire and Elizabeth Howard, the daughter of the 2nd Duke of Norfolk. She married William Carey in 1521. During this marriage, she was briefly the mistress of Henry VIII. Following Carey's death, she contracted a clandestine marriage with the much younger William Stafford. She is the sister of Anne and the grand mother of Lettice Knollys.
- Bonfoy, Anne d. 1821 Daughter of Capt. Hugh Bonfoy. She married Henry Loftus, 1st Earl of Ely in 1775.

- Bonville, Cecily (Cecilia) c. 1460-1529 Daughter and heir to William Bonville, 6th Lord Harington. She married Thomas Grey, Marquess of Dorset in 1474. She married secondly Henry Stafford, Earl of Wiltshire. She was Baroness Bonville and Harington in her own right. She was the mother of Elizabeth and Dorothy Grey.
- Bootle-Wilbraham, Emma d. 1876 Daughter of Charles Bootle-Wilbraham, 1st Baron Skelmersdale. She married Edward Smith-Stanley, 14th Earl of Derby in 1825. She is the mother of Emma Stanley.
- Boscawen, Elizabeth 1747-1828 Daughter of Hon. Edward Boscawen (son of 1st Viscount Falmouth). She married Henry Somerset, 5th Duke of Beaufort in 1766.
- Boughton, Elizabeth Daughter of Edward Boughton. She married firstly Sir Richard Wortley. She married secondly William Cavendish, 1st Earl of Devonshire, as his 2nd wife, before 1619. Elizabeth Hardwick was her mother-in-law.
- Bourchier, Margaret d. 1552 Daughter of Sir Humphrey Bourchier, son 1st Lord Berners. She married Sir Thomas Bryan and was the mother of Sir Francis, Margaret and Elizabeth Bryan. She married secondly David Soche. She served as governess to the future Elizabeth I.
- Bouverie, Charlotte d. 1810 Daughter of Hon. Bartholomew Bouvier (son of 1st Earl of Radnor) and Mary Arundell (granddaughter of 6th Baron Arundell). She married Henry St. John-Mildmay, 4th Bart. in 1809. She is the sister of Harriett.
- Bouverie, Harriett d. 1834 Daughter of Hon. Bartholomew Bouvier (son of 1st Earl of Radnor) and Mary Arundell (granddaughter of 6th Baron Arundell). She married Archibald Primrose, 4th Earl of Rosebery in 1808. She was divorced in 1815 on the grounds of her adultery with her widowed brother-in-law, Henry St. John-Mildmay, 4th Bart. (husband of her sister Charlotte). She and Mildmay were married in 1815 in Germany by special permission of the King of Wurttemberg.
- Bowater, Louisa 1842-1913 Daughter of General Sir Edward Bowater. She married Rainald Knightley, later 1st Baron Knightley in 1869. She followed her family tradition of service to the monarchy, acting as an Extra Lady-in-Waiting to the Duchess of Albany. She was active in supporting her husband's political career in the Conservative Party and was a member of the Primrose League. She spoke out in favour of female education and worked to gain voting rights for women. Her journals are published as Cartwright, Julia (ed). *The Journals of Lady Knightley of Fawsley, 1856-1881*. London: John Murray, 1915. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Bowes (Lyon), Anna Maria d. 1832 Daughter of John Lyon (Bowes), 9th Earl of Strathmore and Mary Bowes. She eloped with Jepson in 1788. Sister of Maria.

Bowes, Maria (Mary)	d. 1806	Daughter of John Lyon (Bowes), 9th Earl of Strathmore and Mary Bowes. She married Col. Barrington Price in 1789. Sister of Anna.
Bowes, Mary	1749-1800	Daughter and heir of the very wealthy industrialist George Bowes. She married John Lyon (Bowes) 9th Earl of Strathmore in 1767. Following his death she entered into a disastrous and scandalous marriage with the Irish soldier Andrew Robinson Stoney in 1777. The marriage ended in divorce in 1789, but not until after allegations of spousal abuse had appeared in the press. A biographical study of her has been published by Wendy Moore, <i>Wedlock: How Georgian Britain's Worst Husband Met His Match</i> . London: Phoenix, 2009. She has an entry in ODNB. Mother of Anna and Maria.
Bowes-Lyon, Elizabeth	1900-2002	Daughter of George Bowes-Lyon, 14th Earl of Strathmore. She married Prince Albert, later King George VI, in 1923. She was the mother of Queen Elizabeth II and Princess Margaret. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Boyle, Alice	1607-1666	Daughter of Richard, 1st Earl of Cork. She married David Barry, 1st Earl of Barrymore in 1621. She married secondly, John Barry after 1642. She is the sister of Catherine, Mary, Lettice, and Joan.
Boyle, Catherine	1615-1691	Daughter of Richard, 1st Earl of Cork. Her father provided no formal education for his daughters, but despite this lack, Catherine developed into a serious intellectual. She married Arthur Jones, 2nd Viscount Ranelagh in 1630. She is the sister of Mary, Alice, Lettice, and Joan.
Boyle, Charlotte	1769-1831	Daughter of Hon. Robert Boyle-Walsingham. She was Baroness de Ros in her own right. She married Lord Henry FitzGerald in 1791. Emily Lennox was her mother-in-law.
Boyle, Elizabeth	c. 1657-1725	Daughter of Richard, 2nd Earl of Cork and Elizabeth Clifford, Baroness Clifford. She married Nicholas Tufton, 3rd Earl of Thanet in 1664.
Boyle, Grace	d. 1763	Daughter and heiress of Richard Boyle, 2nd Viscount Shannon. She married Charles Sackville, 2nd Duke of Dorset in 1744. She was lady of the bedchamber and mistress of the robes to the Princess of Wales from 1743-1763.
Boyle, Joan	1611-1657	Daughter of Richard Boyle, 1st Earl of Cork. She married George FitzGerald, 16th Earl of Kildare in 1630. She is the sister of Catherine, Mary, Lettice and Alice.
Boyle, Lettice	1610-1649	Daughter of Richard Boyle, 1st Earl of Cork. She married George Goring, Lord Goring (son of 1st Earl of Norwich) in 1629. She is the sister of Catherine, Joan, Mary, and Alice.
Boyle, Mary	1625-1678	Daughter of Richard Boyle, the 1st Earl of Cork. Married Charles Rich, later Earl of Warwick, in 1641. She turned down several suitors for her hand that had the support of her father. She married Charles Rich, who at that time had few prospects,

- against the wishes of her father. She is the sister of Catherine, Mary, Alice, and Lettice. Her memoirs are published Rich, Mary (Countess of Warwick). *Memoir of Lady Warwick, Also Her Diary...* London: Religious Tract Society, 1847 and Rich, Mary. *Autobiography of Mary Countess of Warwick*. T. Crofton Croker (ed). London: Percy Society, 1848. Biographical studies include: Anon. *Mary Countess of Warwick*. The English Monthly Tract Soc., c. 1845
- Brandon, Anne
 Daughter of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. Half-sister to Frances. Married Edward, 3rd Baron Grey in the 16th century. She eloped with Randall Haworth whom she married after Edward Grey died.
- Brandon, Eleanor 1520-1547
 Daughter of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk and Mary Tudor (daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV). Sister of Frances. Half-sister to Anne. She married Henry Clifford, 2nd Duke of Cumberland in 1537.
- Brandon, Frances 1517-1559
 Daughter of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk and Mary Tudor. Sister of Eleanor. Half-sister to Anne. Married Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk. She had strong Protestant sympathies. Despite that, she was a good friend to Mary I. Married Adrian Stokes after Grey's execution. Mother of Jane, Katherine, and Mary Grey. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Braye, Dorothy 1530-1605
 Daughter of Edmund Braye, 1st Lord Braye and co-heiress to her brother John. She married firstly Edmund Brydges, 2nd Baron Chandos of Sudley in c. 1548. She then married the much younger William Knolleys, later 1st Earl of Banbury (c.1547-1632). The second marriage was not happy.
- Bridgeman, Ursula d. 1883
 Daughter of Hon. Charles Bridgeman (son of the 1st Earl of Bradford). She married Albert Conyngham, 1st Baron Londesborough in 1847. She married secondly, Rt. Hon. Otho FitzGerald, son of the 3rd Duke of Leinster, in 1861.
- Bristow, Caroline d. 1809
 Daughter of John Bristow. She married William Lyttelton, 1st Baron Lyttelton in 1774. She is the mother-in-law of Sarah Spencer.
- Brockholes, Catherine d. 1784
 Daughter of John Brockholes. She married Charles Howard, 10th Duke of Norfolk in 1739.
- Brooke, Elizabeth d. 1565
 Daughter of George Brooke, 9th Lord Cobham. She was the mistress of William Parr, Marquess of Northampton.
- Bruce, Christian c. 1596-1674
 Daughter of Edward Bruce, 1st Baron Bruce of Kinlosse. She married William Cavendish, 2nd Earl of Devonshire in 1608. Her biography is printed as Pomfret, Thomas. *The life of the right honourable and religious Lady Christian[a], late Countess Dowager of Devonshire*. London: William Rawlins, 1685.
- Brudenell, Harriet 1799-1836
 Daughter of Robert Brudenell, 6th Earl of Cardigan. She married Richard Curzon-Howe, 1st Earl of Howe in 1820.

Brunton, Louisa	1785- 1860	Daughter of John Brunton. She married William Craven, 1st Earl of Craven in 1807. She was an actress.
Bryan, Elizabeth		Daughter of Sir Thomas Bryan and Margaret Bouchier. She married Nicholas Carewe c. 1514. She was the sister of Sir Francis and Margaret Bryan. Her will is in the British Library Add. MSS 29605 f. 14.
Bryan, Margaret		Daughter of Sir Thomas Bryan and Margaret Bouchier. Married Sir Henry Guildford in 1512. Sister of Sir Francis and Elizabeth Bryan.
Brydges, Katherine	d. c. 1566	Daughter of John Brydges, 1st Baron Chandos of Sudley. She married Edward Sutton, 4th Lord Dudley in 1556.
Burdett-Coutts, Angela	1814- 1906	Daughter of Sir Francis Burdett and Sophia Coutts (Daughter of Thomas Coutts and his first wife). She was the step-daughter of Harriet Mellon. Upon Harriet's death in 1837, Angela inherited £1.8 million with the restriction that she not marry a foreign national. She turned her attention and money toward philanthropy and did not marry. In 1881, at the age of 66 she unexpectedly married her 29-year-old American secretary William Ashmead Bartlett. The marriage created great scandal.
Burdett-Coutts, Clara	c. 1808- 1899	Daughter of Sir Francis Burdett and Sophia Coutts (Daughter of Thomas Coutts and his first wife). She was the step-daughter of Harriet Mellon. When her sister Angela married in 1881, Clara inherited her vast fortune. She married Rev. James Money in 1850. In 1880, she legally changed her name to Clara Coutts-Nevill.
Burgh, Margaret de	c. 1831- 1888	Daughter of the Ulrich de Burgh 1st Marquess of Clanricarde. She married Wentworth Beaumont, 1st Baron Allendale in 1856.
Burgh, Selina Constance de	1829- 1851	Daughter of Hubert de Burgh. She married William Ward, later 1st Earl of Dudley. The marriage was not happy.
Butler, Elizabeth	d. 1628	Daughter of Thomas Butler, 10th Earl of Ormonde and Hon. Elizabeth Sheffield (daughter of 2nd Baron Sheffield). She married firstly, Theobald Butler, 1st Viscount Butler in 1603. Following his death in 1613, she married Richard Preston, 1st Earl of Desmond.
Butler, Mary	1846- 1929	Daughter of John Butler, the 2nd Marquess of Ormonde and Frances Paget. She married the Hon. William Henry Fitzwilliam, son of the 6th Earl of Fitzwilliam in 1877. She had previously, in 1866, rejected his brother [confusingly named, as were all of the Marquess's sons] William Fitzwilliam, Viscount Milton.
Byng, Georgiana	d. 1801	Daughter of George Byng, the 4th Viscount Torrington and Lucy Boyle (daughter of the 5th Earl of Cork). She married John Russell (later 6th Duke of Bedford), son of the 4th Duke of Bedford in 1786. Sister of Isabella.

Byng, Isabella	1773- 1830	Daughter of George Byng, the 4th Viscount Torrington and Lucy Boyle (daughter of the 5th Earl of Cork). She married Thomas Thynne, 2nd Marquess of Bath in 1794. Sister of Georgiana.
Byron, Ada	1815- 1852	Daughter of George Gordon, 6th Baron Byron and Anne Millibanke Noel. She married William King, 1st Earl of Lovelace in 1835. She was a renowned mathematician.
Cadogan, Sarah	1705- 1751	Daughter of William Cadogan, 1st Earl of Cadogan. She married Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond in 1719. She was the mother of Georgiana Lennox.
Campbell, Augusta	1760- 1831	Daughter of John, 5th Duke of Argyll. She married Brig. Gen. Henry Clavering c. 1788. The marriage was undertaken without her parents' consent. Apparently, the two had met at a masquerade ball and married two weeks later. The marriage was not happy and the couple eventually separated. Sister of Charlotte.
Campbell, Caroline	1717- 1794	Daughter of John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll. Against her wishes she married Francis Scott, Earl of Dalkeith, (son of the 2nd Duke of Buccleuch) in 1742. Following his death, she married Hon. Charles Townshend (son of 3rd Viscount Townshend) in 1755. She was created Baroness Greenwich in her own right in 1767.
Campbell, Castila	d. 1938	Daughter of Walter Campbell of Islay. She married Granville Leveson-Gower, 2nd Earl Granville in 1865. She was Harriet Cavendish's daughter-in-law.
Campbell, Charlotte	1775- 1861	Daughter of John Campbell, 5th Duke of Argyll. She married Col. John Campbell in 1796 and secondly Rev. Edward Bury in 1818. Following the death of her first husband in 1809, she entered the household of the Princess of Wales, later Queen Caroline, estranged wife of George IV. She made a reputation for herself as a writer. She kept a diary while in service to Caroline that has been published as Bury, Lady Charlotte. <i>The Diary of a Lady-in-Waiting</i> . London: John Lane, 1908. Sister of Augusta. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Campbell, Edith	1849- 1913	Daughter of George Campbell, 8th Duke of Argyll and Elizabeth Sutherland-Leveson-Gower (daughter of the 2nd Duke of Sutherland). She married Henry Percy, later 7th Duke of Northumberland in 1868.
Campbell, Flora	1780- 1840	Daughter and heir of James Campbell, 5th Earl of Loudon. Countess Loudon in her own right. She married Francis Rawdon-Hastings, 1st Marquess of Hastings in 1804.
Campbell, Frances	1858- 1931	Daughter of George Campbell, 8th Duke of Argyll and Elizabeth Sutherland-Leveson-Gower (daughter of the 2nd Duke of Sutherland and Harriett Howard, daughter of the 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish). She married Col. Eustace Balfour in 1879. She is the great-great grand-daughter

		of Georgiana Spencer, the and the great grand-niece of Harriett Cavendish.
Campbell, Mary	1727- 1811	Daughter of John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll. She married Edward Coke, Viscount Coke, son of the 1st Viscount of Leicester in 1747. They separated in 1750.
Cane, Elizabeth	1750- 1842	See Armitage, Elizabeth.
Capel, Georgiana	d. 1835	Daughter of Hon. John Capel (son of the 4th Earl of Essex) and Caroline Paget (daughter of 1st Earl of Uxbridge). She married Pierce Butler in 1831. She died in childbirth in Paris.
Capel, Mary	1630- 1715	Daughter of Arthur, 1st Baron Capel and Elizabeth Morrison. She married Henry Seymour, Lord Beauchamp, son of the 2nd Duke of Somerset, in 1648. She later married Henry Somerset, 1st Duke of Beaufort in 1657.
Caton, Elizabeth	d. 1862	American, daughter of Richard Caton. She married George Jerningham, 8th Baron Stafford in 1836.
Caton, Louisa	1792- 1874	American, daughter of Richard Caton. Married Sir Bathurst-Hervy, 1st Bart. Before 1828 and then Francis Osborne, Marquess of Carmarthen (later 7th Duke of Leeds) in 1828.
Caton, Marianne	d. 1853	American, daughter of Richard Caton. She married firstly Robert Patterson, before 1825. She married secondly Richard Wellesley, 1st Marquess Wellesley (brother of the 1st Duke of Wellington) in 1825. She was lady of the bedchamber to Queen Dowager Adelaide (the widow of William IV)
Cavendish, Dorothy	1750- 1794	Daughter of William Cavendish, 4th Duke of Devonshire and Charlotte Boyle, Baroness Clifford (daughter of the 4th Earl of Cork and Lady Dorothy Savile, daughter of the 2nd Marquess of Halifax and Lady Mary Finch). She married William Cavendish-Bentinck, 3rd Duke of Portland in 1766. She was the mother-in-law of Georgiana Seymour and Anne Wellesley.
Cavendish, Elizabeth	1555- 1582	Daughter of Sir William Cavendish and Elizabeth Hardwick. She married Charles Stuart, 5 th Earl of Lennox (son of Margaret Douglas) in 1574. She was the mother of Arabella Stuart and daughter-in-law of Margaret Douglas.
Cavendish, Georgiana	1783- 1858.	Daughter of William Cavendish, 5th Duke of Devonshire and Georgiana Spencer, daughter of 1st Earl Spencer. She married George Howard, 6th Earl of Carlisle in 1801. Until her husband succeeded as Duke in 1825, she was known as Lady Morpeth and lived with his family in a situation that was not terribly happy. She was the recipient of many of her sister Harriett's letters which have been collected.
Cavendish, Harriett	1785- 1862	Daughter of William Cavendish, 5th Duke of Devonshire and Georgiana Spencer, daughter of 1st Earl Spencer. She married Granville Leveson-Gower, 1st Earl Granville in 1809. She was 24 at the time of her marriage and he was 36. More shocking than the age difference was the fact that he had been the long-

time lover of her aunt Harriet Spencer. The younger Harriet took the children of that union into her home and the family was quite happy. Her letters are collected in Leveson-Gower, Hon. F., ed. *Letters of Harriet Countess Granville, 1810-1845*. London: Longmans, Green, 1894; Leveson-Gower, Sir George and Iris Palmer, eds. *Hary-O: the Letters of Lady Harriet Cavendish, 1796-1809*. London: John Murray, 1940. She was the sister of Georgiana. She has an entry in the ODNB.

- | | | |
|----------------------|------------|---|
| Cavendish, Katherine | 1857-1941 | Daughter of William Cavendish, 2nd Baron Chesham. She married Hugh Grosvenor, 1st Duke of Westminster in 1882. |
| Cecil, Anne | 1556-1589 | Daughter of William Cecil, 1st Lord Burghley. Married Edward de Vere, the 17 th Earl of Oxford in 1571. |
| Cecil, Anne | d. 1637 | Daughter of William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Salisbury. She married Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland before 1630. |
| Cecil, Anne | | Daughter of William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Exeter. She was the heiress to the borough and manor of Stamford. She married Henry Grey, 2nd Baron Grey of Groby, later created 1st Earl of Stamford in 1620. |
| Cecil, Catherine | d. 1752 | Daughter of James Cecil, the 5th Earl of Salisbury and Anne Tufton (daughter of the 6th Earl of Thanet and Catherine Cavendish, daughter of the 2nd Duke of Newcastle). She was married to John Perceval, later 2nd Earl of Egmont in 1737. Sister of Margaret. Her will is in the British Library Add. MSS 47213 ff. 117-121 |
| Cecil, Diana | d. 1658 | Daughter of William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Exeter. She married firstly Henry de Vere, 18th Earl of Oxford in 1623 (he died in 1625) and secondly she married Thomas Bruce, 1st Earl of Elgin. |
| Cecil, Elizabeth | d. c. 1672 | Daughter of William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Exeter. She married Thomas Howard, 1st Earl of Berkshire in 1614. |
| Cecil, Elizabeth | d. 1661 | Daughter of Edward Cecil, 1st Viscount Wimbledon. She married Francis Willoughby, 5th Baron Willoughby of Parham in 1629. She is the mother of Diana, Frances, and Elizabeth. |
| Cecil, Elizabeth | d. 1689 | Daughter of William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Salisbury. She married William Cavendish, 3rd Earl of Devonshire in 1639. |
| Cecil, Frances | 1593-1644 | Daughter of Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury. For most of her early life, her father kept her away from court as she had inherited his humpback and he wanted to shield her from the taunts that had made him so unhappy. She married Henry Clifford, 5th Earl of Cumberland in 1610. |
| Cecil, Margaret | | Daughter of James Cecil, the 5th Earl of Salisbury and Anne Tufton (daughter of the 6th Earl of Thanet and Catherine Cavendish, daughter of the 2nd Duke of Newcastle). Sister of Catherine. |

Cecil, Victoria	1843-1942	Daughter of Brownlow Cecil, 2nd Marquess of Exeter. She married, as his second wife, William Evans-Freke, later 8th Baron Carbery, in 1866.
Chamber, Mary	d. 1783	Daughter of Thomas Chamber and Lady Mary Berkeley (daughter of the 2nd Earl of Berkeley). She was an heiress and her half-caste grandmother made the tongues of London society twitter when she married Admiral Vere Beauclerk, the 3rd son of the 1st Duke of St. Albans (thus the grandson of Charles II) in 1736. She was the correspondent of Henrietta Hobart.
Chambers, Anne	1709-1777	Daughter of Thomas Chambers. She married Richard Genville, 2nd Earl Temple in 1737.
Chaplin, Edith	1879-1959	Daughter of Henry Chaplin, 1st Viscount Chaplin and Florence Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, (daughter of the 3rd Duke of Sutherland and the Countess of Cromartie). She married Charles Vane-Tempest-Stewart, 7th Marquess of Londonderry in 1899. Her memoirs are published as Londonderry, Marchioness of. <i>Retrospect</i> . London: Frederick Muller, 1938. She also wrote a biography of her father.
Charlton, Elizabeth	d. 1594	Daughter of Francis Charlton of Apley Castle. She married John Manners, 4th Earl of Rutland in 1573.
Charteris, Anne	1913-1981	Daughter of Hon. Guy Charteris (son of the 11th Earl of Wemyss). She married firstly, Shane O'Neil, 3rd Baron O'Neil in 1932. He was killed in action in 1944. She married secondly, Edmond Harmsworth, 2nd Viscount Rothermere in 1945. They divorced in 1952. She married thirdly Ian Fleming in 1952. She was a prominent member of artistic circles in the mid-20th century.
Cheape, Marianna	d. 1839	Daughter of John Cheape. She married Thomas Bowes-Lyon, later 11th Earl of Strathmore in 1817. The Earl had to borrow money for the marriage, a situation that later led to legal action when he failed to repay the loan.
Churchill, Anne	1683-1716	Daughter of John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough and Sara Jennings. She married Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland in 1700. A letter she wrote for her husband to open after her death setting out her instructions for her children is in the British Library, Add. MSS 61422 f. 76.
Churchill, Mary	1689-1751	Daughter of John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough and Sara Jennings. She married John Montagu, 2nd Duke of Montagu in 1705.
Clavering, Mary	1685-1724	Daughter of John Clavering. She married William Cowper, 1st Earl Cowper as his second wife in 1706. He was Lord Keeper of the Great Seal and later Lord Chancellor. She met him when she consulted him on legal matters. She was Lady of the Bedchamber to Caroline, Princess of Wales. Her journal is published as Cowper, Mary Clavering Countess. <i>Diary of</i>

- Mary Countess Cowper, Lady of the Bedchamber to the Princess of Wales, 1714-20.* London: J. Murray, 1864.
- Clayton, Rebecca
Clifford, Anne 1590-1676. Daughter of Sir Jasper Clayton. She married Robert Paston, 1st Earl of Yarmouth in 1650.
- 1590-1676. Daughter of George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland and Margaret Russell, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Bedford. She married Richard Sackville in 1609. After his death in 1624 she married Philip Herbert, 4th Earl of Pembroke in 1630. She was her father's only child, but when he died, she inherited only money, not property and title which were left to his younger brother. She spent much of her life fighting for what she considered to be rightfully hers. She did not inherit the property until the death of her uncle and his son; however, she was able to take up residence on her estates in 1649 and she devoted the rest of her life to estate management. Her marriages were unhappy as she did not think that her husbands were sufficiently dedicated to her fight for her title, but rather were only interested in her money. As Anne produced a journal and other writings, which was unusual for a woman of her era, she has been extensively studied. Studies of her life and writings include Myers, Anne M. "Construction Sites: the Architecture of Anne Clifford's Diaries." *English Literary History* 73 (2006): 581-600; Lewalski, Barbara K. "Re-Writing Patriarchy and Patronage: Margaret Clifford, Anne Clifford, and Aemilia Lanyer." *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 87-106; Acheson, Katherine O. (ed). *The Diary of Anne Clifford, 1616-1619*. New York: Garland, 1995; Clifford, Anne. *Lives of Anne Clifford... and of Her Parents, Summarized by Herself*. London: 1916; Clifford, D.J.H. (ed). *Diaries of Anne Clifford*. London: Alan Sutton, 1990.
- Clifford, Elizabeth 1613-1691. Daughter and heir of George Clifford, 5th Earl of Cumberland and Frances Cecil (daughter of 1st Earl of Salisbury). She held the title Baroness Clifford in her own right. She married Richard Boyle, later 2nd Earl of Cork in 1635. She is the mother of Elizabeth Boyle.
- Clifford, Katherine d. 1598. Daughter of Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland. She married John le Scrope, 8th Lord Scrope of Bolton around 1530. She was a devout Catholic.
- Clifford, Margaret 1540-1596. Daughter of Henry Clifford, 2nd Earl of Cumberland and Lady Eleanor Brandon (daughter of Henry VII's daughter Mary Tudor and her 2nd husband Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk). She married Henry Stanley, 4th Earl of Derby in 1555. She and Stanley were estranged. She was lady-in-waiting to Elizabeth I.

Clifford, Maud		Daughter of Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland and Lady Margaret Percy (daughter of the 4th Earl of Northumberland). She married John Conyers, 3rd Lord Conyers before 1539.
Clinton, Katherine	1797-1854	Daughter of Edward, 1st Earl of Lincoln and Elizabeth Blount. She married William Burgh, 2nd Lord Burgh in 1552. Her marriage contract is in the British Library, Add. MSS 33579 ff. 1-8.
Clinton, Louisa		Daughter of Gen. Sir William Clinton and Louisa Holyroyd (daughter of 1st Earl of Sheffield). She did not marry. She was a correspondent of Louisa Stuart.
Clopton, Joyce		Daughter and co-heiress of William Clopton. She married George Carew, later Baron Carew of Clopton and still later 1st Earl of Totnes, in 1580.
Clotworthy, Mary	d. 1686	Daughter and heiress of John Clotworthy, 1st Viscount Massereene and Margaret Jones (daughter of 1st Viscount Ranelagh). She married John Skeffington in 1654, who became 2nd Viscount Massereene in right of his wife.
Coke, Anne	1845-1876	Daughter of Thomas Coke, 2nd Earl of Leicester of Holkham. She married Maj. Gen. Edward Manningham-Buller in 1874.
Coke, Anne	1932-	Daughter of Thomas Coke, 5th Earl of Leicester and Elizabeth Yorke (daughter of the 8th Earl of Hardwicke). She married Colin Tennant, 3rd Baron Glenconner in 1956. She and her husband were prominent members of the social circle around Princess Margaret (daughter of George VI and sister to the current Queen) and introduced her to the island of Mustique where they own considerable property.
Coke, Frances	d. 1645	Daughter of Sir Edward Coke, the jurist, and Elizabeth Cecil (daughter of the 1st Earl of Exeter). She married John Villiers, 1st Viscount Purbeck, the brother of the 1st Duke of Buckingham in 1617. The marriage was unhappy. She eloped four years later with Sir Robert Howard. She was tried and found guilty of adultery and eventually fled to the Channel Islands.
Coke, Gertrude	1847-1943	Daughter of Thomas Coke, 2nd Earl of Leicester of Holkham. She married Charles Murray, 7th Earl of Dunmore in 1866.
Coke, Julia	1844-1931	Daughter of Thomas Coke, 2nd Earl of Leicester of Holkham. She married Mervyn Wingfield, 7th Viscount Powerscourt in 1864.
Coke, Winifred	1851-1940	Daughter of Thomas Coke, 2nd Earl of Leicester of Holkham. She married Robert Clements, 4th Earl of Leitrim in 1873.
Conygham, Elizabeth	d. 1839	Daughter of the 1st Marquess of Conygham. Married Charles Gordon, Lord Strathaven (later Earl of Aboyne and 10th Marquess of Huntly) in 1826. Her 1823 engagement to the future Duke of St. Albans (which was called off) was the cause of considerable gossip due to his reputed mental instability. She died without issue.

- Cooke, Elizabeth d. 1609 Daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke. She married firstly, Thomas Hoby before 1574. She married secondly John Russell, 3rd Baron Russell in 1574. She is the mother-in-law of Margaret Dakins. She and her sisters had far more distinguished careers than did their brothers. An unpublished dissertation was written on the sisters: Harvey, Sheridan. "The Cooke Sisters: A Study of Tudor Gentlewomen." Indiana University, 1981.
- Cooke, Mildred 1524-1589 Daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke. She married William Cecil, later Lord Burghley, in 1546 as his second wife. She was the eldest child of her family and was given a very good education at home by her father who was Edward VI's tutor. Due to her father's influence, she was very Puritan in her outlook. During the reign of Elizabeth I, when Cecil was the most important man in government, Mildred acted as an intermediary between petitioners and her husband. She and her sisters had far more distinguished careers than did their brothers. An unpublished dissertation was written on the sisters: Harvey, Sheridan. "The Cooke Sisters: A Study of Tudor Gentlewomen." Indiana University, 1981. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Copley, Elizabeth d. 1887 Daughter of Sir Joseph Copley, Bart. She died unmarried
- Copley, Maria d. 1879 Daughter of Sir Joseph Copley, Bart. She married Henry Grey Lord Howick, later the 3rd Earl Grey in 1832. Earl Grey was an important political figure.
- Cornwallis-West, Constance 1878-1970 Daughter of William Cornwallis-West. She married Hugh Grosvenor, 2nd Duke of Westminster in 1901. She was active in war work during the First World War and was awarded the Commander of the Order of the British Empire in 1918. She and Grosvenor were divorced in 1919. She married secondly Wing Commander Fitzpatrick Lewes in 1920.
- Courtenay, Elizabeth c. 1772-1815 Daughter of William Courtenay, 2nd Viscount Courtenay. She eloped with Lord Charles Somerset, son of the 5th Duke of Beaufort in 1788. The case was written up in the *London Times*.
- Coutts, Frances d. 1832 Daughter of the wealthy banker Thomas Coutts. She was the 2nd wife of John Stuart, 1st Marquess of Bute, whom she married in 1800. Her step-mother Harriet Mellon married the Duke of St. Albans. Sister of Susan.
- Coutts, Susan d. 1837 Daughter of the wealthy banker Thomas Coutts. She was the 2nd wife of the 3rd Earl of Guilford, George North, whom she married in 1796. Her step-mother Harriet Mellon married the Duke of St. Albans. Sister of Frances.

Coventry, Sophia	d. 1875	Daughter of William Coventry, 7th Earl of Coventry. She married Sir Roger Gresley, 8th Bart. in 1821. This marriage was the subject of a law suit in which his mother attempted to stop the marriage. She married secondly Henry Des Voeux, 3rd Bart. in 1839.
Cowper, Emily	d. 1879	Daughter of Peter Cowper, 5th Earl of Cowper and Emily Lamb (daughter of 1st Viscount Melborne). She married Anthony Ashley-Cooper, later 7th Earl of Shaftesbury in 1830.
Craddock- Hartopp, Catherine	d. 1935	Daughter of Sir John Craddock-Hartopp, 4th Bart. She married Alfred Edward Miller Mundy in 1883.
Craven, Beatrice	1844- 1907	Daughter of William Craven, 2nd Earl of Craven and Emily Grimston (daughter of 1st Earl of Verulam and Charlotte Jenkinson – daughter of the 1st Earl of Liverpool). She married George Cadogan, 5th Earl of Cadogan in 1865. She was an important London hostess.
Craven, Maria	1769- 1851	Daughter of William Craven, 6th Baron Craven and Elizabeth Berkeley, daughter of 4th Earl of Berkeley. She married William Molyneux, 2nd Earl of Sefton in 1792. She was a leading society figure.
Crew, Jemima		Daughter of Thomas Crew, 2nd Baron Crew of Stene. She married Henry Grey, 1st Duke of Kent, in 1695. She is the mother of Jemima Grey.
Crewe-Milnes, Annabel	1881- 1948	Daughter of Robert Crewe-Milnes, 1st Marquess of Crewe. She married Capt. Hon. Arthur O'Neill, heir of the 2nd Baron O'Neill. He was killed in action in 1914. She married secondly, Maj. James Hamilton in 1922.
Crichton, Caroline	d. 1856	Daughter of John Crichton the 1st Earl of Erne. She married James Stuart-Wortley-Mackenzie, 1st Baron Wharnccliffe in 1799.
Cromwell, Joan	d. c. 1641	Daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell. She married Sir Francis Barrington, 1st Bart. Her correspondence is in the British Library, Egerton MSS 2643 – 2651.
Curzon, Mary	1848- 1929	Daughter of Richard Curzon, 1st Earl of Howe. She married James Hamilton, 2nd Duke of Abercorn in 1869.
Dacre, Anne	d. 1581	Daughter of William Dacre, 3rd Lord Dacre. She married Henry Clifford, 2nd Earl of Cumberland in 1553 as his 2nd wife.
Dacre, Mabel		Daughter of Thomas Dacre, 2nd Lord Dacre and Elizabeth Greystoke. She married Henry le Scrope, 7th Lord Scrope of Bolton in the 16th century.
Dacre, Magdalen	1538- 1608	Daughter of William Dacre, 3rd Lord Dacre and Lady Elizabeth Talbot (daughter of the 4th Earl of Shrewsbury). She married Anthony Browne, 1st Viscount Montagu c. 1558. She was resolutely Catholic in her beliefs. A contemporary biography of her was published as Richard Smith, <i>The life of</i>

the most honourable and vertuous lady the Lady Magdalen Viscountesse Montague / written ... by Richard Smith. And now translated into English, by C. F[ursdon]. (St. Omer: English College Press, 1627).

- Dacre, Mary
 Daughter of Thomas Dacre, 2nd Lord Dacre. She married Francis Talbot, later 5th Earl of Shrewsbury before 1523.
- Dakins, Margaret 1571-1633
 Daughter and heiress of Arthur Dakins. She was raised in the household of George Hastings, the 4th Earl of Huntingdon. Before she was 30 she had been married three times. Her first husband was Walter Devereux, younger son of the 1st Earl of Essex. He died soon after their marriage and she was then wed to Thomas Sidney, the younger brother of the poet. Following his untimely death she then married Thomas Posthumous Hoby. Her journals survive and are the basis for Moody, Joanna (ed). *The Private Life of an Elizabethan Lady, the Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599-1605*. Thrupp: Sutton Publishing, 1998; Meads, Dorothy M. (ed). *Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599-1605*. London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1930.
- Darcy, Amelia (Emily) 1754-1784
 Daughter of Robert Darcy, 4th Earl of Holderness. She married Francis Osborne, later 5th Duke of Leeds in 1773. They were divorced in 1777. She then married Capt. John Byron in 1779.
- Darcy, Elizabeth 1584-1651
 Daughter and heir of Thomas Rivers, 1st Earl Rivers. She was Countess Rivers in her own right. She married Thomas Savage, 1st Viscount Savage of Rocksavage in 1602. She is the mother of Dorothy Savage.
- Dashwood, Catherine
 Daughter of Robert Dashwood, 1st Bart. She married Sir Robert Jenkinson, 4th Bart. in 1718. Her marriage contract is in the British Library, Add. MSS 3871.
- Dawson, Mary 1852-1935
 Daughter of Richard Dawson, 1st Earl of Dartry. She married Henry Fox-Strangways, 5th Earl of Ilchester in 1872. She was a leading figure in London Society. She collaborated with her son in editing the letters of Sarah Lennox, which were published as Ilchester, Countess of and Lord Stavordale (eds). *Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox, 1745-1826*. London: John Murray, 1901.
- Deacon, Gladys
 Daughter of Edward Deacon (American). She married Charles Spencer-Churchill, 9th Duke of Marlborough in 1921. *The New York Times* on June 2, 1921 announced their engagement with banner headlines reading: "MARLBOROUGH WILL WED GLADYS DEACON; Dukes Engagement to Former Friend of His Ex-Wife Announced in London. BRIDE-TO-BE WELL KNOWN Has Several Times Been Reported Engaged to Marry Members of European Nobility." She was friends

- with Consuelo Vanderbilt.
- Devereux, Dorothy 1561-1619 Daughter of Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex and Lettice Knollys. She married firstly Sir Thomas Perrot in 1583. She then married secondly Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland in 1594.
- Devereux, Penelope b. after 1561-1607 Daughter of Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex and Lettice Knollys. Married Robert Rich, 1st Earl of Warwick in 1581. Despite the birth of at least 7 children, the union was not happy. She entered into a liaison with Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy by 1595. Before 1605 she had at least 4 illegitimate children with Blount. In 1605, Rich sued for divorce. She admitted adultery and the divorce was granted but she was not given the right to remarry or to legitimize the children. She and Blount went through a form of marriage anyway. She is the sister of Dorothy. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Dillon, Louisa Daughter of Mr. Dillon. Married Sir Richard Strachan in 1812. She was a figure of some controversy in London as is evidenced by the cartoon entitled "Love a la mode: or two dear friends" which shows her embracing Lady Warwick on a park bench while their husbands look on in disapproval.
- Dillon-Lee, Henrietta Maria 1807-1895 Daughter of Henry Dillon-Lee, the 13th Viscount Dillon. Married Edward Stanley, 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderly in 1826. She was the daughter-in-law of Maria Holyroyd.
- Douglas, Caroline d. 1873 Daughter of Hon. John Douglas and Lady Frances Lascelles (granddaughter of the 14th Earl of Morton and the 1st Earl of Harewood). She married William Fox-Lane in 1817. She is the mother-in-law of Alice Stanley.
- Douglas, Jane 1698-1753 Daughter of James Douglas, 2nd Marquess of Douglas and Mary Kerr (daughter of 1st Marquess of Lothian). She entered into a clandestine marriage with the Jacobite adventurer Colonel John Steuart of Grandtully. The pair took up residence in France where, in 1748 at the age of 50, she claimed that she gave birth to twins. People suspected that it was a fraud in order to claim the inheritance of her brother. Ultimately, the case ended up in the courts where the legitimacy of the boys was upheld. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Douglas, Jane 1701-1729 Daughter of James Douglas, 2nd Duke of Queensberry. She married Francis Scott, 2nd Duke of Buccleuch in 1720. She is the sister-in-law of Catherine Hyde.
- Douglas, Margaret 1515-1578 Daughter of Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus and Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII and widow of James IV of Scotland. She entered into two clandestine relationships with members of the Howard family before marrying Matthew Stuart, 4th Earl of Lennox. Her eldest son married Mary, Queen of Scots. She was the grandmother of Arabella Stuart. She has an entry in the ODNB.

Drummond, Louisa	d. 1890	Daughter and heiress of Henry Drummond and Henrietta Hay-Drummond (daughter of the 10th Earl of Kinnoul). She married Algernon Percy, 6th Duke of Northumberland in 1845. She was a famous society hostess.
Drummond, Sarah Clementina	d. 1865	Daughter of John Drummond, 11th Earl of Perth and Clemintina Eliphinstone (daughter of the 10th Earl of Eliphinstone and Clementina Fleming, daughter of 6th Earl of Wigton and Lady Mary Keith). She married Peter Burrell (later Drummond-Burrell), 21st Baron Willoughby de Eresby in 1807. She was a leading society lady.
Duff, Anne	d. 1811	Daughter of William Duff. She married her mother's kinsman William Dalrymple-Crichton, 5th Earl of Dumfries in 1766. She married secondly Hon. Alexander Gordon, Lord Rockville (son of 2nd Earl of Aberdeen) in 1769.
Duncombe, Anne	d. 1829	Daughter of 1st Baron Feversham and Anne Hales. She married Jacob Bouverie, 2nd Earl of Radnor (he was her mother's step-son) in 1777.
Dyve, Charlotte	1679- 1742	Daughter of John Dyve and grand daughter (through her mother) of Sir Robert Wolseley. Married William Clayton, M.P., c. 1714. Through her friendship with the Marlboroughs she secured a position in Queen Caroline's (consort to George II) household. Her husband was elevated to the Irish peerage as Baron Sundon in 1735.
Eden, Emily	1797- 1869	Daughter of William Eden, 1st Baron Auckland. She was a novelist. She and her sister traveled to India to serve as hostesses for their brother who the Governor-General. She did not marry. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Edgecumbe, Caroline	d. 1824	Daughter of Richard Edgecumbe, 2nd Daughter of Mount Edgecumbe. She married Reginald MacDonald in 1812. He held the Jacobite title of the 6th Baron of Clanranald and was the 18th Chief of Clanranald.
Egerton, Alice	1923- 1927	Daughter of John Egerton, 4th Earl of Ellesmere. She never married and served Elizabeth II as Woman of the Bedchamber. She committed suicide in 1977 after losing her post.
Elliot-Murray- Kynynmound, Eileen	1884- 1938	Daughter of Gilbert Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, 4th Earl of Minto and Mary Grey. She married Lord Francis Montagu Douglas Scott, son of the 6th Earl of Buccleuch in 1915
Elliot-Murray- Kynynmound, Ruby	1886- 1961	Daughter of Gilbert Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, 4th Earl of Minto and Mary Grey (granddaughter of the 2nd Earl Grey). She married Roland Baring, 2nd Earl of Cromer in 1908.
Elliot-Murray- Kynynmound, Violet	1889- 1965	Daughter of Gilbert Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, 4th Earl of Minto and Mary Grey (granddaughter of the 2nd Earl Grey). She married Charles Mercer Nairne Petty-FitzMaurice, son of the 5th Marquess of Lansdowne in 1909 and then married John Astor, 1st Baron Astor of Hever, in 1916.

Etheridge, May	d. 1935	Daughter of Jesse Etheridge. She married Edward FitzGerald, 7th Earl of Leinster in 1913. They divorced in 1930. She was an actress.
Eversfield, Sophia	d. 1901	Daughter of James Eversfield. She married Henry Paget, later 3rd Marquess of Anglesey in 1845.
Fane, Augusta	1786- 1861	Daughter of John Fane, 10th Earl of Westmoreland. Unhappily married to John Parker, later first Earl of Morley (son of Theresa Robinson) in 1804. They were divorced in 1809 and she married the Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur Paget, the son of the 1st Earl of Uxbridge.
Fane, Harriet	1793- 1834	Granddaughter of Thomas Fane, the 8th Earl of Westmoreland. Married Rt. Hon. Charles Arbuthnot, MP in 1814. He was 26 years older than she. She is most famous as the 1st Duke of Wellington's "close female friend." Not surprisingly she was known for her strict Tory leanings. She died of cholera. She left extensive journals which are printed as Bamford, Francis and the Duke of Wellington, eds. <i>The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot, 1820-1832</i> . London: MacMillan, 1950.
Fane, Rose	1834- 1921	Daughter of John Fane, 11th Earl of Westmoreland and Priscilla Wellesley-Pole (daughter of the 3rd Earl of Mornington). She married Henry Weigall in 1866. In addition to other literary undertakings, she published her mother's letters as <i>The Correspondence of Priscilla, Countess of Westmoreland</i> . London: John Murray, 1909. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Fane, Sarah	1785- 1867	Daughter of John Fane, 10th Earl of Westmorland. She married George Child-Villiers, 5th Earl of Jersey in 1804. She was one of the leading ladies of 19th century London Society.
Farren, Elizabeth	d. 1829	Actress who had a long affair with and eventually married Edward Smith-Stanley, the 12th Earl of Derby in 1797.
Fellowes, Gladys		Daughter of William Fellowes, 2nd Baron de Ramsay and Rosamond Spencer-Churchill (daughter of the 7th Duke of Marlborough and Frances Vane, daughter of the 3rd Marquess of Londonderry and Lady Frances Vane-Tempest). She married Heneage Finch, Lord Geurnsey, son and heir to the 8th Earl of Aylesford. He was killed in action in 1914.
Fenton, Catherine	d. 1629	Daughter of Sir Geoffrey Fenton. She married Richard Boyle, 1st Earl of Cork in 1603.
Ferguson, Sarah	1959-	Daughter of Ronald Ferguson. She married Prince Andrew, Duke of York (son of Elizabeth II) in 1986. They were divorced in 1996.

Fermor, Sophia	1721-1745	Daughter of Thomas Fermor, 1st Earl of Pomfret and Hon. Henrietta Jeffreys, daughter of John Jeffreys, 2nd Baron Jeffreys and Lady Charlotte Herbert (daughter of Philip Herbert, 7th Earl of Pembroke). She married John Carteret, 2nd Earl of Granville in 1744. She was renowned for her beauty.
Fielding, Anne	d. 1636	Daughter of William Fielding, 1st Earl of Denbigh. She married Baptist Noel, 3rd Viscount Campden in 1632.
Fielding, Elizabeth	d. 1667	Daughter of William Fielding, 1st Earl of Denbigh. She married Lewis Boyle, 1st Viscount Boyle of Kinalmeaky, son of the 1st Earl of Cork, in 1639.
Fielding, Frances	d. 1734	Daughter of Basil, 4th Earl of Denbigh. She married Daniel Finch, later 8th Earl of Winchelsea (3rd Earl of Nottingham) in 1720 against the wishes of his father.
Fiennes, Celia	1662-1741	Daughter of Hon. Nathaniel Fiennes, son of 1st Viscount Saye and Sele (a Parliamentary General) and sister of the 3rd Viscount. She traveled around England from 1683-1703, keeping extensive notes which have been published as <i>Fiennes, Celia. Through England on a Side Saddle: In The Time of William and Mary. Being the Diary of Celia Fiennes. With an Introduction by the Hon. Mrs. Griffith.</i> London: Field and Tuer, 1888. She never married.
Finch, Mary	1677-1718	Daughter of Edward Finch, 7th Earl of Winchelsea (1st Earl of Nottingham) and Essex Rich (daughter of the 3rd Earl of Warwick). She married William Saville, 2nd Marquess of Halifax. She married secondly John Ker, 1st Duke of Roxburghe in 1708.
Fitton, Mary	1578-1647	Daughter of Sir Edward Fitton. She became a maid-in-waiting to Elizabeth I c. 1595. At court she attracted the attention of several prominent men including William Knollys (then married to Dorothy Braye) whom she ultimately rejected. She then became the mistress of William Herbert, later Earl of Pembroke and became pregnant. Herbert acknowledged paternity but refused to marry her, a stance that resulted in his imprisonment in the Fleet Prison. In the wake of the scandal Mary was forced to leave court and she then entered into affairs with at least 1 more married man. She married twice. It is said by some that she is the famous “Dark Lady” of Shakespeare’s sonnets, but there is little concrete evidence to support this contention.
FitzAlan - Howard, (Gwendolyn) Mary	1854-1932	Daughter of Edward FitzAlan-Howard, 1st Baron Howard of Glossop. She married John Crichton-Stuart, 3rd Marquess of Bute in 1872.

FitzAlan-Howard, Adeliza	d. 1904	Daughter of Henry Howard, 13th Duke of Norfolk. She married George Manners, son of the 5th Duke of Rutland and Elizabeth Howard (daughter of the 5th Earl of Carlisle) in 1855.
FitzGerald, Elizabeth	d. 1857	Daughter of William FitzGerald, 2nd Duke of Leinster. She married Sir Edward Littlehales in 1805. She was the great niece of Sarah Lennox.
FitzGerald, Emily	1751-1818	Daughter of James FitzGerald, 1st Duke of Leinster and Lady Emily (Emilia) Lennox (daughter of the 2nd Duke of Richmond and Sarah Cadogan, daughter of the 1st Earl of Cadogan). She married Charles Coote, 1st Earl of Bellamont in 1774.
FitzGerald, Joan	c. 1509-1565	Daughter and heiress of James FitzGerald, 10th Earl of Desmond. She married firstly, James Butler, 9th Earl of Ormonde. She married secondly, the courtier Francis Bryan in 1548. She was the most powerful Irish widow and had extensive estates. She married thirdly, Gerald FitzGerald 16th Earl of Desmond. An unpublished dissertation was written on her: Holland, Karen Ann. "Joan Desmond, Ormond, and Ossory: The World of a Countess in Sixteenth Century Ireland." Providence College, 1995.
FitzGerald, Margaret	d. 1542	Daughter of Gerald FitzGerald, 8th Earl of Kildare. She married Piers Butler, 8th Earl of Ormonde, c. 1485.
FitzGerald-de Ros, Blanche	1832-1910	Daughter of William FitzGerald-de Ros, 22nd Lord de Ros and Lady Georgiana Lennox (daughter of the 4th Duke of Richmond and Charlotte Gordon, daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). She married James Swinton in 1865. She edited her mother's papers as <i>A Sketch of the Life of Georgiana, Lady de Ros...</i> London: J. Murray, 1893.
FitzPatrick, Louisa	1755-1789	Daughter of John, 1st Earl of Upper Ossory. She married William Petty, 1st Marquess of Lansdowne in 1779.
Fitzroy, Georgiana	1792-1821	Daughter of Hon. Henry Fitzroy (son of 1st Baron Southampton) and Anne Wellesley (daughter of 1st Earl of Mornington). She married Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort in 1814. She died suddenly without a male heir. Somerset then married her half sister, Emily Smith.
FitzWilliam, Mary	d. 1769	Daughter of Richard Fitzwilliam, 5th Viscount Fitzwilliam. She married Henry Herbert, 9th Earl of Pembroke in 1733. She then married Johann Bernard.
Foote, Maria	1798-1867	Daughter of Samuel Foote. She married Charles Stanhope, 4th Earl of Harrington in 1831. She was an actress. Maria had a complex career as the mistress of aristocratic men. She was involved with William Berkeley, later Earl of Fitzhardinge and had two children. When he did not fulfill his promise to marry her she broke off the relationship and then received a proposal of marriage from Joseph Hayne. Hayne also refused to marry

her, stating that he had not known of the relationship with Berkeley. Maria sued him for breach of promise and was awarded £3000 in damages after she had shown that he did know of Berkeley before the proposal. She returned to the stage after the court case and played to packed houses. She married Charles Stanhope, 4th Earl of Harrington in 1831. They had two children, but she was never received into society. She has an entry in the ODNB.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Forester,
Isabella | d.
1858 | She is the daughter of Cecil Weld-Forester, 1st Baron Forester. She married General the Hon. George Anson, son of 1st Viscount Anson, in 1830. |
| Fox-
Strangways,
Louisa | 1785-
1851 | Daughter of Henry Fox-Strangways, 2nd Earl of Ilchester. She married Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice, 1st Marquess of Lansdowne in 1808. She was an important figure in the London social scene. |
| Fox-
Strangways,
Susan | 1742-
1827 | Daughter of Stephen Fox-Strangways, 1st Earl of Ilchester and Elizabeth Horner. She eloped with William O'Brien, a famous actor, in 1764. She was a good friend of Sarah Lennox. |
| Fraser, Agnes | | Daughter of Hugh Fraser, the 3rd Lord Lovat. She married William MacLeod, the 9th Chief before 1541. |
| Fraser, Anne | d.
1734 | Daughter of Hugh Fraser, 9th Lord Lovat. She married firstly, Norman MacLeod, 20th Chief in 1703. She married secondly, Peter Fotheringham, and she married thirdly John Mackenzie, 2nd Earl of Cromartie in 1717. |
| Gamage,
Barbara | d.
1621 | Daughter and heiress of John Gamage. She was the first cousin of Walter Raleigh. She married Robert Sydney, 1st Earl of Leicester in 1584. |
| Gardner,
Charlotte | d.
1859. | Daughter of Alan Gardner, 2nd Baron Gardner. She married Edward Harbord, 4th Baron Suffield in 1835. |
| Garnier, Anne | 1837-
1924 | Daughter of Rev. Thomas Garnier and Lady Caroline Keppel (daughter of 4th Earl of Albermarle and Elizabeth Southwell, daughter of the 20th Lord Clifford). She married Sir Edward Newdigate-Newdegate in 1858. |
| Gascoyne,
Frances | d.
1839 | Daughter and heir of the wealthy Bamber Gascoyne. She married James Cecil, later 2nd Marquess of Salisbury in 1821. This marriage resulted in the alteration of the family name to Gascoyne-Cecil (which it still holds). Mother of Blanche. |
| Gascoyne-
Cecil, Blanche | d.
1872 | Daughter of James Cecil, 2nd Marquess of Salisbury and Frances Gascoyne. She married James Balfour in 1843. |
| Gilbert, Emma | d.
1807 | Daughter of John Gilbert. She married George Edgcumbe, 1st Earl of Mount Edgcumbe in 1761. |
| Gladstone,
Mary | 1847-
1927 | Daughter of William Gladstone, the Prime Minister. Despite the prominence of her family, she was indifferently educated. In the period before her marriage, she served as a private secretary to her father, whom she utterly adored. She married the curate Henry Drew in 1886 much to the shock of those |

		who knew her. She is the niece of Mary Glynne.
Glynne, Mary	1813-1857	Daughter of Stephen Glynne, 8th Bart. She married George Lyttelton, 4th Lord Lyttleton in 1839. She is the aunt of Mary Gladstone.
Golding, Marjory	d. 1568	Married John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford in 1548. After his death she married a member of her household, Charles Tyrell.
Gordon, Charlotte		Daughter of Charles Gordon of Cheyney. Sister of Johanna.
Gordon, Charlotte	1768-1842	Daughter of the Duke of Gordon and Jane Maxwell. Sister to Georgiana, Susan, Louisa, and Madelina. Married Charles Lennox, the 4th Duke of Richmond. Mother of Georgiana and Sarah Lennox.
Gordon, Evelyn	1846-1921	Daughter of Charles Gordon, 10th Marquess of Huntly. She married Gilbert Heathcote-Drummond-Willoughby, 1st Earl of Ancaster in 1863.
Gordon, Georgiana	1781-1853	Daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon and Jane Maxwell. Sister to Charlotte, Susan, Louisa, and Madelina. Married the 6th Duke of Bedford.
Gordon, Johanna		Daughter of Charles Gordon of Cheney. She married John Dalrymple, 7th Earl of Stair in 1804. He married Laura Manners in 1808 without dissolving his previous marriage. The union to Laura Manners was declared null and the marriage to Johanna Gordon was valid. The marriage to the Earl was annulled in 1820. Sister of Charlotte.
Gordon, Louisa		Daughter of Alexander Gordon, the 4th Duke of Gordon and Jane Maxwell. Sister to Charlotte, Susan, Georgiana, and Madelina. Married Charles Cornwallis, the 2nd Marquess of Cornwallis in 1797.
Gordon, Madelina	c. 1772-1847	Daughter of Alexander Gordon, the 4th Duke of Gordon and Jane Maxwell. Sister to Charlotte, Susan, Louisa, and Georgiana. She married firstly Robert Sinclair, 7th Bart in 1789 and secondly Charles Palmer in 1805.
Gordon, Susan	1774-1828	Daughter of Alexander Gordon, the 4th Duke of Gordon and Jane Maxwell. Sister to Charlotte, Georgiana, Louisa, and Madelina. She married William Montagu, the 5th Duke of Manchester in 1793.
Gordon-Lennox, Cecilia	1838-1910	Daughter of Charles Gordon-Lennox, 5th Duke of Richmond and Lady Caroline Paget (daughter of the 1st Marquess of Anglesey). She married Charles Bingham, 4th Earl of Lucan in 1859.
Gore, Anne	d. 1877	Daughter of Admiral John Gore. She was the 2nd wife of the Richard Curzon-Howe, 1st Earl Howe, whom she married in October 1845.

- Gore, Anne 1763-1827 Daughter of Arthur, 2nd Earl of Arran and his 1st wife Catherine Annesley (daughter of 1st Viscount Glenrallow). She married Henry Hatton in 1783 and following his death, she married John Hamilton, 1st Marquess of Abercorn in 1800.
- Gore, Hannah d. 1826 Daughter of Charles Gore. She married George Cowper, 3rd Earl Cowper in 1755 in Florence, Italy where she also died. She is the mother-in-law of Emily Lamb.
- Gore, Julia c. 1800-1891 Daughter of Arthur, 2nd Earl of Arran and his 3rd wife, Elizabeth Underwood. She married Robert Lockwood (grandson on his mother's side of Lord George Manners-Sutton) in 1821. Her sister Anne did not approve of the match.
- Gore, Mabell 1866-1956 Daughter of Arthur Gore, 5th Earl of Arran and Edith Jocelyn. She married David Ogilvy, 6th Earl of Airlie in 1866. Following his death in the Boer War she became Lady in Waiting to the Princess of Wales (later Queen Mary). She was the author of *Lady Palmerston and Her Times* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1922), *In Whig Society: Compiled from the Hitherto Unpublished Correspondence of Elizabeth Viscountess Melbourne and Emily Lamb Countess Cowper, Afterwards Viscountess Palmerston*. (London: Hodder Stoughton, 1921) and *Thatched With Gold: The Memoirs of Mabell Countess of Airlie*. Jennifer Ellis (ed). (London: Hutchinson, 1962). She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Graham, Agnes d. 1873 Daughter of James Graham, 4th Duke of Montrose and Caroline Horsley-Beresford (daughter of the 2nd Baron Decies). She married John Murray in 1859. Her parents had previously planned to match her with Arthur Davenport in the hope that his alcoholism would lead to an early death and the family would be able to profit from a large jointure payment.
- Green, Maud c. 1493- Daughter of Sir Thomas Green. She married Sir Thomas Parr in 1508. She is the mother of Katherine Parr.
- Grenville, Charlotte c. 1751-1832 Daughter of Rt. Hon. George Grenville (the son of Hester Temple, Countess Temple) She married Sir Watkins Williams-Wynn, 4th Bt. in 1771.
- Grenville, Honor c. 1493-1566 Daughter of Sir Thomas Grenville. Married Sir John Basset. Married secondly Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle. Her correspondence is printed in the *Lisle Letters*, edited by Muriel St. Clare Byrne.
- Greville, Frances 1748-1818 Daughter of Fulke Greville. She married John Crewe, 1st Baron Crewe in 1766. She and her husband were prominent members of the circle surrounding Charles James Fox and she made a reputation as a leading Whig hostess. Frances was renowned for her beauty which was commented upon by several commentators of the age. She has an article in ODNB.

Grey, Dorothy		Daughter of Thomas Grey, 1st Marquess of Dorset and Cecily Bonville, Baroness Bonville and Harington. She married Robert Willoughby, 2nd Baron Willoughby de Broke. She sued the executors of her father's estate in order to gain control of her dowry.
Grey, Elizabeth		Daughter of Thomas Grey, 1st Marquess of Dorset and Cecily Bonville, Baroness Bonville and Harington. She married Sir John Arundell. Her second marriage to Gerald FitzGerald, 9th Earl of Kildare, in 1519 was done in defiance of her father's wishes.
Grey, Jane	d. 1558	Daughter of Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk and Frances Brandon (daughter of the Duke of Suffolk and Mary Tudor). Married Guildford Dudley, son of the Duke of Northumberland. She received an outstanding education and was known for her staunch Protestant sympathies. Known as the Nine Days Queen. Executed in 1554. She is the subject of several biographical studies, most recently Eric Ives. She is the sister of Katherine and Mary. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Grey, Jemima	1700- 1731	Daughter of Henry Grey, 1st Duke of Kent and Jemima Crew. She married John Ashburnham, 1st Earl of Ashburham on March 4, 1724. She was his 3rd wife.
Grey, Katherine	1540- 1568	Daughter of Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk and Frances Brandon (daughter of the Duke of Suffolk and Mary Tudor). She married Henry Herbert, 2nd Earl of Pembroke in 1553. They were divorced in 1555. She then married, secretly, Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Hereford in 1560.
Grey, Louisa	1855- 1949	Daughter of Hon. Charles Grey, son of 2nd Earl Grey. Married William McDonnell, 6th Earl of Antrim in 1875. Sister of Mary.
Grey, Mary	1545- 1578	Daughter of Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk and Frances Brandon (daughter of the Duke of Suffolk and Mary Tudor). She married, without royal permission, Thomas Keyes in 1564.
Grey, Mary	d. 1940	Daughter of Hon. Charles Grey, son of 2nd Earl Grey. She married Gilbert Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, 4th Earl of Minto, in 1883. Sister of Louisa.
Greystoke, Elizabeth	d. 1516	Daughter of Sir Robert de Greystoke and Lady Elizabeth Grey (daughter of 1st Earl of Kent and Catherine Percy, daughter of the 1st Earl of Northumberland and Eleanor de Neville). She was Baroness Greystoke in her own right. She married Thomas Dacre, 2nd Lord Dacre in c. 1488.
Grimston, Katherine	1810- 1874	Daughter of James Grimston, 1st Earl of Verulam and Charlotte Jekinson (daughter of the 1st Earl of Liverpool). She married John Foster-Barham in 1834 and secondly George Villiers, 4th Earl of Clarendon in 1839. She is the mother of Emily Villiers.

Grosvenor, Elizabeth	d. 1928	Daughter of Hugh Grosvenor, 1st Duke of Westminster and Constance Leveson-Gower (daughter of the 2nd Duke of Sutherland). She married James Butler, 3rd Marquess of Ormonde in 1876. She was also known as Lilah.
Grosvenor, Jane	1953-	Daughter of Robert Grosvenor, 5th Duke of Westminster and Viola Lyttleton (daughter of the 9th Viscount Cobham). She married Guy Innes-Ker, 10th Duke of Roxburghe in 1977; they divorced in 1990. She married Edward Dawnay in 1996.
Grosvenor, Leonora	1949-	Daughter of Robert Grosvenor, 5th Duke of Westminster and Viola Lyttleton (daughter of the 9th Viscount Cobham). She married Thomas Anson, 5th Earl of Lichfield in 1975. They divorced in 1986.
Grosvenor, Theodora	d. 1924	Daughter of Richard Grosvenor, 2nd Marquess of Westminster and Lady Elizabeth Leveson-Gower (daughter of 1st Duke of Sutherland and Elizabeth Gordon, Countess of Sutherland). She married Thomas Guest, son of Josiah Guest 1st Bart. and Charlotte Bertie, in 1877.
Guest, Blanche	d. 1919	Daughter of Josiah Guest, 1st Bart. and Charlotte Bertie (daughter of 9th Earl of Lindsay). She married Edward Ponsonby, 8th Earl of Bessborough in 1875. She was invested as Commander in the Order of the British Empire in 1918.
Guest, Charlotte	1834-1902	Daughter of Josiah Guest, 1st Bart. and Charlotte Bertie (daughter of 9th Earl of Lindsay). She married Richard Du Cane.
Guest, Constance	d. 1916	Daughter of Josiah Guest, 1st Bart. and Charlotte Bertie (daughter of 9th Earl of Lindsay). She married Hon. Charles Eliot, son of 3rd Earl of St. Germans and Lady Jemima Cornwallis (daughter of 2nd Marquess of Cornwallis and Lady Louisa Gordon) in 1865.
Guest, Katherine	d. 1926	Daughter of Josiah Guest, 1st Bart. and Charlotte Bertie (daughter of 9th Earl of Lindsay). She married Rev. Frederick Alderson.
Guilford, Jane	c. 1509-1555	Daughter of Sir Edward Guilford. She married John Dudley, later 1st Duke of Northumberland.
Guinness, Maureen	1907-1998	Daughter of Hon. Ernest Guinness (son of 1st Earl of Iveagh). She married firstly Basil Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, 4th Marquess of Dufferin and Ava in 1930. Dufferin was killed in action in 1945. She married secondly Maj. Henry Buchanan in 1948. They were divorced in 1954. She married thirdly John Maude in 1955. She is the mother of Caroline and Perdita Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood.
Guise, Mary of	1515-1560	Daughter of the duc de Guise. She married firstly, Louis d'Orleans, the second duc de Longueville in 1534. Following his death in 1537, she avoided a match with Henry VIII and instead married his nephew, James V of Scotland in 1538.

		<p>Their two sons died young, and when James died in 1542, his only heir was their daughter the famous Mary Stuart (Mary Queen of Scots). Mary of Guise sent her daughter to France to be educated in preparation for her marriage to the Dauphin and she ruled Scotland as regent on her behalf.</p>
Gurney, Rachel	1868-1920	<p>Daughter of Charles Gurney. She married William Ward, 2nd Earl of Dudley in 1891. She was active in war work during the First World War and was made Commander of the Order of the British Empire.</p>
Hales, Anne	d. 1795	<p>Daughter of Thomas Hales, 3rd Bt. She married Anthony Duncombe, 1st Baron Feversham in 1758. Following his death she married William de Bouverie, 1st Earl of Radnor in 1765. She is the mother of Anne Duncombe.</p>
Hamilton, Albertha	1847-1932	<p>Daughter of James Hamilton, the 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell (daughter of the 6th Duke of Bedford and Georgiana Gordon, daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). Sister of Beatrix, Louisa, Katherine, Georgiana, Harriet, and Maud. Married George Spencer Churchill, 8th Duke of Marlborough. She divorced Marlborough in 1883 due to his repeated infidelities.</p>
Hamilton, Beatrix	1835-1871	<p>Daughter of James Hamilton, the 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell (daughter of the 6th Duke of Bedford and Georgiana Gordon, daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). Sister of Harriet, Louisa, Katherine, Georgiana, Albertha, and Maud. Married George Lambton, 2nd Earl of Durham in 1854.</p>
Hamilton, Charlotte	1772-1827	<p>Daughter of Archibald Hamilton, the 9th Duke of Hamilton and Harriett Stewart (daughter of the 6th Earl of Galloway and Catherine Cochrane, daughter of the 4th Earl of Dundonald and Lady Anne Murray). Married Edward Seymour, 11th Duke of Somerset in 1800. Sister of Susan Hamilton.</p>
Hamilton, Elizabeth	1753-1797	<p>Daughter of the 6th Duke of Hamilton. Married Edward Smith-Stanley, 12th Earl of Derby in 1774. Her husband was unhappy with her and carried on a long affair with the actress Elizabeth Farren, whom he married six weeks after Elizabeth's death.</p>
Hamilton, Georgiana	1834-1913	<p>Daughter of 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell. Sister of Beatrix, Louisa, Katherine, Harriet, Albertha, and Maud. Married Edward Turnour, 5th Earl of Wintertoun.</p>
Hamilton, Harriet	1834-1913	<p>Daughter of 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell. Sister of Beatrix, Louisa, Katherine, Georgiana, Albertha, and Maud. Married Thomas Anson, 2nd Earl of Lichfield.</p>
Hamilton, Katherine	1838-1874	<p>Daughter of 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell. Sister of Beatrix, Louisa, Harriet, Georgiana, Albertha, and Maud. Married William Edgecumbe, 4th Earl of Mount Edgecumbe.</p>
Hamilton, Louisa	1836-1912	<p>Daughter of 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell. Sister of Beatrix, Harriet, Katherine, Georgiana, Albertha, and Maud.</p>

- Married William Montagu Douglas Scott, 6th Duke of Buccleuch. She was a leading figure in London Society.
- Hamilton, Maud 1850-1932 Daughter of 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell. Sister of Beatrix, Louisa, Katherine, Georgiana, Albertha, and Harriet. Married Henry Petty-FitzMaurice, 5th Marquess of Lansdowne.
- Hamilton, Susan 1774-1846 Daughter of Archibald Hamilton, the 9th Duke of Hamilton and Harriett Stewart (daughter of the 6th Earl of Galloway and Catherine Cochrane, daughter of the 4th Earl of Dundonald and Lady Anne Murray).. Married George Murray, the 5th Earl of Dunmore in 1803. Sister of Charlotte Hamilton.
- Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, Caroline 1931-1996 [Known as Caroline Blackwood] Daughter of Basil Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, 4th Marquess of Dufferin and Ava and Maureen Guinness (grand daughter of 1st Earl of Iveagh). She married Lucien Freud (grandson of Sigmund) in 1953. She was the subject of several of his finest portraits. They divorced in 1957. She married secondly Israel Citkowitz in 1959; they divorced in 1972. She married thirdly Robert Lowell in 1972 (their relationship is chronicled in the poem sequence in his book *The Dolphin*). Following her first divorce, Caroline moved to the United States where she did some acting. She was a prominent writer. In 1973, she published her first book, *For All that I Found There*, a collection of articles that she had published in the popular press and short stories. Her first novel, *The Stepdaughter* was published in 1976 and won the David Higham Prize. *Great Granny Webster* came out in 1977 and was shortlisted for the Booker Prize. She died of cancer in New York. Sister of Perdita. Her biography is published as *Dangerous Muse: The Life of Lady Caroline Blackwood* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2001) by Nancy Schoenberger. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, Perdita 1934- Daughter of Basil Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, 4th Marquess of Dufferin and Ava and Maureen Guinness (grand daughter of 1st Earl of Iveagh). Sister of Caroline.
- Hardwick, Elizabeth 1527-1608 Daughter of John Hardwicke. She married Robert Barley in 1543; he died later that year. She then married the much older (b. 1505) Sir William Cavendish in 1547. At least 6 children were born to the couple. Cavendish died in 1562 and she married Sir William St. Loe. Following his death she married George Talbot, 6th Earl of Shrewsbury in 1568. Elizabeth Boughton was her daughter-in-law. Her daughter Elizabeth Cavendish married Margaret Douglas's son. She is the grandmother of Arabella Stuart. She is the subject of several biographical studies; one of the most recent is Mary S. Lovell, *Bess of Hardwick: Empire Builder* (New York: Norton, 2006).

- She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Harington, Lucy c. 1581-1627 Daughter of John, 1st Baron Harington. Her family was well connected to the Elizabethan elite. When her brother, the 2nd Baron, died in 1614 she became the heiress for the substantial estates. She married Edward Russell, 3rd Earl of Bedford in 1594. She served as Lady of the Bedchamber to Anne of Denmark, wife of James I and in that capacity was a prominent figure at court, where she remained until the Queen's death in 1619. She spent the last years of her life in the country. She died without issue and left her property to her niece. Her letters are found in a variety of sources including Griffin, R. and Lord Bay Brooke (eds). *The Private Correspondence of Lady Jane Cornwallis, 1613-44, from the Originals in the Possession of the Family*. 1842. Biographical studies include Lawson, Lesley. *Out of the Shadow: the Life of Lucy, Countess of Bedford*. London: Hambledon, 2007.
- Harley, Elizabeth d. 1713 Daughter of Robert Harley, 1st Earl of Oxford. She married Peregrine Osborne, 3rd Duke of Leeds in 1712.
- Hastings, Flora 1854-1887 Daughter of Charles Abney-Hastings, created 1st Baron Donington in 1880, and Edith Rawdon-Hastings, Countess of Loudon. She married Henry FitzAlan Howard, 15th Duke of Norfolk in 1877.
- Hatton, Anne d. 1743 Daughter of Christopher Hatton, 1st Viscount Hatton and Frances Yelverton, daughter of Sir Henry Yelverton, 2nd Bart and Susan Longueville, Baroness Grey. She married Daniel Finch, 7th Earl of Winchelsea in 1685.
- Hay, Hannah Charlotte d. 1887 Daughter of George Hay, 8th Marquess of Tweeddale. She married Simon Taylor in 1843.
- Hay-Drummond, Agnes 1873-1938 Daughter of George Hay-Drummond, Viscount Dupplin and Agnes Duff (daughter of the 5th Earl of Fife and Agnes Hay, daughter of 18th Earl of Erroll and Elizabeth Fitz-Clarence, the illegitimate daughter of William IV). She married Herbert, Baron von Hindenberg in 1903.
- Henley, Bridget d. 1796 Daughter of Robert Henley, 1st Earl of Northington. She married Hon. Robert Fox-Lane, the son of 1st Baron Bingley. Following his death in 1768, she married Capt. Hon. John Tollemache, son of the 4th Earl of Dysart, in 1773.
- Heron, Dorothy 1672-1706 Daughter of Sir Henry Heron. She married Sir Francis Fane in 1693. Her marriage contract is in the British Library Add. 38579 MSS ff. 33-38.
- Hervey, Elizabeth 1757-1824 Daughter of Frederick Hervey, 4th Earl of Bristol. She married firstly, John Foster in 1776. Following his death she entered into a long-standing affair with William Cavendish, 5th Duke of Devonshire (husband of Georgiana Spencer) whom she married in 1809. She has an entry in the ODNB.

- Hervey, Louisa d. 1821 Daughter of Frederick Hervey, 4th Earl of Bristol. She married Robert Jenkinson, Baron Hawkesbury, later 2nd Earl of Liverpool in 1795. She is the sister of Elizabeth.
- Hobart, Amelia 1772-1829 Daughter of John Hobart, 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire. She married Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh (2nd Marquess of Londonderry. He was a prominent member of the government but committed suicide in 1822 after being implicated in a homosexual sex scandal). She was a prominent society figure.
- Hobart, Henrietta c. 1681-1767 Daughter of Sir Henry Hobart, 4th Bt. She married Charles Howard, 9th Earl of Suffolk in 1706. She then married Hon. George Berkeley, son of the 2nd Earl of Berkeley in 1735, her first husband having died in 1733. She was the mistress of George II and was allegedly instrumental in procuring the Earldom of Buckinghamshire for her brother John. She was the correspondent of Mary Chamber and Catherine Hyde
- Hobart, Sophia d. 1806 Daughter of John Hobart, 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire. She married Richard Edgcumbe, later 2nd Earl of Mount Edgcumbe in 1789.
- Holroyd, Maria d. 1863 Daughter of John Holroyd, the 1st Earl of Sheffield. She married John Stanley, 1st Baron Stanley of Alderly in 1796. She was the mother-in-law of Henrietta Maria Dillon-Lee. Her letters are published Mitford, Nancy, ed. *The Ladies of Alderly: Being the Letters Between Maria-Josephina, Lady Stanley of Alderly and her Daughter-in-Law, Henrietta Maria Stanley, During the Years 1841-1850*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1967.
Mitford, Nancy, ed. *The Stanleys of Alderly: Their Letters Between 1851-1865*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1968.
- Hope, Henrietta 1843-1913 Illegitimate daughter of Henry Hope. She married Henry Pelham-Clinton, later 6th Duke of Newcastle, in 1861. She married secondly Thomas Hohler in 1880.
- Horner, Elizabeth Daughter of Thomas Strangways-Horner. She married Stephen Fox (later Fox-Strangways), 1st Earl of Ilchester in 1736. She was the mother of Susan Fox-Strangways.
- Horsey, Adeline de 1824-1915 Daughter of Spencer de Horsey and Lady Louisa Rous (daughter of 1st Earl of Stradbroke). She shocked all of London Society in the 1850s but having a very public affair with the married (though separated) James Brudenell, 7th Earl of Cardigan, whom she then married in 1858. Following his death she married Don Antonio Manuel de Lancastere Soldana, Conde de Lancastere in 1873. She published her memoirs as Cardigan and Lancastre, Countess of. *My Recollections*. London: Eveleigh Nash, 1909. She has an entry in the ODNB.

- Horsley-Beresford, Caroline d. 1894 Daughter of John Horsley-Beresford, 2nd Baron Decies. She married firstly James Graham, 4th Duke of Montrose. Following his death in 1874, she married secondly William Stirling-Crawford in 1876. Stirling-Crawford died in 1883; whereupon, Caroline married Marcus Milner in 1888. She is the mother of Agnes Graham.
- Howard, Anne c. 1696 -1764 Daughter of Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle and Anne Capell (daughter of the 1st Earl of Essex). She married Rich Ingram, 5th Viscount Irvine. After his death in 1621, she traveled before marrying Col. William Douglas, c. 1638. She was a poet who wrote in response to Alexander Pope's attack on women.
- Howard, Anne Daughter of Henry Howard, 4th Earl of Carlisle. Her reputation was damaged by the attentions of Watkins Williams-Wynn in the 1770s and she never married.
- Howard, Blanche 1812-1840 Daughter of George Howard, 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish (daughter of the 5th Duke of Devonshire and Georgiana Spencer). She married William Cavendish, 7th Duke of Devonshire in 1729. She was the sister of Caroline.
- Howard, Caroline d. 1881 Daughter of George Howard, 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish (daughter of the 5th Duke of Devonshire and Georgiana Spencer). She married Rt. Hon. William Lascelles, son of the 2nd Earl of Harewood, in 1823. She was the sister of Blanche.
- Howard, Dorothy 1875-1952 Daughter of Hon. Greville Howard (son of the 17th Earl of Suffolk) and Audrey Townshend (daughter of the 4th Marquess of Townshend). She married Ralph Macon in 1907. She was the sister of Joyce.
- Howard, Elizabeth c. 1480-1538 Daughter of Thomas Howard, 2nd Duke of Norfolk. She married Thomas Boleyn, later 1st Earl of Wiltshire, c. 1498. She was the mother of Anne and Mary Boleyn.
- Howard, Elizabeth 1586-1658 Daughter of Thomas Howard, 1st Earl of Suffolk. She married William Knollys, 1st Earl of Banbury in 1605. She married secondly Edward Vaux, 4th Lord Vaux before 1632.
- Howard, Elizabeth d. 1705 Daughter of Theophilus Howard, 2nd Earl of Suffolk. She married, as his 2nd wife, Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland in 1642.
- Howard, Elizabeth d. 1825 Daughter of Frederick Howard, 5th Earl of Carlisle. She married John Manners, 5th Duke of Rutland in 1799. She took an active interest in historical architecture and horticulture. On December 3, 1825, *The London Times* published a relatively long account of her death, which included such descriptions as "Her Grace, whose self-possession was remarkable, felt perfectly alive to the imminence of her danger, and the fortitude with which she bore her acute sufferings, and viewed her approaching fate, was in the highest degree affecting."

“Her Grace exhibited a union of qualities that are seldom found united in the female character. Of her elevated taste, the castle of Belvoir will long remain a magnificent monument; from its first commencement, 25 years ago, she had been the presiding genius of the place.” “It is somewhat singular, that with predilections so strong for a rural life, her Grace was one of the brightest ornaments of the English Court; no one ever exhibited so much of graceful dignity, joined to manners of the highest polish and a condescension that fascinated every one who came within the sphere of its magic influence. As a wife, a mother, a benefactress, she was most exemplary; her loss is, indeed, an irreparable one, and will long be mourned with an affliction that admits of no consolation by her bereaved family.”

- | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Howard,
Frances | d.
1598 | Daughter of Lord William Howard of Effingham. She was a lady-in-waiting to the Queen. She entered into a clandestine marriage with Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Hertford. |
| Howard,
Harriet | 1806-
1868 | Daughter of George Howard, the 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish (daughter of the 5th Duke of Devonshire and Georgiana Spencer, daughter of 1st Earl Spencer). Married George Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, 2nd Duke of Sutherland in 1823. <i>The Times</i> printed a glowing obituary of her making especial note of her cultural accomplishments. She was the grandniece of Harriett Cavendish. |
| Howard, Jane | d. c.
1593 | Daughter of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (son of the 3rd Duke of Norfolk) and Frances de Vere (daughter of the 15th Earl of Oxford). She married Charles Neville, 6th Earl of Westmorland in c. 1563. She experienced great hardship following her husband’s exile and attainder for rebelling against the government of Elizabeth I. |
| Howard, Joyce | 1876-
1961 | Daughter of Hon. Greville Howard (son of the 17th Earl of Suffolk) and Audrey Townshend (daughter of the 4th Marquess of Townshend). She married Sir Arthur Doyle in 1903. Sister of Dorothy. |
| Howard,
Katherine | c.
1524-
1542 | Daughter of Lord Edmund Howard. She married Henry VIII, King of England in 1540. She was executed on charges of adultery in 1542. Jane Parker was executed with her. She was the cousin of Anne and Mary Boleyn. She has an entry in the ODNB. |
| Howard,
Margaret | 1623-
1689 | Daughter of Theophilus Howard, 2nd Earl of Suffolk. Married Roger Boyle, 1st Earl of Orrery in 1641. |
| Howard, Mary | d.
1555 | Daughter of Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk and Elizabeth Stafford (daughter of 3rd Duke of Buckingham). She married Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond (Henry VIII’s illegitimate son) in 1533. She was a leading figure at court and known for her Protestant sympathies. |

- Howard, Mary d. 1600 Daughter of William Howard, 1st Baron Howard of Effingham. She married Edward Sutton, 4th Lord Dudley. She married secondly Richard Mompesson.
- Howard, Mary 1767-1843 Daughter of Henry Howard. She married Robert Petre, 10th Baron Petre in 1786. She was the mother of Maria Petre.
- Hurt, Caroline d. 1897 Daughter of Richard Hurt. She married firstly Edward Davenport in 1830. Married secondly, Edward Littleton, 1st Baron Haworth in 1852. She was the mother of Arthur Davenport who was the object of matrimonial plotting on the part of Caroline Horsley-Beresford, Duchess of Montrose
- Hyde, Bridget c. 1662-1734 Daughter of Sir Thomas Hyde, Bart. Following a questionable clandestine first marriage, she married Peregrine Osborne, later 2nd Duke of Leeds in 1682. Many of her letters are in the British Library Add. 78915. Her first marriage is the subject of the pamphlet: Jean Davis, *The Case of the Pretended Marriage: Hide v. Emerton 1674-1683* (Aldbury, 1976).
- Hyde, Catherine 1701-1777 Daughter of Henry, 4th Earl of Clarendon. She married Charles Douglas, 3rd Duke of Queensberry in 1720. Her letters to her friend Henrietta Hobart, Lady Suffolk are in the British Library, [Add. 22626](#) ff. 22-32, 35-79 .
- Jeffreys, Henrietta d. 1761 Daughter of John Jeffreys, 2nd Baron Jeffreys and Lady Charlotte Herbert, daughter of the 7th Earl of Pembroke. She married Thomas Fermor, 1st Earl of Pomfret in 1720. She is the mother of Sophia Fermor.
- Jerome, Jennie 1854-1921 Daughter of the American businessman Leonard Jerome. She married Lord Randolph Spencer-Churchill, the son of the 7th Duke of Marlborough in 1874. Following his death in 1895, she married secondly George Cornwallis-West in 1900; the marriage ended in divorce in 1913. She then married the much-younger Montague Porch in 1918. She was a leading society figure in London and the mother of the Prime Minister Winston Churchill. She published her memoir as *The Reminiscences of Lady Randolph Churchill*. London: Edward Arnold, 1908. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Jervis, Maria Parentage unknown. She married George Nuget, 1st Marquess of Westmeath in 1858. They divorced in 1862. She was his scullerymaid.
- Jocelyn, Edith 1845-1871 Daughter of Robert Viscount Jocelyn and Frances Cowper, daughter of the 5th Earl of Cowper. She married Arthur Gore, 5th Earl of Arran. She is the granddaughter of Elizabeth Milbanke. She is the mother of Mabel Gore.
- Johnson, Anne c. 1684-1754 Of unknown parentage. She married Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford in 1711.
- Keppel, Ann 1803-1844 Daughter of William Keppel, the 4th Earl of Albermarle. She married the much older Thomas Coke, later 1st Earl of

		Leicester of Holkham, in 1822. The union produced four sons and a daughter. In 1843 she married the Right Hon. Edward Ellice, M.P.
Kerouaille, Louise de	1649- 1734	Daughter of the French nobleman Guillaume de Penancoët, Sieur de K�rouaille. She became Charles II's mistress and was created Duchess of Portsmouth in her own right. She died unmarried.
Knevitt, Elizabeth	1574? - 1630?	Daughter and co-heir of Sir Henry Knevitt. She married Thomas Clinton, Lord Fiennes, later Earl of Nottingham c. 1584. She was the mother of at least 18 children, 9 of which survived infancy. Her apparent frustration at not being permitted to breast-feed led her to write the short tract <i>The Countess of Lincolnes Nurserie</i> (Oxford: John Lichfield, 1622) in favour of the practice.
Knight, Henrietta	b. 1729	Daughter of Robert Knight, 1st Earl of Catherlough and Henrietta St. John, daughter of 1st Viscount St. John. She married Charles Wymondesold in 1748. She eloped with Josiah Child, while still married.
Knollys, Lettice	1539- 1634	Daughter of Sir Francis Knollys and Katherine Carey, the daughter of Mary Boleyn. She married Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex in the early 1560s. After his death, she married secondly Elizabeth I's favourite Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester in 1578. She married thirdly Sir Christopher Blount. Her latter two marriages were scandalous, the Queen never forgave her for marrying Dudley and Blount was the same age as her son. Her reputation was further tainted by the treason of her son Robert, 2nd Earl of Essex. She is the mother of Penelope and Dorothy Devereux and the grandmother of Dorothy Percy. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Lamb, Emily	1787- 1869	Daughter of 1 st Viscount Melbourne. She married Peter Cowper, 5 th Earl Cowper in 1805 (he died in 1837). Papers relating to the financial aspects of this marriage are in the British Library, Add. 8308. She then married her long-time lover, Henry Temple, 3 rd Viscount Palmerston in 1839. Her letters are published as Airlie, Mabell Countess of. <i>In Whig Society: Compiled from the Hitherto Unpublished Correspondence of Elizabeth Viscountess Melbourne and Emily Lamb Countess Cowper, Afterwards Viscountess Palmerston</i> . London: Hodder Stoughton, 1921; Lever, Tresham (ed). <i>The Letters of Lady Palmerston: Selected and Edited from the Originals at Broadlands and Elsewhere</i> . London: John Murray, 1957. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Lambart, Gertrude	d. 1775	Daughter of Richard Lambart, 4th Earl of Cavan. She married William Fitzmaurice, 2nd Earl of Kerry in 1738. She married secondly James Tilson, a barrister. She is the mother of Gertrude Tilson.

Lambart, Honora	1784- 1856	Daughter of Richard Lambart, 7th Earl of Cavan. She married, against her father's wishes, John Woodgate in 1805. Following his death, she married secondly G.F. Harvey in 1809. They divorced in 1816.
Lane-Fox, Marcia	1863- 1926	Daughter of Sackville Lane-Fox, 12th Lord Conyers. She was Baroness Conyers in her own right. She married Charles Pelham, 4th Earl of Yarborough in 1886.
Lascelles, Constance	1852- 1932	Daughter of Henry Lascelles, 4th Earl of Harewood and Elizabeth de Burgh (daughter of the 1st Marquess of Clanricarde and Hon. Harriet Canning). She married Bielby Lawson, later 3rd Baron Wenlock in 1872.
Lascelles, Emma	1838- 1920	Daughter of Hon. William Lascelles (son of the 2nd Earl of Harewood) and Caroline Howard (daughter of the 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish). She married Lord Edward Cavendish (son of the 7th Duke of Devonshire) in 1865.
Layard, Charlotte	d. 1858	Daughter of the Very Rev. Charles Layard. She married Albermarle Bertie, 9th Earl of Lindsey in 1809. Following Lindsey's death in 1818, she married Rev. Peter Pegus in 1821. She is the mother of Charlotte Bertie, who always believed that she was damaged socially by her mother's poor choice of a second spouse.
Lee, Charlotte	1678- 1721	Daughter of Henry Lee, 1st Earl of Lichfield and Charlotte Fitzroy (illegitimate daughter of Charles II). She married Benedict Calvert, 4th Baron Baltimore in 1699. The marriage contract is in the British Library, Add. Ch. 55589. They separated in 1705. Following his death (in 1715) she married Christopher Crowe in 1719.
Lennox, Emilia (Emily)	1731- 1814	Daughter of Charles Lennox, the 2nd Duke of Richmond and Sarah Cadogan (daughter of the 1st Earl of Cadogan). She married James FitzGerald, 1st Duke of Leinster in 1747. She then married her children's tutor William Ogilvie. A biographical study of her is Stella Tillyard, <i>Aristocrats: Caroline, Emily, Louisa, and Sarah Lennox, 1740-1832</i> . New York: Noonday, 1994. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Lennox, Georgiana	1723- 1774	Daughter of Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond and Sarah Cadogan (daughter of the 1st Earl of Cadogan). She eloped with Henry Fox in 1744. She was made Baroness of Holland in her own right in 1762.
Lennox, Georgiana	1795- 1891	Daughter of Charles Lennox, the 4th Duke of Richmond and Charlotte Gordon, (daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). She married her cousin William Fitzgerald de Ros, 22nd Lord de Ros in 1824. He was a Captain in the First Life Guards and was the son of Lord Henry FitzGerald and Charlotte, Baroness de Ros. A biographical study of her was published as Swinton, Blanche Arthur Georgina. <i>A Sketch of the Life of Georgiana, Lady de Ros...</i> London: J. Murray, 1893.

Lennox, Mary	1790-1847	Daughter of Charles Lennox, the 4th Duke of Richmond and Charlotte Gordon (daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). She married Sir Charles Fitzroy in 1820. Sister of Sarah, and Georgiana.
Lennox, Sarah	1745-1826	Daughter of Charles Lennox, the 2nd Duke of Richmond and Sarah Cadogan (daughter of the 1st Earl of Cadogan). She married Sir Thomas Bunbury, 6th Bt. in 1762; they were divorced in 1776. She then married Col. Hon. George Napier, son of 6th Baron Napier, in 1781. It was rumoured that the future George III, when Prince of Wales, was in love with her. She is the sister of Georgiana, Emilia, Louisa. A biographical study of her is Stella Tillyard, <i>Aristocrats: Caroline, Emily, Louisa, and Sarah Lennox, 1740-1832</i> . New York: Noonday, 1994. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Lennox, Sarah	c. 1794-1873	Daughter of Charles Lennox, the 4th Duke of Richmond and Charlotte Gordon (daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). She married General Sir Peregrine Maitland as his second wife in 1815. Sister of Georgiana, Mary.
Leveson-Gower, Frances	1720-1788	Daughter of John Leveson-Gower, 1st Earl Gower and Evelyn Pierrepont (daughter of the Evelyn Pierrepont, 1st Duke of Kingston-upon-Hill and Mary Fielding, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Denbigh). She married Lord John Sackville, son of 1st Duke of Dorset. She was the mother of Mary Sackville.
Leveson-Gower, Susan	1771-1838	Daughter of Granville Leveson-Gower, 1st Marquess of Stafford and Lady Susannah Stewart, daughter of the 6th Earl of Galloway. She married Dudley Ryder, 1st Earl of Harrowby in 1795.
Liddell, Susan	1810-1886	Daughter of Thomas, 1st Baron Ravensworth. She married Charles Yorke, 3rd Earl of Hardwicke in 1833.
Lister, Adelaide		Daughter of Thomas Lister, 2nd Baron Ribblesdale. She married Maurice Drummond in the 19th century.
Lister, Beatrix	b. 1856	Daughter of Thomas Lister, 3rd Baron Ribblesdale. She edited her mother's (Emma Mure's) papers and published them as <i>Emma, Lady Ribblesdale: Letters and Diaries</i> . London: Chiswick, 1930.
Lloyd, Harriet	d. 1920	Daughter (and only child) of Samuel Lloyd, 1st Baron Overstone. She married Robert Lindsay-Loyd, later 1st Baron Wantage, in 1858.
Lockwood, Catherine	1964-	Daughter of John Lockwood. She married Charles Spencer, later 9th Earl Spencer, in 1989. She was a model. They divorced in 1997.
Low, Beatrice	d. 1982	Daughter of Frederick Low. She married Christopher Addison, later 1st Viscount Addison as his second wife, in 1937. Her unfinished autobiography, <i>Looking Glass Land</i> , is housed at the British Library as Add. MSS 71686.

Lowther, Grace	1792- 1883	Daughter of William Lowther, the 1st Earl of Lonsdale and granddaughter on her mother's side of the 9th Earl of Westmoreland. She married William Vane, 3rd Duke of Cleveland in 1815.
Lucas, Margaret	1661- 1717	Daughter of Sir Thomas Lucas. Her natal family were prominent in the Royalist cause. She married William Cavendish, later 1st Duke of Newcastle in 1645. She published <i>The Life of the Duke of Newcastle: To Which is Added A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life</i> . London: J.C Nimmo, 1886. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Lyon, Elizabeth	d. 1681	Daughter of John Lyon, 2nd Earl of Kinghorne and Elizabeth Maul (daughter of 1st Earl of Panmure). She married George Gordon, 1st Earl of Aboyne in 1665.
Lyon, Elizabeth	d. 1739	Daughter of Patrick Lyon, 3rd Earl of Strathmore. She married firstly Charles Gordon, 2nd Earl of Aboyne. She then married Patrick Kinnaird, 3rd Lord Kinnaird. She married thirdly Captain Alexander Grant.
Lyttleton, Lucy	1841- 1925	Daughter of 4th Baron Lyttleton, Her aunt was married to William Gladstone. Married Lord Frederick Cavendish, son of the 7th Duke of Devonshire and later Chief Secretary for Ireland (he was murdered there). She was Maid of Honour to Queen Victoria. Following the death of her husband, she was active in causes associated with female education. In 1965 the Lucy Cavendish College was named for her in Cambridge. Her diary is published: Bailey, John, ed. <i>The Diary of Lady Frederick Cavendish</i> . New York: Stokes, 1927. She is the granddaughter of Sarah Spencer.
MacLeod, Sibylla	d. 1682	Daughter of Ian MacLeod, 16th Chief. She married Thomas Fraser, son of the 7th Lord Lovat.
Maitland, Eleanor	d. 1869	Daughter of James Maitland, 8th Earl of Lauderdale. She married James Balfour in 1815.
Manners, (Victoria)	1883- 1946	Daughter of Henry Manners, 8th Duke of Rutland and Marion Lindsay (grand-daughter of the 24th Earl of Crawford). She married Charles Paget, 6th Marquess of Anglesey in 1912.
Marjorie Manners, Anne	d. c. 1549	Daughter of Thomas Manners, 1st Earl of Rutland. She married Henry Neville, later 5th Earl of Westmoreland in 1537.
Manners, Elizabeth	1800- 1886	Daughter of John Manners, the 5th Duke of Rutland and Lady Elizabeth Howard (daughter of the 5th Earl of Carlisle and Margaret Leveson-Gower, daughter of the 1st Marquess of Stafford and Lady Louisa Egerton). Married Andrew Drummond, a well-connected banker, in 1822.
Manners, Gertrude	d. c. 1566	Daughter of Francis Talbot, 5th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married George Talbot, later 6th Earl of Shrewsbury.
Manners, Laura	d. 1834	Daughter of John Manners and Louisa Tollemache, Countess of Dysart. She was married, in a fashion, to John Dalrymple,

		7th Earl of Stair in 1808. The marriage was nullified as Stair was already married. Laura never remarried and she changed her name to Laura Tollemache. Sister of Louisa.
Manners, Louisa	1777- 1816	Daughter of John Manners and Louisa Tollemache, Countess of Dysart. She married Aubrey Beauclerk, 6th Earl of St. Albans in 1802.
Marjoribanks, Amelia	d. 1886	Daughter of Edward Marjoribanks. She married John Fox-Strangways, son of the 2nd Earl of Ilchester in 1844. She is the mother-in-law of Mary Dawson.
Marjoribanks, Isabel	1857- 1939	Daughter of Dudley Marjoribanks, 1st Lord Tweedmouth. She married John Hamilton-Gordon, 1st Marquess of Aberdeen in 1877. She published her memoirs as Aberdeen, The Marchioness of. <i>More Cracks With 'We Twa.'</i> London: Methuen, 1929.
Mason- Villiers, Gertrude	1778- 1809	Daughter and heiress of Charles Mason-Villiers, 2nd Earl of Grandison and Gertrude Seymour-Conway (daughter of the 1st Marquess of Hertford and Isabella Fitzroy, daughter of the 2nd Duke of Grafton and Lady Henrietta Somerset). She married Lord Henry Stuart (son of the 1st Marquess of Bute and Charlotte Windsor, daughter of the 2nd Viscount of Windsor) in 1802. A previous attempt had been made to match her with George Osborne, later 6th Duke of Leeds, foundered due to their incompatibility.
Maxwell, Jane	1748- 1812	Daughter of William Maxwell, 3rd Bt. She married Alexander Gordon, 4th Duke of Gordon in 1767. They separated in 1793. She was a major figure in Whig political circles and was a great supporter of Pitt. She was renowned for her abilities as a matchmaker. She is the mother of Georgiana Gordon. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Maynard, Frances	1861- 1938	Daughter of Hon. Charles Maynard (son of 3rd Viscount Maynard). She married Francis Greville, 5th Earl of Warwick in 1881. She was better known by her nick-name Daisy. Frances inherited the bulk of the Maynard estates (amounting to £20,000 per year in rents alone) upon the deaths of her father and grandfather in 1865. She began an affair with Sir Charles Beresford in 1886; the affair ended when she discovered that his wife was pregnant. Frances wrote an indiscreet letter to Beresford protesting this and his wife opened it and made its contents known. In order to avoid social exile, she threw herself on the mercy of Edward, Prince of Wales. This maneuver resulted in the two becoming lovers. She was a famous society hostess and philanthropist, becoming quite intrigued with socialism. She published her memoirs as Warwick, Frances Greville Countess of. <i>A Woman and the War.</i> New York: George H. Doon, c. 1916. She has an entry in the ODNB.

- Mellon, Harriet 1777-1837 An actress who was the 2nd wife of the very wealthy banker Thomas Coutts and then married the much younger Aubrey Beauclerk, 9th Duke of St. Albans. Her stepdaughter Susan Coutts was the Countess of Guilford.
- Milbanke, Annabella 1792-1860 See Noel, Anne.
- Milbanke, Elizabeth 1732-1818 Daughter of Ralph Milbanke, 5th Bt. Married Penniston Lamb, 1st Viscount Melbourne in 1769. The marriage was troubled as Lamb was consistently unfaithful and quite debauched in his habits. Starting perhaps as early as 1773, she herself began an affair with George Wyndham, 3rd Earl of Egremont, who was most likely the father of two of her children. It was also thought that she was the mistress of the future George IV which helped to further her husband's political career. She was also the known mistress of Francis Russell, 5th Duke of Bedford. She was a noted political hostess of the era and served as a mentor of sorts to Georgina Spencer, Duchess of Devonshire. Later in life, she was a friend to the poet Lord Byron and helped to facilitate his affair with her daughter-in-law. She was the grandmother of Edith Jocelyn and the aunt of Annabella Milbanke. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Mildmay, Mary d. 1640 Daughter of Sir Anthony Mildmay and Grace Sharnington. She married Francis Fane, 1st Earl of Westmoreland in 1599.
- Millar, Gertrude (Gertie) d. 1952 Daughter of John Millar. She married firstly John Monckton before 1924. She then married William Ward, 2nd Earl of Dudley in 1924.
- Mitford, Deborah 1920- Daughter of David Mitford, 2nd Baron Redesdale. She married Andrew Cavendish, 11th Duke of Devonshire in 1941. She was the sister of Nancy.
- Mitford, Nancy 1904-1973 Daughter of David Mitford, 2nd Baron Redesdale. She married Lt. Col. Hon. Peter Rodd, son of 1st Baron Rennell in 1933. She is the author of several books including *Love in a Cold Climate* and the *Pursuit of Love*. She also edited *The Ladies of Alderly: Being the Letters Between Maria-Josephina, Lady Stanley of Alderly and her Daughter-in-Law, Henrietta Maria Stanley, During the Years 1841-1850*. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1967) and *The Stanleys of Alderly: Their Letters Between 1851-1865*. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1968). She was the sister of Deborah. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Monckton, Mary 1748-1840 Daughter of John Monckton, 1st Viscount Galway. She married Edmund Boyle, 7th Earl of Cork in 1786. She was renowned as a hostess who looked beyond the confines of polite society.

Moncreiffe, Georgiana	1846- 1929	Daughter of Sir Thomas Moncreiffe of that Ilk, 7th Bart. and Lady Louisa Hay Drummond (daughter of 11th Earl of Kinnoull). She married William Ward, 1st Earl of Dudley as his 2nd wife, in 1865.
Monroe, Frances	d. 1774	Daughter of Henry Monroe. She married Henry Loftus, 1st Earl of Ely in 1745.
Montagu, Elizabeth	d. 1654	Daughter of Daughter of Edward Montagu, 1st Baron Montagu (ennobled in 1621). She married Robert Bertie, 1st Earl of Lindsey in 1605.
Montagu, Elizabeth	d. 1768	Daughter of George Montagu, 2nd Earl of Halifax. She married John Montagu, later 5th Earl of Sandwich, in 1766.
Montagu, Susan	1797- 1870	Daughter of William Montagu, the 5th Duke of Manchester and Lady Susan Gordon (daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). She married George Hay, 8th Marquess of Tweeddale in 1816.
Montagu- Douglas-Scott, Alice	1901- 2004	Daughter of John Montagu-Douglas-Scott, 9th Duke of Queensbury and Margaret Bridgeman (daughter of the 4th Earl of Bridgeman and Ida Lumley, daughter of the 9th Earl of Scarborough). She married Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester (son of George V) in 1935.
Morison, Lettice (Letitia)	d. 1647	Daughter of Sir Richard Morison. She married Lucius Carey, 2nd Viscount Falkland. A biography of her written by J. Duncan in the year she died is in the British Library, Add. MSS 45388.
Mure, Emma	d. 1911	Daughter of Col. William Mure. She married Thomas Lister, 3rd Baron Ribblesdale in 1853. Her papers were edited by her daughter Beatrix and published as <i>Emma, Lady Ribblesdale: Letters and Diaries</i> . London: Chiswick, 1930.
Murray, Anne	1623- 1699	Anne Murray was born in London on January 4, 1623. Her parents, Thomas Murray (1564–1623) , provost of Eton College, and Jane Drummond (<i>d.</i> 1647), claimed descent from recently ennobled Scottish families. Thomas Murray died when his youngest daughter Anne was only three months old, but her mother was able to maintain the court connections that had been formed in his lifetime to ensure a comfortable life for the family. Anne and her sisters were quite well educated and were given a thorough religious instruction in the teachings of the Church of England.

The family was resolutely pro-Stuart and during the reign of Charles I Jane Drummond was governess to his children Princess Mary, the Princess Royal, and Prince Henry, Duke of Gloucester, in the years around 1642. That same year, Anne herself may have served as a lady of the bedchamber to Charles' wife, Queen Henrietta Maria. These pro-Stuart loyalties will continue throughout Anne's life and will be the source of some adventure.

Anne's early adulthood before her marriage was

characterized by rather extraordinary adventures, many of them connected with her romantic life. She met Thomas Howard, the eldest son of Edward Howard, Lord Howard of Escrick, in 1644 and the pair became romantically involved. The match was forbidden by both Anne's mother and Thomas' father, primarily because she did not have a sufficient fortune to make her a suitable bride (his family was suffering from financial set-backs and looked to the dowry of Thomas' wife to help put them on a firmer footing). Despite parental disapproval, the couple continued to meet and Anne pledged that she would not marry anyone else until she had heard that he had married elsewhere. Unfortunately for her, Thomas did bow to parental pressure and married a well-dowered Earl's daughter in 1646.

Anne's mother died in August 1647 and in that same year she met a man who was to cast a long shadow over much of her life, the royalist spy, Colonel Joseph Bampfield. Bampfield had been charged with engineering the escape of James, Duke of York (later James II) from parliamentary imprisonment. Bampfield brought Anne in to the plot; it was her task to procure female dress for James in which disguise he would make his escape. The Memoirs contain a rather amusing account of her taking the young man's measurements to her dressmaker who exclaimed that he had never heard of a woman who was so proportioned. It was Anne's responsibility on the day of the escape, April 20, 1648, to get James dressed in his disguise. This grand adventure appears to have whetted her appetite for both intrigue and Colonel Bampfield. A romance developed between the two, which Bampfield facilitated by claiming that his wife was dead. Ultimately he asked Anne to marry him, and she considered herself engaged, even when reports began to come to her that the first Mrs. Bampfield was far from dead.

Anne's reputation was suffering from the rumours surrounding her liaison with Bampfield and talk of her involvement in the Duke's escape. Under this pressure, Anne left London in September 1649 and went to stay with friends in the north. While she was there she learned that Bampfield had been arrested and was likely to be executed, that his wife was in fact alive, that he was suspected of being disloyal to the royalist cause, and that her relationship with him was becoming notorious. All of this was too much for Anne and her health gave way; she became convinced that she was going to die. As she recovered she began to insist, against all evidence, that all of the charges against Bampfield were false. This insistence, along with her hostess' jealousy of Anne (it

seemed that her host was somewhat attracted to her) made life in that household quite untenable for Anne.

Anne therefore moved to Scotland to take advantage of the hospitality of the Earl of Dunfermline (Bampffield made the arrangements). Both Anne and the exiled Charles II arrived at Dunfermline at about the same time in 1650 and she took steps to bring herself to his attention. In September of that year, the pro-Stuart Scottish army was defeated by Cromwell at Dunbar resulting in a large number of wounded men. Anne saw the wounded in the area around Fife and was horrified by the fact that there was no place for them to go to receive medical care. She had an interest in medicine and this came to the fore as she undertook to provide care for these men. Charles II later gave her a cash reward for her service. The recognition was sweet, but of much more practical consideration was the money since she was in serious financial difficulties as she had lost effective control over her inheritance and was having to resort to the law courts for restitution.

Anne spent nearly two years at the Earl of Dunfermline's castle at Fyvie, where she was quite happy. Unfortunately, Bampffield came to see her, persisting with his pressure on her to continue the love affair; the stress of his visit caused her to become quite ill again. She was still convinced that he was a widower, but for the sake of her reputation she could not enter into an open relationship with a man who was generally considered to be married.

Anne was brought out of her emotional illness by a crisis of a rather more physical nature; in 1651 Cromwell's army appeared at Fyvie, threatening to kill any who opposed them. The Earl of Dunfermline was not in residence, so his wife begged Anne to deal with them. At first they abused her calling her an 'English whore,' but she stood up to them and shamed them into moderating their behaviour. In the months of the occupation, Anne won the good opinion of the officers and continued to provide medical care for those in need.

Anne left Fyvie in mid-1652, going to Edinburgh to begin legal proceedings to recover her property. Again Bampffield appeared and complicated her life, but it was at this point that she met and was courted by Sir James Halkett of Pitfirrane, a widower with several children. In early 1653 she was presented with incontrovertible evidence that Bampffield's wife was still alive and in the wake of that upset she responded favourably to Halkett's proposal of marriage. They were married in March 1656, when Anne was 33, which is where her Memoirs leave off.

The marriage was seemingly a happy, if quite short, union

producing two sons. Halkett died in September 1670 and Anne moved to Dunfermline. There she undertook to be of practical use in the world and to earn a living so in 1683 she began to educate the orphan children of local gentry. She continued with her medical interests, holding also held a free weekly surgery out of which she gained a national reputation for medical knowledge. Her financial situation was further improved in 1685 with the accession of James II who awarded her a pension of £100 sterling in recognition of her part in his 1648 escape. Even after the Glorious Revolution and the accession of William and Mary, Anne remained resolutely Jacobite. She died at Dunfermline on April 22, 1699.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Nassau,
Amelia de | d.
1684 | Daughter of Louis de Nassau, Herr van der Leck and Beverwaerde. She married Thomas Butler, Earl of Ossory in 1659. |
| Nevill, Joan | 1877-
1952 | Daughter of Henry Nevill, 3rd Marquess of Abergavenny. She married John Pratt, 4th Marquess of Camden in 1898. |
| Neville,
Caroline | 1790- | Daughter of Richard Griffin, 2nd Baron Braybrooke. She married Paul Beilby Lawley (later changed his name to Thompson and was eventually ennobled as 1st Baron Wenlock). |
| Neville,
Dorothy | d. c.
1546 | Daughter of Ralph Neville, 4th Earl of Westmoreland. She married John de Vere, later 16th Earl of Oxford in 1537. She was the sister of Margaret. |
| Neville,
Katherine | d.
1596 | Daughter of John Neville, 4th Lord Latymer. She married Henry Percy, 2nd Earl of Northumberland before 1562. She then married Francis Fitton in 1588. |
| Neville,
Margaret | c.
1527-
1559 | Daughter of Ralph Neville, 4th Earl of Westmoreland. She married Henry Manners, later 2nd Earl of Rutland in 1537. She was the sister of Dorothy. |
| Neville, Mary | 1554-
1626 | Daughter and heir of Henry Neville, 4th Lord Abergavenny and Lady Francis Manners (daughter of 1st Earl of Rutland and Eleanor Paston). She was Baroness Le Despenser in her own right. She married Sir Thomas Fane in 1574. |
| Newdigate,
Jane | | Daughter of John Newdigate. She married Sir Robert Dormer in the early 16th century. |
| Newton,
Frances | d.
1592 | Daughter of Sir John Newton. She married Sir William Brooke, 10th Lord Cobham in 1560. She and Lord Cobham were estranged. She was lady-in-waiting to Elizabeth I. |
| Noel, Anne
(Milbanke) | 1792-
1860 | Daughter of Sir Ralph Milbanke Noel, 6th Bart. and Judith Noel. Anne was Baroness Wentworth in her own right. She married George Gordon, 6th Baron Byron, the infamous poet in 1815. The marriage was unhappy and the couple separated in 1816. Conflict among her descendants over the publication of a biography is chronicled in the British Library, Add. MSS 72094. |

Noel, Rachel	d. 1709	Daughter and co-heir of Wriothsesley Noel, 2nd Earl of Gainsborough. She married Henry Somerset, 2nd Duke of Beaufort as his 2nd wife in 1706. She had a fortune of £60,000. She had two sons prior to her death in 1709.
Ogilvie, Emily	c. 1775- 1832	Daughter of William Ogilvie and Emilia Lennox, Dowager Duchess of Leinster. On Oct. 2, 1790 <i>The London Times</i> published the following announcement: "Mr. Ogilvie's daughter by the Duchess of Leinster is shortly to be married to Lord Chichester, son to the Earl of Donegal; she is between fifteen and sixteen years of age, and a very accomplished young lady." The announcement was a bit premature; instead, she married Charles Beauclerk in 1799.
Ogle, Joane	d. c. 1626	Daughter of Cuthbert Ogle, 7th Baron Ogle. She married Gilbert Talbot, 8th Earl of Shrewsbury, c. 1584.
Osborne, Bridget	d. 1718	Daughter of Thomas Osborne, 1st Duke of Leeds and Bridget Bertie (daughter of 2nd Earl of Lindsey). She married Charles FitzCharles, 1st Earl of Plymouth (illegitimate son of Charles II) in 1678. Following his death in 1680 she married Philip Bisse, Bishop of Hereford in 1705.
Osborne, Camilla	1950-	Daughter of John Osborne, the 11th Duke of Leeds. She was the heiress to the fortune of her father and her cousin the 12th Duke of Leeds, but she did not inherit the title which is now extinct. She married Robert Brownlow Harris before 1972; they divorced in 1976. She married secondly Nigel Dempster in 1977; they divorced in 2002 but remained friendly as she nursed him through his final illness.
Osborne, Mary	1688- 1722	Daughter of Peregrine Osborne, 2nd Duke of Leeds and Bridget Hyde. She married Henry Somerset, 2nd Duke of Beaufort as his 3rd wife in 1711. Following his death in 1714 she married John Cochrane, 4th Earl of Dundonald in 1715.
Paget, Caroline	1773- 1847	Daughter of Henry Paget, 1st Marquess of Anglesey. She married Hon. John Capel, son of the 4th Earl of Essex in 1792.
Paget, Frances	d. 1903	Daughter of Hon. Edward Paget (son of 1st Earl of Uxbridge) and Harriet Legge (daughter of the 3rd Earl of Dartmouth and Frances Finch, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Aylesford). She married John Butler, 2nd Marquess of Ormonde in 1843. She is the mother of Mary Butler.
Paget, Jane	1798- 1876	Daughter of Henry Paget, 1st Marquess of Anglesey. She married Francis Conyngham, Earl of Mount Charles, later 2nd Marquess of Conyngham in 1824. She had been engaged in 1821 to Lord Worcester. She and Conyngham had been engaged previous to their marriage, but had broken it off and then got back together.
Parker, Jane	c. 1505 -1542	Daughter of Henry Parker, 10th Baron Morely. She married George Boleyn, later Viscount Rochford in c. 1524. The marriage does not appear to have been happy and she provided

- evidence that sent her husband and his sister Queen Anne Boleyn to the scaffold on charges of, among other things, incest. Jane remained in the service of Henry VIII's queens until she was implicated in the adultery of Katherine Howard. She was beheaded along with the Queen.
- Parr, Katherine c. 1512-1548 Daughter of Sir Thomas Parr and Maud Green. She married Sir Edward Burgh, after 1526. She married secondly, John Neville, 3rd Lord Latimer in 1533. She married thirdly, Henry VIII, King of England, in 1543. She married lastly Thomas Seymour, Baron Seymour in 1547. She died as a result of complications in childbirth. She was known in her lifetime for her learning and her Protestant sympathies. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Parry, Blanche 1508-1590 Daughter of Henry Myles. She was one of the closest of Elizabeth I's ladies-in-waiting. She did not marry.
- Paston, Eleanor d. c. 1550 Daughter of Sir William Paston. She married Thomas Manners, 1st Earl of Rutland before 1523.
- Paulet, Mary d. 1779 Daughter and co-heiress of Harry Paulet, 6th Duke of Bolton. She married John Montagu, later 5th Earl of Sandwich, as his second wife in 1772.
- Peers-Williams, Edith d. 1897 Daughter of Lt. Col. Thomas Peers Williams. She married Heneage Finch, 7th Earl of Aylesford in 1871. As a result of her affair with George Spencer-Churchill, later 8th Duke of Marlborough, she was involved in one of the most dramatic divorce cases of the Victorian era. The divorce was not granted and the couple were separated from 1877. She bore the Duke a son and was the cause of his divorce from Albertha Hamilton in 1883.
- Pelham, Lucy d. 1721 Daughter of John Pelham, 3rd Bart. and Lucy Sydney. She married Gervaise Pierrepont, later 1st Baron Pierrepont of Ardglass in c. 1680.
- Pelham, Lucy d. 1797 Daughter of Thomas Pelham, 1st Earl of Chichester. She married John Holroyd, 1st Earl of Sheffield in 1794.
- Percy, Dorothy 1598-1650 Daughter of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland and Dorothy Devereux, daughter of 1st Earl of Essex and Lettice Knollys. She married Robert Sydney, 2nd Earl of Leicester, in c. 1615. She is the granddaughter of Lettice Knollys and the mother of Dorothy Sydney.
- Percy, Elizabeth 1667-1722 Daughter and heiress of Jocelyn Percy 11th Earl of Northumberland and Elizabeth Wriothesley (daughter of the 4th Earl of Southampton and Lady Elizabeth Leigh, daughter of 1st Earl of Chichester and Hon. Audrey Boteler). She married Henry Cavendish, Earl of Ogle in 1679. Following his death in 1680, she married Thomas Thynne in 1681. Following his murder the next year, she married Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of Somerset in 1682. She has an entry in ODNB.

Percy, Lucy	1599-1660	Daughter of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland and Dorothy Devereux, daughter of 1st Earl of Essex and Lettice Knollys. She married James Hay, 1st Earl of Carlisle in 1617. The King attended the wedding, but it was done without the consent of her father. He tried to prevent the match by having Lucy stay with him in the Tower of London where he was imprisoned for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot. When she refused, he reputedly offered her £20,000 not to marry Hay. She became a prominent member at court of Charles I, reputedly she was the mistress of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Both she and her husband were involved in sexual intrigue at court, using their relationships to further their political ambitions. Eventually Lucy became involved with the people who were in opposition to Charles I; it is said that she was one of the people who warned John Pym of the King's intention to arrest members of the House of Commons. Once the Civil War broke out, Lucy allied herself with aristocrats who were interested in brokering a peace with the King. Following Charles' execution, she was imprisoned in the Tower for a short time.
Percy, Margaret	d. 1540	Daughter of Henry Percy, 5th Earl of Northumberland. She married Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of Cumberland after 1515 as his second wife.
Petre, Maria	c. 1787-1824	Daughter of Robert Petre, 10th Baron Petre. She eloped with Stephen Phillips, her brother's tutor, in 1805.
Petty-FitzMaurice, Evelyn	1870-1960	Daughter of Henry Petty-FitzMaurice, 5th Marquess of Lansdowne and Maude Hamilton (daughter of the 1st Duke of Abercorn and Louisa Russell – daughter of the 6th Duke of Bedford and Lady Georgiana Gordon). She married Victor Cavendish, 9th Duke of Devonshire in 1892. She was a leading figure in London Society.
Phipps, Katherine	1850-1926	Daughter of George Phipps, 2nd Marquess of Normanby. She married Francis Egerton, 3rd Earl of Ellesmere in 1868. She was a leading figure in London Society.
Pierrepont, Frances	d. 1761	Daughter of Evelyn Pierrepont, 5th Earl of Kingston-upon-Hull (later 1st Duke) and Mary Fielding (daughter of 3rd Earl of Denbigh). She married John Erskine, 6th Earl of Mar in 1714.
Pierrepont, Grace	d. 1702	Daughter of Hon. William Pierrepont (son of 1st Earl of Kingston-upon-Hull). She married Gilbert Holles, 3rd Earl of Clare in 1655.
Pierrepont, Mary	c. 1690-1762	Eldest daughter of Evelyn Pierrepont, 5th Earl of Kingston-upon-Hull (later 1st Duke) and Mary Fielding (daughter of 3rd Earl of Denbigh). She was well educated and married, against her family's wishes, Edward Wortley Montagu, grandson of

- the Earl of Sandwich and the brother of her friend, in 1712. Her letters and writings are collected in Halsband, Robert (ed). *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967 and Montagu, Mary Wortley Lady. *The Works of the Right Honourable Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Including her Correspondence, Poems, and Essays*. London: R. Phillips, 1803. Biographical studies of her include Grundy, Isobel. *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999 and Paston, George. *Mary Wortley Montagu and Her Times*. London: Methuen, 1907.
- Pitt-Rivers, Frances 1836-1896 Daughter of George Pitt-Rivers, the 4th Baron Rivers of Sudley Castle. She married George Osborne, 9th Duke of Leeds in 1861.
- Plantagenet, Bridget b. before 1526 Daughter of Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle (illegitimate son of Edward IV) and Elizabeth Grey, 6th Baroness Lisle, (daughter of Edward Grey, 1st Viscount Lisle).
- Plantagenet, Elizabeth b. before 1526 Daughter of Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle (illegitimate son of Edward IV) and Elizabeth Grey, 6th Baroness Lisle, (daughter of Edward Grey, 1st Viscount Lisle). She married Sir Francis Jobson, one of the receivers of the Court of Augmentations after 1534 and before 1543.
- Plantagenet, Frances Daughter of Arthur Plantagenet, 1st Viscount Lisle (illegitimate son of Edward IV) and Elizabeth Grey, 6th Baroness Lisle, (daughter of Edward Grey, 1st Viscount Lisle). She married her stepbrother John Bassett and married secondly Thomas Moncke in the 16th century.
- Ponsonby, Loelia 1902-1993 Daughter of Frederick Ponsonby, 1st Baron Sysonby. She married, as his 3rd wife, Hugh Grosvenor 2nd Duke of Westminster in 1930. They were divorced in 1947. She then married Martin Lindsay, 1st Bart. in 1969.
- Popham, Frances c. 1597-1671 Daughter of Sir Francis Popham. She married Edward Conway, 2nd Viscount Conway in 1621.
- Poulett, Mary 1788-1860 Daughter of John Poulett, 4th Earl Poulett. She married Lord Charles Somerset, son of the 5th Duke of Beaufort, in 1821.
- Power, Elizabeth Daughter of Richard Power, 4th Baron le Power and Coroghmore and Katherine Barry (daughter of 3rd Viscount Barry). She married Hon. David Barry (son of the 5th Viscount Barry) before 1605. She married secondly Patrick Sherlock.
- Power, Ellen c. 1791-1845 Daughter of Edmund Power. She married first John Purvis, before 1828. She then married Charles Manners-Sutton, later 1st Viscount of Canterbury in 1828. She was famous for her beauty which she used to gain entry into Society.
- Poynings, Jane (Joan) Illegitimate daughter of Sir Edward Poynings. She married John Clinton, 7th Lord Clinton in 1510. She married secondly Sir Robert Wingfield after 1519.

Poyntz, Margaret	1737- 1814	Daughter of Rt. Hon. Stephen Poyntz. She married John Spencer, 1st Earl Spencer in 1755. She was the mother of Georgiana and Henrietta Spencer.
Price, Lilian	d. 1909	Daughter of the American Commodore Cicero Price. She married firstly Louis Hammersley and was a widow when she married, as his second wife following his divorce from Albertha Hamilton, George Spencer-Churchill, 8th Duke of Marlborough. Reportedly, she took a fortune of \$7,000,000 with her when she went to Britain. Following Marlborough's death in 1892, she married Lt. Col. Lord William de la Poer Beresford, the son of the 4th Marquess of Waterford in 1895.
Primrose, Constance	d. 1939	Daughter of Archibald Primrose, Lord Dalmeny. She married Henry Wyndam, 2nd Baron Leconfield in 1867.
Rawdon- Hastings, Edith	1833- 1874	Daughter of George Rawdon-Hastings and Barbara Yelverton, Baroness Grey. She was Countess Loudon in her own right. She married Charles Abney-Hastings (Clifton), 1st Baron Donington in 1853.
Rawson, Anne		Daughter of Nicholas Rawson. She married Sir Michael Stanhope of Shelford. He was executed in 1552 in the plot that brought down his brother-in-law, Edward Seymour the Duke of Somerset.
Rich, Essex		Daughter of Robert, 3rd Earl of Warwick. She married Daniel Finch, 7th Earl of Winchelsea (2nd Earl of Nottingham) in 1674. She is the niece of Mary Boyle who arranged the marriage and the mother of Mary Finch.
Ridgeway, Cassandra		Daughter of Thomas Ridgeway, 1st Earl of Londonderry. Married Francis Willoughby, c. 1610.
Robinson, Anne		Daughter of 1st Baron Grantham. She was the sister of Theresa Robinson. She never married and took care of her sister Theresa's children after their mother's death.
Robinson, Theresa	1745- 1775	Daughter of Thomas Robinson, 1st Baron Grantham. She married John Parker, 1st Baron Boringdon in 1769. She was the sister of Anne Robinson.
Romanovitch, Catherine	1783- 1856	Daughter of <u>Simon Romanovitch</u> , Count Woronzow. She married George Herbert, 11th Earl of Pembroke as his second wife in 1808.
Roper, Anna	1719- 1782	Daughter of Henry Roper, the 8th Baron Teynham and Anne Lennard, Baroness Dacre (daughter of the 1st Earl of Essex). She was the sister of both the 9th and 10th Barons. The 10th Baron's son was the 11th Baron who was the father of Betty and Catherine Roper. She married Captain Peter Tyler and they were the parents of Francis Tyler, the husband of Betty and Catherine.
Roper, Betty	d. 1788	Daughter of Henry Roper, 11th Baron Teynham. She married her cousin Francis Tyler in 1785. She died after giving birth to three children in three years. She was the sister of Catherine.

Roper, Catherine	d. 1829	Daughter of Henry Roper, 11th Baron Teynham. She married her cousin and brother-in-law Francis Tyler in 1791. She was the sister of Betty.
Rothschild, Annie de	1844- 1926	Daughter of Anthony Rothschild, 1st Baronet. She married Hon. Eliot Yorke, son of 4th Earl of Hardwicke and Susan Liddell (daughter of 1st Baron Ravensworth) in 1873. Some of her correspondence is in the British Library, Add. MSS 47963.
Rothschild, Constance de	1843- 1941	Daughter of Anthony Rothschild, 1st Baronet. She married Cyril Flower, 1st Baron Battersea in 1877. Her diaries are in the British Library, Add. MSS 47913. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Rothschild, Hannah de	1851- 1890	Daughter of Baron Mayer de Rothschild. Married Archibald Primrose, 5th Earl of Roseberry in 1878. The marriage was very controversial both in the Jewish and British aristocratic communities. Throughout her life she remained faithful to her Jewish faith, though she was adamant that her children be raised in the religion of their father. She died unexpectedly of typhoid fever complicated by Bright's disease and was buried in the Jewish cemetery in Willesden in London.
Russell, Anne	d. 1604	Daughter of Francis Russell, 2nd Earl of Bedford. She married, as his 3rd wife, Ambrose Dudley, 1st Earl of Warwick in 1565.
Russell, Anne	d. 1639	Daughter of John Russell, 3rd Baron Russell and Elizabeth Cooke. She married Henry Somerset, later 1st Marquess of Somerset in 1600. She is the sister-in-law of Margaret Dakins.
Russell, Elizabeth		Daughter of John Russell, 3rd Baron Russell and Elizabeth Cooke. She was prominent at the court of Elizabeth I, where she was known for her flirtations. She died unmarried.
Russell, Louisa	1812- 1905	Daughter of John Russell, the 6th Duke of Bedford and Georgiana Gordon (daughter of the 4th Duke of Gordon). Married James Hamilton, 1st Duke of Abercorn. She was famous as a matchmaker.
Ryder, Susan	1796- 1827	Daughter of Dudley Ryder, 1st Earl of Harrowby and Lady Susan Leveson-Gower (daughter of the 1st Marquess of Stafford and Susannah Stewart – daughter of 6th Earl of Galloway and Lady Catherine Cochrane). She married Hugh Fortescue, later 2nd Earl Fortescue in 1817.
Sackville, Elizabeth	1795- 1870	Daughter of John Sackville, 3rd Duke of Dorset. She married George West, 5th Baron De La Warr in 1813. This marriage changed the family name to Sackville-West.
Sackville, Mary	1688- 1705	Daughter of Charles Sackville, 6th Earl of Dorset. She married Henry Somerset, 2nd Earl of Beaufort in 1702. She died in childbed.
Sackville, Mary	d. 1778	Daughter of Lord John Sackville (son of the 1st Duke of Dorset) and Frances Leveson-Gower (daughter of 1st Earl of Gower and Evelyn Pierrepont, daughter of 1st Duke of Kingston-upon-Hill and Lady Mary Fielding) and sister to the

		3rd Duke of Dorset. She married Sackville Thanet, 8th Earl of Thanet in 1767.
Sackville, Mary	1792-1864	Daughter of John Sackville, 3rd Duke of Dorset. She married firstly Other Windsor, 6th Earl of Plymouth in 1811. She married secondly William Pitt Amherst, 1st Earl of Amherst in 1839. Oddly enough, Amherst was the widower of Mary's mother-in-law Sarah Archer.
Sackville-West, Elizabeth	1818-1897	Daughter of George West (later Sackville-West), 5th Baron De La Warr and Elizabeth Sackville, Baroness Buckhurst in her own right (daughter of 3rd Duke of Dorset). She married Francis Russell, later 9th Earl of Bedford in 1844. She was the mother of Mary Tribe, of whom she disapproved.
Savage, Anne	c. 1506-1564	Daughter of Sir John Savage. She married Thomas Berkeley, 6th Lord Berkeley in 1533. She resisted efforts to compel her to remarry following her husband's death.
Savage, Dorothy	c. 1611-1691	Daughter of Thomas Savage, 1st Viscount Savage of Rocksavage and Elizabeth Darcy, Countess Rivers, daughter of Thomas Rivers, 1st Earl Rivers. She married Charles Howard, later 2nd Earl of Berkshire in 1637.
Savile, Frances	d. 1695	Daughter of Thomas, 1st Earl of Sussex. She married Francis Brudenell, Lord Brudenell, son of the 2nd Earl of Cardigan, in 1668. Some of her correspondence is in the British Library, Add. MSS 29558.
Schulenberg, Ermengarde von der	1667-1743	Daughter of Baron von der Schulenberg. She was George I's mistress. She bore him at least three children. She was created Duchess of Kendal in her own right in 1719. She took an active role in the politics of Britain. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Sedley, Catherine	1657-1717	Daughter of Sir Charles Sedley and Catherine Savage (daughter of Earl Rivers). She married David Colyear, 2nd Bart (he was created 1st Earl of Portmore in 1703) in 1696. She came to court as lady-in-waiting to the Duchess of York, and thus came to the attention of the Duke (later James II). She was the mistress of James II, both before and after he became King.. Catherine was also linked by rumour to James' keeper of the privy purse, James Grahame who asserted that he was the father of the children that she claimed were the Duke's. In 1686, when James became king he broke off the affair as a moral example, but some of the courtiers engineered her return to favour as a Protestant counter-weight to the rising Catholic influence. In recognition of her service, she was made Countess of Dorchester in her own right in 1686. This upset the Queen who insisted that Catherine be banished. In the face of great opprobrium, the new Countess of Dorchester retired to Ireland, but she only remained there a matter of months. Upon her return to England, she renewed her affair with the King.

- Upon his overthrow, she was a part of the circle of the leading Jacobite conspirators and was open in her disdain for William III and Mary II. Perhaps in an effort to reduce suspicion against her, she married one of William's generals David Colyear. She has an entry in ODNB.
- Seymour, Anne d. 1588 Daughter of Edward Seymour, 1st Duke of Somerset and Anne Stanhope. She married John Dudley, son of the 1st Duke of Northumberland and Jane Guilford in 1550. Following his death in 1554, she married Sir Edward Unton in 1555.
- Seymour, Elizabeth d. 1776 Daughter of Algernon Seymour, 7th Duke of Somerset. She married Hugh Smithson (later Hugh Percy), 1st Duke of Northumberland in 1740. Her journal is printed as Greig, James (ed). *Diaries of a Duchess: Extracts from the Diaries of the First Duchess of Northumberland, 1716-76*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- Seymour, Georgiana d. 1813 Parentage unknown. She married William Charles Cavendish-Bentinck (son of 3rd Duke of Portland and Lady Dorothy Cavendish) in 1808.
- Seymour, Jane 1510-1537 Daughter of Sir John Seymour. She married Henry VIII as his 3rd wife in 1536. She died the following year as a result of childbirth, after having his only legitimate son. She was the sister-in-law of Anne Stanhope. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Sharington, Grace c. 1552-1620 Daughter and co-heir of Sir Henry Sharington. She married Sir Anthony Mildmay in 1567. Her journals are published as Pollock, Linda. *With Faith and Physic: the Life of a Tudor Gentlewoman: Lady Grace Mildmay, 1552-1620*. New York: St. Martin's, 1995; Warnicke, Retha. "Lady Mildmay's Journal." *Sixteenth Century Journal* (1989).
- Sharington, Olive Daughter and co-heir of Sir Henry Sharington. She married Sir John Talbot, the younger brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury in c. 1574.
- Shepherd, Frances Heiress of a very wealthy merchant and M.P. She married Charles Ingram, later 9th Viscount Irwin in 1758.
- Sherard, Sophia 1795-1851 Daughter of Philip Sherard, 5th Earl of Harborough. She married firstly, Thomas Witchcote, 6th Bart. She married William Evans-Freke in 1840.
- Shirley, Selina 1707-1791 Daughter of Washington Shirley, 2nd Earl Ferrers. She married Theophilus Hastings, 9th Earl of Huntingdon in 1728. She was known for her religious sensibilities and founded the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion. Biographical studies of her include Welch, Edwin. *Spiritual Pilgrim: A Reassessment of the Life of the Countess of Huntingdon*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1995; Alan Harding, *The Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion*, Oxford University Press, 2003.

Shovell, Elizabeth	1692- 1750	Daughter of Sir Cloudesley Shovell. She married firstly Sir Robert Marsham, later 1st Baron Romney in 1708. Following his death in 1724, she married John Carmichael, 3rd Earl of Hyndford.
Sidney, Mary		Daughter of Sir William Sidney. She married Sir William Dormer in the 1st half of the sixteenth century.
Sidney, Mary	c. 1586- 1621	Daughter of Robert Sidney, 1st Earl of Leicester and Barbara Gamage. She married Sir Robert Wroth in 1604. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Smith, Emily	1800- 1889	Daughter of Charles Smith and Lady Anne Wellesely (daughter of 1st Earl of Mornington). She married Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort in 1822. Somerset was the widower of her half-sister, Georgiana Fitzroy. This marriage within the prohibited degrees of affinity led to a change in the law in 1835, that stated that all marriages to a deceased wife's sister contracted before 1835 were valid, but those afterward were void. This began a yearly debate in the Commons on the issue until 1907 when such unions were finally permitted.
Somers-Cocks, Adeline	1852- 1920	Daughter of Charles Somers-Cocks, 3rd Earl of Somers. She married George Russell, later 10th Duke of Bedford in 1876.
Somerset, Edith	1838- 1915	Daughter of Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort and Emily Smith. She married William Denison, 1st Earl of Londesborough in 1863.
Somerset, Emily Blanche	d. 1895	Daughter of Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beafort and Emily Smith. She married George Hay-Drummond, 12th Earl of Kinnoull in 1848.
Somerset, Henrietta	1690- 1726	Daughter of Charles Somerset, Marquess of Worchester. She married Charles Fitzroy, 2nd Duke of Grafton in 1713.
Somerset, Katherine	1834- 1914	Daughter of Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort and Emily Smith. She married Arthur Walsh, 2nd Baron Ormathwaite in 1858.
Somerset, Mary		Daughter of Charles Somerset, 1st Earl of Worcester. She married William Grey, 13th Lord Grey of Wilton in the 16th century.
Somerset, Mary Isabella	1756- 1831	Daughter of 4th Duke of Beaufort. Married Charles Manners, 4th Duke of Rutland, 1775.
Somerset, Rose		Daughter of Henry Somerset, 7th Duke of Beaufort and Emily Smith. She married Francis Lovell in 1846 against her parents' wishes.
Sparrow, Mary	1777- 1841	Daughter of Robert Sparrow. She married Archibald Acheson, 2nd Earl of Gosford in 1805.
Spencer, Caroline	1763- 1813	Daughter of George Spencer, 4th Duke of Marlborough and Lady Caroline Russell (daughter of the 4th Duke of Bedford). She married Henry Ellis, 2nd Viscount Clifden in 1792. She is the sister of Charlotte Spencer.

Spencer, Charlotte	d. 1802	Daughter of George Spencer, 4th Duke of Marlborough and Lady Caroline Russell (daughter of the 4th Duke of Bedford). Married Rev. Edward Nares in 1797. Sister of Caroline.
Spencer, Cynthia Jane	1957-	Daughter of Edward Spencer, 8th Earl Spencer and Frances Roche (daughter of 4th Baron Fermoy). She married Robert Fellowes, later Baron Fellowes, in 1978.
Spencer, Diana	1734- 1808	Daughter of the 3rd Duke of Marlborough. She married Frederick St. John, 2nd Viscount of Bolingbroke in 1757. The couple divorced in 1765 due to her adultery with Topham Beauclerk, the great-grandson of Charles II. She and Beauclerk married in 1768. She was Lady of the Bedchamber from 1762-1768.
Spencer, Diana	1961- 1997	Daughter of Edward Spencer, 8th Earl Spencer and Frances Roche (daughter of 4th Baron Fermoy). She married Charles Mountbatten Windsor, Prince of Wales (son of Queen Elizabeth II and heir to the throne) in 1981. They divorced in 1996. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Spencer, Dorothy	1640- 1670	Daughter of Henry Spencer, 1st Earl of Sunderland and Dorothy Sydney. She married George Savile, 1st Marquess of Halifax in 1656.
Spencer, Elizabeth Sarah	1955-	Daughter of Edward Spencer, 8th Earl Spencer and Frances Roche (daughter of 4th Baron Fermoy). She married Neil McCorquodale in 1980.
Spencer, Georgiana	1757- 1806	Daughter of John Spencer, 1st Earl Spencer. She married William Cavendish, 5th Duke of Devonshire in 1774. She was a famous society figure. She was the sister of Harriet and the mother of Harriet and Georgiana. Biographical studies include <i>Georgiana: Duchess of Devonshire</i> by Amanda Foreman. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Spencer, Harriet	1761- 1821	Daughter of John Spencer, 1st Earl Spencer. She married Frederick Ponsonby, 3rd Earl of Bessborough in 1780. She had a long-standing affair with Granville Leveson-Gower, later 1st Earl of Granville, which produced two children. She then arranged Leveson-Gower's marriage to her niece Harriet Cavendish.
Spencer, Sarah	1787- 1870	Daughter of George Spencer, 2nd Earl Spencer and Lavinia Bingham (daughter of 1st Earl of Lucan). She married William Lyttleton, 3rd Lord Lyttleton in 1813. Her letters were published in Wyndham, Hon. Mrs. Hugh, ed. <i>Correspondence of Sarah Spencer, Lady Lyttleton, 1787-1870</i> . London: John Murray, 1912. She was the grandmother of Lucy Lyttleton.
Spencer- Churchill, Cornelia	1847- 1927	Daughter of John Spencer-Churchill, 7th Duke of Marlborough. She married Ivor Guest, 1st Baron Wimborne in 1868. She was the daughter-in-law of Charlotte Bertie.

- Spencer-Churchill, Henrietta
Spencer-Churchill, Sarah
- 1958-
1921-
2000
- Daughter of John Spencer-Churchill, the 11th Duke of Marlborough. She married the German banker Nathan Gelber in 1980. He divorced her on grounds of her adultery in 1989.
- Daughter of John Spencer-Churchill the 10th Duke of Marlborough. She married Lt. Edwin Russell (American) in 1943. The couple divorced in 1966. That same year she married the Chilean Guy Burgos whom she divorced in 1967. She then married the Greek Theodorus (Theo) Roubanis that year; they divorced in 1981. She was the heiress of her grandmother Consuelo Vanderbilt, who had been married to the 9th Duke of Marlborough.
- St. Clair-Erskine, Angela
- 1876-
1950
- Daughter of Robert St. Clair-Erskine, the 4th Earl of Rosslyn. She married Lt. Col. James Forbes in 1896. She was the sister of Sybil and Millicent. She published her memoirs as *Memoirs and Base Details*. London: Hutchinson, 1921.
- St. Clair-Erskine, Millicent
- 1867-
1955
- Daughter of Robert St. Clair-Erskine, the 4th Earl of Rosslyn. She married Cromartie Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, 4th Duke of Sutherland in 1884. Following his death in 1913 she married Brig. General Percy Fitzgerald in 1914. That marriage ended in divorce in 1919. She married thirdly, Lt. Col. George Hawes in 1919. They were divorced in 1925. She was active in war work during the First World War. She was the sister of Angela and Sybil.
- St. Clair-Erskine, Sybil
- 1871-
1910
- Daughter of Robert St. Clair-Erskine, the 4th Earl of Rosslyn. Sister to Angela. She married Anthony Fane, 13th Earl of Westmoreland in 1892. She was the sister of Angela and Millicent.
- St. John, Henrietta
- 1699-
1756
- Daughter of Henry St. John, 1st Viscount St. John. She married Robert Knight, 1st Earl of Catherlough in 1727. She is the mother of Henrietta Knight. Letters to her from Frances Thynne are preserved in the British Library as Add. 23728 f. 3-4. In that volume there is the following biographical sketch: "The letters are addressed to Henrietta, one of the daughters of Sir Henry St. John Bart., afterwards Viscount St. John. She married Roland Knight, Esq (son of the well-known Cashien(?) in the year 1720 by the South Sea Company of that name), created in 1746 Baron Luxborough of Ireland; but after having had a son and a daughter, lived separately from him at Barrells(?) in Warwickshire, until her decease in 1756. Her daughter in 1748 married Charles Weymonds, Esq but a divorce took place between them in consequence of her eloping in 1753 with Earl Tylney's* brother, [in a note in a later hand, f. 45, He is identified as the Hon. Josiah Child] to whom she was married the following year.

Within less than three months of the decease of his former wife, Lord Luxborough married Lady Lequesne, relict of Sir

John Lequesne, Knt. Her maiden name was Knight, (it is thought she was first cousin to her second husband) and her sister, into whose possession these letters afterwards came, had in 1742 married Edward Bacon Esq. of Earham, near Norwich, many years a representative in Parliament for that City.

Lord Luxborough was in 1763 advanced to the title of Earl of Catherlaugh (or Carlow) in Ireland and died in 1772, exactly 16 years after the death of his first wife, who is said to have been a woman of uncommon endowments of mind but of not so religious a cast as her friend the Duchess of Somerset. A volume of her letters to William Sherstone, Esq was published in 1775, but, being on mostly local contemporary subjects interesting only to the parties, the expectations of the public were much disappointed.”

St. Lawrence, Isabella	d. 1836	Daughter of Thomas St. Lawrence, 1st Earl of Howth. She married Dudley Cosby, 1st Baron Sydney and Stradbally in 1773.
Stafford, Elizabeth	1499-1588	Daughter of Henry Stafford, the 3 rd Duke of Buckingham and Eleanor Percy (daughter of the 3 rd Earl of Northumberland). She was unhappily married to Thomas Howard, 3 rd Duke of Norfolk in 1512. She was the mother of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and Mary Howard, Duchess of Richmond.
Stanhope, Anne	c. 1497-1587	Daughter of Sir Edward Stanhope and Elizabeth Bouchier (daughter of 10th Lord FitzWarin). She married Edward Seymour, later 1st Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector in 1537. Following his execution, she married her steward, Francis Newdigate.
Stanhope, Evelyn	1834-1875	Daughter of George Stanhope, 6th Earl of Chesterfield and Anne Weld-Forester. She married Henry Herbert, 4th Earl of Carnarvon in 1861. She died in 1875 of puerperal fever.
Stanhope, Jane	d. 1618	Daughter of Sir Michael Stanhope. She married Sir Roger Townshend. She married secondly Henry Berkeley, 7th Lord Berkeley, in 1597. Her rules for her household, dated 1601, are in the British Library, Add. MSS 33588 ff. 44-49.
Stanhope, Gwendolyn Mary	1844-1876	Daughter of Philip Stanhope, 5th Earl of Stanhope. She married Frederick Lygon, 6th Earl of Beauchamp in 1872.
Stanhope, Serena	1970-	Daughter of Henry Stanhope, 12th Earl of Harrington. She married David Armstrong-Jones, Viscount Linley (son of Princess Margaret and 1st Earl Snowdon) in 1993.
Stanley, Alice	1828-1910	Daughter of Edward, 2nd Lord Stanley and Henrietta Dillon-Lee. She married Augustus Fox-Pitt-Rivers (Lane-Fox) in 1853. She was the sister of Rosalind and Henrietta.
Stanley, Anne	1580-1647	Daughter and co-heiress of Ferdinando Stanley, 5th Earl of Derby. She married firstly Grey Brydges, 5th Baron Chandos

- of Sudley in 1607. She then married Mervyn Tuchet, 2nd Marquess of Castlehaven in 1624. She gave evidence against her 2nd husband on charges of rape, incest, and unnatural acts with a page which resulted in his execution.
- Stanley, Charlotte d. 1776 Daughter of Edward Stanley, 11th Earl of Derby. She eloped with John Burgoyne, the future general, in 1751.
- Stanley, Eleanor c. 1821-1903 Daughter of Edward Stanley and Lady Mary Maitland (daughter of the 8th Earl of Lauderdale). She married Lt. Col. Samuel Long in 1866. She was maid of honour to Queen Victoria. Her memoirs are published as Erskine, Mrs. Stewart, ed.. *Twenty Years at Court: From the Correspondence of the Hon. Eleanor Stanley... 1842-1862*. London: Nisbett, 1916.
- Stanley, Elizabeth 1588-1633 Daughter and co-heiress of Ferdinando Stanley, 5th Earl of Derby. She married Henry Hastings, 5th Earl of Huntingdon in 1601. She was the sister of Frances.
- Stanley, Emma d. 1928 Daughter of Edward Smith-Stanley, 14th Earl of Derby and Emma Bootle-Wilbraham. She married Hon. Wellington Chetwynd-Talbot, son of the 2nd Earl Talbot, in 1860.
- Stanley, Frances 1583-1636 Daughter and co-heiress of Ferdinando Stanley, 5th Earl of Derby. She married John Edgerton, 1st Earl of Bridgewater c. 1602. She was the sister of Elizabeth.
- Stanley, Henrietta Blanche 1830-1921 Daughter of Edward, 2nd Lord Stanley and Henrietta Dillon-Lee. She married David Ogilvy the 5th Earl of Airlie in 1851. She was the sister of Rosalind and Alice.
- Stanley, Jane d. 1569 Daughter of Edward Stanley, 3rd Earl of Derby and Lady Dorothy Howard (daughter of the 2nd Duke of Norfolk). She married Edward Sutton, 4th Lord Derby in 1567. She died in 1569 after giving birth to two children.
- Stanley, Rosalind 1845-1921 Daughter of Edward, 2nd Lord Stanley and Henrietta Dillon-Lee. She married George Howard, later the 9th Earl of Carlisle in 1864. She was known for her radical political views. She was the sister of Henrietta and Alice.
- Stephens, Catherine 1794-1882 Daughter of Edward Stephens. She married George Capell-Coningsby, 5th Earl of Essex, as his 2nd wife in 1838. She was an actress and singer.
- Stevens, Mary d. 1919 Daughter of Paran Stevens (American). Her father was a very wealthy American businessman. She married Gen. Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur Paget in 1878. She was a prominent Society hostess and inherited her mother's considerable wealth.
- Stewart, Susan 1767-1841 Daughter of John Stewart, 7th Earl of Galloway. She married George Spencer-Churchill, 5th Duke of Marlborough in 1791.
- Stewart-Mackenzie, Susan Mary d. 1931 Daughter of Keith Mackenzie. Her maternal great-grandfather was the 1st Lord Seaforth. She married first Col. Hon. John Stanley, son of the 2nd Baron Stanley of Alderly in 1871. After Stanley's death in 1878 she married Francis Jeune, later 1st Baron St. Helier, in 1881. She became a leading society

- hostess. She published her memoirs as *Memoirs of Fifty Years*. London: Edward Arnold, 1909.
- Stuart, Arbella (Arabella) 1575-1615 Daughter of Charles Stuart, 5th Earl of Lennox and Elizabeth Cavendish (daughter of Elizabeth Hardwick). Her father and James I's father were brothers. She was perceived as a threat to James' throne. She entered into a clandestine marriage with William Seymour, 2nd Duke of Somerset in 1610. For this both she and Seymour were imprisoned. She was the granddaughter of Margaret Douglas and Elizabeth Hardwick. Her letters are published as Cooper, Elizabeth. *The Life and Letters of Lady Arabella Stuart, Including Numerous Original and Unpublished Documents*. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1866. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Stuart, Charlotte c. 1775-1847 Daughter of John Stuart, 1st Marquess of Bute and Charlotte Windsor (daughter of 1st Viscount Windsor). She eloped with William Jackson Homan in 1797.
- Stuart, Louisa Daughter of John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute and Mary Wortley Montagu, Baroness Mount Stuart. She was unmarried. Her writings are collected in *Lady Louisa Stuart: Selections from Her Manuscripts*. New York: Harper, 1899. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Stuart-Wortley, Caroline d. 1940 Daughter of Hon. James Stuart-Wortley (son of 1st Baron Wharncliffe). She married Hon. Norman Grosvenor (son of 1st Baron Ebury) in 1881. She edited the letters of her grandmother and published them as *The First Lady Wharncliffe and Her Family, 1779-1856*. London: Heinemann, 1927.
- Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, Elizabeth 1824-1878 Daughter of George Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, 2nd Duke of Sutherland and Harriet Howard (daughter of the 6th Earl of Carlisle and Georgiana Cavendish – daughter of the 5th Duke of Devonshire and Georgiana Spencer). She married George Campbell, 8th Duke of Argyll in 1844. She was an important Society hostess.
- Sydney, Barbara Daughter of Thomas Sydney, 1st Earl of Leicester and Barbara Gamage. She married Thomas Smythe, 1st Viscount Strangford in the 17th century. Following his death, she married Col. Strangford.
- Sydney, Dorothy 1617-1684 Daughter of Robert Sydney, 2nd Earl of Leicester and Dorothy Percy. She married Henry Spencer, 1st Earl of Sunderland in 1639. Following his death in 1643, she married Robert Smythe in 1652.
- Sydney, Katherine Daughter of Thomas Sydney, 1st Earl of Leicester and Barbara Gamage. She married Louis Mansel, 2nd Bart. after 1603.
- Sydney, Lucy 1630-1685 Daughter of Robert Sydney, 2nd Earl of Leicester and Dorothy Percy. She married Sir John Pelham, 3rd Bart. in 1647. She was the mother of Lucy Pelham, the sister of Dorothy.

Talbot, Alethea	d. 1654	Daughter and co-heiress of Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married Thomas Howard, 21st Earl of Arundel in 1606.
Talbot, Anne	d. 1558	Daughter of George Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married first Peter Compton and then William Herbert, 1st Earl of Pembroke.
Talbot, Anne	d. 1584	Daughter of Francis Talbot, 5th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married first John Braye, 2nd Lord Braye. She married secondly Thomas Wharton, 1st Baron Wharton in 1561.
Talbot, Elizabeth		Daughter of George Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married William 3rd Lord Dacre in 1517. She was the sister of Margaret and Mary and half sister to Anne.
Talbot, Elizabeth	d. 1651	Daughter and co-heiress of Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury and Mary Cavendish. She married Henry Grey, 8th Earl of Kent in 1601. She married secondly, John Seldon.
Talbot, Margaret		Daughter of George Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married Henry Clifford, later 1st Earl of Cumberland. She was the sister of Elizabeth and Mary
Talbot, Mary	d. 1572	Daughter of George Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married Henry Percy, 6th Earl of Northumberland in 1524. The marriage was notoriously unhappy; her husband had been romantically involved with Anne Boleyn before Henry VIII turned his eye on her. She was the sister of Elizabeth and Margaret.
Talbot, Mary	d. 1649	Daughter and co-heiress of Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke in 1604.
Talbot, Theresa	d. 1919	Daughter of Charles Chetwynd-Talbot, 19th Earl of Shrewsbury. She married Charles Vane-Tempest-Stewart, 6th Marquess of Londonderry in 1875. She was a leading figure in London Society.
Temple, Anne	1619- 1696	Daughter of Sir Peter Temple, 2nd Bt. and Anne Throckmorton. She married Thomas Roper, 2nd Viscount Baltinglass in 1637. Her family opposed the match. She died in the Fleet Prison.
Temple, Jane	1672- 1751	Daughter of Sir John Temple. She married John Berkeley, 3rd Baron Berkeley and secondly William Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland in 1700.
Temple, Martha		Daughter of Sir John Temple, Master of the Rolls. She married Sir Thomas Gifford (Giffard), 1st Bart. in April 1662. Thomas died the following month.
Tennant, Laura (Octavia)	d. 1886	Daughter of Sir Charles Tennant, 1st Bart., a rich industrialist. She married George Lyttleton, 4th Lord Lyttelton in 1885.
Tennant, Margot (Emma)	1865- 1945	Daughter of Sir Charles Tennant, 1st Bart., a rich industrialist. She married Herbert Asquith, later Prime Minister and 1st Earl of Oxford. Her memoirs are published as Asquith, Margot. <i>The</i>

Autobiography of Margot Asquith. Mark Bonham Carter, ed. Bath: Cedric Chivers, 1962; Asquith, Margot. *More Memories*. 1933; Asquith, Margot. *Myself When Young*. London: F Muller, 1938; Asquith, Margot. *Off the Record*. 1943; Asquith, Margot. *Places and Persons*. London: T. Butterworth, 1925. She has an entry in the ODNB.

Throckmorton, Anne d. c. 1620 Daughter and co-heir of Sir Arthur Throckmorton. She married Sir Peter Temple, 2nd Bt. in 1614. She was the mother of Anne Temple.

Thynne, Charlotte 1811-1895 Daughter of Thomas Thynne, the 2nd Marquess of Bath. She married Walter Montague Douglas Scott, 5th Duke of Buccleuch in 1829.

Thynne, Frances d. 1754 Daughter and co-heir of Hon. Henry Thynne, son of 1st Viscount Weymouth. She married Algernon Seymour, later 7th Duke of Somerset, son of Elizabeth Percy, c. 1713. Her letters to Henrietta, Lady Luxborough, are preserved in the British Library, Add.MSS 23728 f. 3-4. In the front of that volume is the following biographical sketch: "The writer of the following letters was Frances, eldest of the two daughters and co-heirs of Henry Tynne, only son of Thomas, the first Viscount Weymouth by Grace, daughter and heir of Sir George Strode of Leveston in Dorsetshire* [*Her younger sister Mary was the wife of William Greville, Lord Brooke, and died at the early age of 19 years]. She was married about the year 1713 to Algernon, Earl of Hartford, a young nobleman who is said to have been distinguished for every amiable virtue that could adorn his rank. He was the eldest surviving son of Charles Seymour, Duke of Somerset, by Elizabeth, daughter and sole heir of Jocelyn Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and on the death of his mother in 1722 took his seat in the house of peers as Baron Percy and c the title he inherited from her.

The fruits of this marriage were, first a daughter, Lady Elizabeth Seymour, born in 1716, who afterwards became Duchess of Northumberland, and a son, George Seymour, Viscount Beauchamp, born in 1725. He died of the small pox which seized him in 1744 at Bologna in Italy during his travels on the Continent, and carried him off the evening of his birthday, on which he had completed his 19th year.

Not long after her marriage the Countess of Hartford became on the Ladies of the Bedchamber to Caroline, the Queen of King George the second, then Prince of Wales. She continued in this office 'till the death of the Queen, in 1737, when she retired from the bustle of the court to enjoy the more satisfactory comforts of domestic life. Her husband, Algernon, Earl of Hartford became Duke of Somerset on the death of his father in 1748, but survived him little more than 14 months;

		his widow, the writer of these letters died in 1754, having survived her husband exactly 4 years and 5 months.”
Thynne, Mary	1702-1720	Daughter and co-heir of Hon. Henry Thynne, son of 1st Viscount Weymouth. She married William Greville, 7th Baron Brooke in 1716.
Tilson, Gertrude		Daughter of James Tilson and Gertrude Lambart (daughter of the 4th Earl of Cavan). She eloped with a hairdresser in 1769.
Tollemache, Elizabeth	1797-1858	Daughter of John Tollemache and Elizabeth Stratford (daughter of the 3rd Earl of Aldborough). She married firstly Lt. Col. Christian Johnstone in 1817; they were divorced in 1826. She then married Thomas Brudenell, 7th Earl of Cardigan in 1826. The marriage was unhappy and they separated in 1846.
Tollemache, Laura	d. 1834	See Laura Manners
Tollemache, Louisa	1745-1840	Daughter of Lionel Tollemache, 4th Earl of Dysart and Grace Carteret (daughter of the 2nd Earl of Granville). She was Countess of Dysart in her own right. She married John Manners, son of Lord William Manners in 1765. Mother of Laura and Louisa Manners.
Townshend, Charlotte	1776-1856	Daughter of George Townshend, 1st Marquess of Townshend. She married George Osborne, later 6th Duke of Leeds, in 1797.
Townshend, Elizabeth	d. 1785	Daughter of Charles Townshend, 2nd Viscount Townshend and Elizabeth Pelham, daughter of 1st Baron Pelham. She married Charles Cornwallis, 1st Earl Cornwallis, in 1722.
Tresham, Frances		Daughter of Sir Thomas Tresham. She married Edward Stourton, 10th Baron Stourton in the late 16th century.
Tribe, Mary	1865-1937	Daughter of the Venerable Walter Tribe, Archdeacon of Lahore. She married Herbrand Russell, 11th Duke of Bedford in 1888. She was invested as a Dame of Grace, Order of St. John of Jerusalem, as a Fellow, Linnean Society of the Imperial College, and as a Dame Commander, Order of the British Empire in 1928. She was a passionate aviatrix. She broke the record for a flight to South Africa in the 1930s. She left Woburn Abbey in a plane on March 22, 1937 and was never seen again. She was also very interested in ornithology. She had a passion for medicine as well.
Tudor, Margaret	1489-1541	Daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York (daughter of Edward IV). Married James IV of Scotland in 1503. Following his death at Flodden Field she married Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus in 1513. She was divorced from Angus and married Henry Stewart, 1st Lord Methven in 1528. She is the mother of Margaret Douglas and the grandmother of Mary, Queen of Scots. She is the sister of Mary Tudor and Henry VIII. She has an entry in the ODNB.

Tudor, Mary	1496-1533	Daughter of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York (daughter of Edward IV). Married Louis XII of France in 1514 and following his death, she entered into an unauthorized marriage with Charles Brandon, 1st Duke of Suffolk in 1515. She was the sister of Henry VIII and Margaret Tudor. She was the mother of Frances Brandon and the grandmother of Jane Grey. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Tufton, Anne	d. 1750	Daughter of Thomas Tufton, 6th Earl of Thanet. She was married to James Cecil, the 5th Earl of Salisbury in 1709.
Twisleton-Wykeham-Fiennes, Emily	c. 1827-1917	Daughter of Benjamin Twisleton-Wykeham-Fiennes, 10th Baron Seye-and-Sele. She married firstly Thomas Gisborne in 1849. She married secondly John Griffiths in 1872. She published the travel diary of Celia Fiennes as <i>Through England on a Side Saddle: In The Time of William and Mary. Being the Diary of Celia Fiennes. With an Introduction by the Hon. Mrs. Griffith.</i> London: Field and Tuer, 1888.
Vanderbilt, Consuelo	1877-1964	Daughter of William Vanderbilt (American). Married Charles Spencer-Churchill, 9th Duke of Marlborough. They were divorced in 1921. She then married Louis Balsan. She published her memoir as <i>The Glitter and the Gold.</i> New York: Harper, 1953.
Vane-Tempest-Stewart, Helen	1876-1956	Daughter of Charles Vane-Tempest-Stewart, 6th Marquess of Londonderry and Teresa Talbot. She married Giles Fox-Strangways, 6th Earl of Ilchester in 1902.
Vassal, Elizabeth	1771-1845	Daughter of Richard Vassal. She married Sir Godfrey Webster, 4th Bt. They were divorced due to her adultery with Henry Fox, 3rd Baron Holland whom she married in 1797. She was a famous, though scandalous, hostess. Her substantial correspondence and journals are printed in Holland, Elizabeth Vassal Fox, Lady. <i>The Journal of Elizabeth Lady Holland (1791-1811)</i> . Earl of Ilchester, ed. London: Longmans, Green, 1908; Ilchester, Earl of, ed. <i>Elizabeth, Lady Holland to her Son, 1821-45</i> . London: John Murray, 1946; Ilchester, Earl of, ed. <i>Journal of Elizabeth, Lady Holland</i> . London: Longmans, 1908; Holland, Elizabeth Vassal Fox, Lady. <i>The Spanish Journal of Elizabeth Lady Holland</i> . London: Longman's, 1910.
Vatcher, Caroline	1931-2005	Daughter of Col. Henry Vatcher. She married John Osborne, 11th Duke of Leeds in 1955. Following his death in 1963, she married Peter Hoos in 1968; they were divorced in 1975. She then married Lt.-Cmdr. Sir Robert Hobart, 3rd Bart. in 1975. She was the last woman to hold the title of Duchess of Leeds. She was a well-known artist under the name Caroline Leeds. <i>The Independent</i> ran a very flattering obituary of her, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/caroline-leeds-504267.html .

- Vaughan, Anne d. 1751 Daughter and heiress of John Vaughan, 3rd Earl of Carbery. She married Charles Paulett, 3rd Duke of Bolton in 1713. The marriage was unhappy and the couple separated.
- Vaux, Anne c. 1562-1637 Daughter of Lord Vaux of Harrowden. She was unmarried but sued to gain control of her dowry. Her life was spent furthering the cause of Catholicism in England. She worked to provide safe houses for the Jesuit priests who were in the country illegally, being especially associated with Henry Garnet. She and her sister fitted out Baddesley Clinton and White Webbs as safe houses. Some of the Gunpowder plotters met at White Webbs and Anne was arrested following the discovery of the plot, but was soon released. Garnet was arrested in 1606 and Anne went to London with him attempting to pass messages to the imprisoned priest. This activity resulted in her second arrest. Following Garnet's execution she was released and she retired into the countryside and ran a Catholic school.
http://www.show.me.uk/gunpowderplot/adults_people_wp.htm
She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Vere, Elizabeth de d. 1627 Daughter of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford and Anne Cecil. She married William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby in 1595.
- Vere, Frances de 1517-1577 Daughter John de Vere, 15th Earl of Oxford and Elizabeth Trussell. Married Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (son of the 3rd Duke of Norfolk). She had been a particular favourite of Henry VIII's 5th wife Catherine Howard. Following Catherine's execution, Frances rarely came to court. Following Howard's execution, she married Thomas Steyning.
- Vere, Mary de d. 1634 Daughter of John de Vere, 16th Earl of Oxford and Marjory Golding. She married Peregrine Bertie, 12th Baron Willoughby de Eresby in 1577.
- Villiers, Barbara 1640-1709 Daughter of William Villiers, 2nd Viscount Grandison and Hon. Mary Bayning (daughter of the 1st Viscount Bayning). She married Roger Palmer, 1st Earl of Castlemaine in 1659. They separated before 1661. She entered into a bigamous marriage with Robert Fielding in 1705 (his first wife was still alive). They divorced in 1707. She was the long-time mistress of Charles II between 1659 and 1668. She was also associated with John Churchill, later 1st Duke of Marlborough. She was created Duchess of Cleveland in her own right. She has an entry in the ODNB.
- Villiers, Caroline 1774-1835 Daughter of George Villiers, 4th Earl of Jersey. She married Henry Paget, 1st Marquess of Anglesey in 1795. They were divorced in 1810; that same year she married George Campbell, 6th Duke of Argyll.
- Villiers, Constance 1840-1922 Daughter of George Villiers, 4th Earl of Clarendon and Katherine Grimston (daughter of the 1st Earl of Verulam and Charlotte Jenkinson, daughter of the 1st Earl of Liverpool).

		She married Frederick Stanley, later 16th Earl of Derby in 1864. She was the sister of Emily
Villiers, Emily	1843-1927	Daughter of George Villiers, 4th Earl of Clarendon and Katherine Grimston (daughter of the 1st Earl of Verulam and Charlotte Jenkinson, daughter of the 1st Earl of Liverpool) . She married Odo Russell, 1st Baron Amptill, in 1868. She was the sister of Constance.
Villiers, Susan		Daughter of Sir George Villiers and Mary Beaumont, Countess of Buckingham. She married William Fielding, 1st Earl of Denbigh c. 1607.
Vincent, Mary	d. 1823	Daughter of Francis Vincent, 7th Bart. She married Archibald Primrose, 3rd Earl of Rosebery in 1775. She was the mother-in-law of Harriett Bouverie and Anne Anson.
Vivian, Alexandra	1890-	Daughter of Hussey Vivian, 3rd Baron Vivian. She married Lord Charles Pelham, eldest son of the 4th Earl of Yarborough in 1911. He was killed in action in 1914.
Wade, Elizabeth	d. 1908	Daughter of William Wade. She married Lord Robert Montagu, son of the 6th Duke of Manchester in 1862. She was his children's nursery maid.
Waldegrave, Laura	1760-1816	Daughter of James Waldegrave, 2nd Earl of Waldegrave and Maria Walpole. She married George Waldegrave, 4th Earl of Waldegrave.
Walmoden, Amalia	1704-1765	She was the mistress of George II. She was Countess of Yarmouth in her own right.
Walpole, Dorothy	1826-1913	Daughter of Horatio Walpole, 3rd Earl of Orford. Her reputation was damaged when rumours arose about a liason with George Smythe, a friend of Disraeli's. Her family moved quickly to marry her to her much older cousin Reginald Nevill in 1847. She was famous as a hostess and a gardener. Her writings and reminiscences are printed in several collections, many of them edited by her son Ralph, including <i>Under Five Reigns, by Lady Dorothy Nevill</i> . London: Methuen, 1910; <i>Leaves from the Note-Books of Lady Dorothy Nevill</i> . London: MacMillan, 1907; <i>Life and Letters of Lady Dorothy Nevill</i> . London: Methuen, 1919; <i>My Own Times</i> . Ralph Nevill, ed. London: Methuen, 1912; and <i>The Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill</i> . London: T. Nelson, 1906. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Walpole, Maria	1736-1807	Daughter of Hon. Sir Edward Walpole. She married Edward Waldegrave, 2nd Earl of Waldegrave in 1759. Her second husband was William Hanover, 1st Duke of Gloucester (the son of Frederick Prince of Wales and thus brother of George III) in 1766. She was the mother of Laura Waldegrave.
Walsingham, Frances	d. 1632	Daughter of Sir Francis Walsingham. She married Sir Philip Sidney in 1583. Following his death, she married Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex and following his execution in

		1601 she married Richard Bourke, 4th Earl of Clanricarde in 1603.
Walters, Catherine	1839- 1920	Daughter of Edward Walters. She was also known as Skittles. She was a prominent society courtesan, who had liaisons with many aristocratic men. She was known for her beauty and her horsemanship.
Warden, Juliet	d. 1913	Daughter of Francis Warden (American). She married Rt. Hon. Sir William Carrington, son of 2nd Baron Carrington in 1871. Her friendship with George V and Queen Mary is discussed in "The Close Friends of England's New King and Queen" published in the <i>New York Times</i> , May 29, 1910.
Weld-Forester, Anne	1802- 1885	Daughter of Cecil Weld-Forester, 1st Baron Forester. She married George Stanhope, 6th Earl of Chesterfield in 1830. She was a correspondent of Benjamin Disraeli.
Wellesley, Anne	c. 1794- 1875	Illegitimate daughter of Richard Wellesley, 1st Marquess of Wellesley. She married Sir William Abdy, 7th Bart. in 1806. In 1815 she eloped with William Charles Cavendish-Bentinck, son of the 3rd Duke of Portland. Following her divorce from Abdy they married in 1816. Abdy sued Cavendish-Bentinck for Crim. Con. and was awarded £7,000.
Wellesley- Pole, Priscilla	1793- 1879	Daughter of William Wellesley-Pole, 3rd Earl of Mornington. She married John Fane, Lord Burghersh, later 11th Earl of Westmorland in 1811. She was the niece of the Duke of Wellington. Her correspondence was published as <i>The Correspondence of Priscilla, Countess of Westmoreland</i> . London: John Murray, 1909. She has an entry in the ODNB.
Wentworth, Anne		Daughter of Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford. She married William Conolly, the nephew and heir of the very wealthy speaker of the Irish House of Commons (also named William Conolly) in 1733.
Wentworth, Harriet		Daughter of Thomas Watson-Wentworth, 1st Marquess of Rockingham. She married her much younger footman, William Sturgeon, in 1764 causing a huge scandal.
Westenra, Jane	d. 1788	Daughter of Henry Westenra. She married John Monckton, 1st Viscount Galway in 1734. She was the mother of Mary.
Williams, Margaret	d. 1880	Daughter of Sir John Williams, 1st Bart. She married Henry Verney, 16th Baron Willoughby de Broke in 1829.
Willoughby, Cassandra	1670- 1735	Daughter of Francis Willoughby. In 1687 she went to keep house for her brother. She married her cousin James Brydges, later 1st Duke of Chandos as his second wife in 1713 (she was 43 at the time). She published a study of her father's family entitled <i>The Continuation of the History of the Willoughby Family</i> . A.C. Wood, ed. Eton: The Shakespeare Head Press, 1958.
Willoughby, Katherine	1520- 1580	Daughter and heir of William Willoughby, 10th Lord Willoughby de Eresby and Maria Selinas, lady-in-waiting to

		Katherine of Aragon. She married Charles Brandon, 1st Duke of Suffolk in 1534. Both of her sons from this marriage died young. She married secondly her servant Richard Bertie. Katherine was known as a devoted Protestant and went into exile during the reign of Mary I. Her descendants from her second marriage continued the title of Lord Willoughby de Eresby.
Willoughby, Diana		Daughter of Francis Willoughby, 5th Baron Willoughby of Parham and Elizabeth Cecil. She married Heneage Finch, 3rd Earl of Winchelsea in 1645. The marriage was unhappy.
Willoughby, Elizabeth	d. 1695	Daughter of Francis Willoughby, 5th Baron Willoughby of Parham and Elizabeth Cecil. She married Richard Jones, 1st Earl of Ranelagh in 1662.
Willoughby, Frances	d. 1680	Daughter of Francis Willoughby, 5th Baron Willoughby of Parham and Elizabeth Cecil. She married William Brereton, 3rd Baron Brereton before 1659.
Wilson, Enid	1878- 1957	Daughter of Charles Wilson, later 1st Baron Nunburnholme. She married Edwyn Scudamore-Stanhope, 10th Earl of Chesterfield in 1900.
Wilson, Gwladys		Daughter of Charles Wilson, later 1st Baron Nunburnholme. She married Eric Chaplin, 2nd Viscount Chaplin in 1905.
Wilson, Millicent	1872- 1952	Daughter of Charles Wilson, later 1st Baron Nunburnholme. She married firstly Sir Charles Craddock-Hartopp, 5th Bart. in 1895; they were divorced in 1905. She married secondly, Henry Wellesley, 3rd Earl Cowley in 1905; they were divorced in 1913. She married thirdly, Maj. Grey Duberly in 1914.
Windsor, Charlotte	1746- 1800	Daughter of Herbert Hickman-Windsor, 2nd Viscount Windsor. She married John Stuart, later 1st Marquess of Bute, in 1766.
Wombwell, Almina	c. 1877- 1969	Daughter of Frederick Wombwell. She married George Herbert, 5th Earl of Carnarvon in 1895. Following the Earl's death in 1923, she married secondly, Ian Dennistoun in 1923.
Worsley, Frances	1694- 1743	Daughter of Sir Robert Worsley, 4th Bart. and Lady Frances Thynne (daughter of the 1st Viscount Weymouth). She married John Carteret, later 2nd Earl of Granville in 1710. She was described as as 'a very pretty lady and £12,000' (Swift, Vindication; Portland MSS, 4.537, quoted in the ODNB article on Granville).
Wortley, Mary	d. 1941	Daughter of the Rt. Hon. James Wortley. She was the second wife of Ralph King, 2 nd Earl of Lovelace, the grandson of the poet Lord Byron. They married in 1880. She entered into a very public conflict with her niece-by-marriage, Judith Blunt Lytton, over the publication of a biography of Annabel, Lady Byron. Much of the correspondence associated with that conflict is housed in the British Library, Add. MSS 72094.

Wortley-Montagu, Mary	1718-1794	Daughter of Edward Wortley-Montagu and Lady Mary Pierrepont. She married John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute in 1736.
Wotton, Catherine	1609-1667	Daughter of Thomas Wotton, 2nd Baron Wotton. She married Sir Henry Stanhope, Lord Stanhope (son and heir of 1st Earl of Chesterfield) in 1628. Following his death in 1634 she married Jan van der Kerckhove, Lord of Henvliet who died in 1660. She then married Daniel O'Neale. In 1660, Charles II created her Countess of Chesterfield for life.
Wriothlesley, Elizabeth	d. 1555	Daughter of Thomas Wriothlesley, 1st Earl of Southampton. She married Thomas Radcliffe, later 3rd Earl of Sussex in 1545.
Wriothlesley, Elizabeth	1646-1690	Daughter and co-heir of Thomas Wriothlesley, 4th Earl of Southampton and Elizabeth Leigh (daughter of the 1st Earl of Chichester and Audrey Boteler, daughter of 1st Baron Boteler). She married firstly Jocelyn Percy, 11th Earl of Northumberland in 1662. From this marriage, she was the mother of Elizabeth Percy who was her father's heiress. Following the death of the Earl of Northumberland, she married Ralph Montagu, 1st Duke of Montagu in 1673.
Wriothlesley, Rachael	c. 1636-1723	Daughter of Thomas, 3rd Earl of Southampton. She seems to not have been given a good education, possibly due to the Civil War. She and her sister Elizabeth were their father's co-heiresses. She married Francis Vaughan, Lord Vaughan, the son and heir of the 2nd Earl of Carberry, in 1653. Vaughan died in 1667 and she then married Hon. William Russell, Lord Russell, the son of 1st Duke of Bedford, in 1669. Her letters are collected in Russell, Lady Rachael. <i>Letters of Lady Rachel Russell; from the manuscript in the library at Woburn Abbey. To which is prefixed, an introduction, vindicating the character of Lord Russell against Sir John Dalrymple, &c.</i> London, 1801. Russell, Lady Rachael. <i>Some account of the life of Rachael Wriothlesley Lady Russell. . . . Published from the originals in the possession of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire.</i> London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Browne, 1820. Biographical Studies of her include Schwoerer, Lois G. <i>Lady Rachel Russell: 'One of the Best of Women.'</i> Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988; Blakiston, G. (ed). <i>Lord William Russell and His Wife.</i> 1972.
Wythes, Alice	d. 1957	Daughter of George Wythes. She married Frederick Hervey, 4th Marquess of Bristol in 1896.
Yelverton, Frances	d. 1684	Daughter of Henry Yelverton, 2nd Bart. and Susan Longeuville, Baroness Grey (daughter of 12th Lord Grey). She married Christopher Hatton, 1st Viscount Hatton c. 1675. She was the mother of Anne Hatton.

Yohe, Mary	d. 1938	Daughter of William Yohe. She married Henry Pelham-Clinton-Hope, 8th Duke of Newcastle in 1894. They divorced in 1902.
Yorke, Elizabeth	d. 1867	Daughter of Philip Yorke, 3rd Earl of Hardwicke and Elizabeth Lindsay (daughter of the 5th Earl of Balcarres). She married Charles Stuart, 1st Baron Stuart de Rothesay in 1816.
Ysnaga, Consuelo	1853-1909	Daughter of Antonio Ysnaga (American). She married George Montagu, 8th Duke of Manchester in 1876.

Bibliography

Unpublished Manuscript Sources

- BL Add. MSS 2269 f. 61.
- BL Add. MSS 2269 f. 126.
- BL Add. MSS 2269 f. 127.
- BL Add. MSS 2850 f. 149.
- BL Add. MSS 8308.
- BL Add. MSS 15892 f. 152.
- BL Add. MSS 22256 ff. 50-53.
- BL Add. MSS 22626 f. 25.
- BL Add. MSS 22626 f. 28.
- BL Add. MSS 22626 f. 65.
- BL Add. MSS 22627 f. 98.
- BL Add. MSS 23728 ff. 3-4.
- BL Add. MSS 23728 ff. 10-11.
- BL Add. MSS 23728 f. 17.
- BL Add. MSS 23728 f. 18.
- BL Add. MSS 23728 ff. 43-44.
- BL Add. MSS 23728 ff. 46-47.
- BL Add. MSS 2747 f. 274.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 27.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 42.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 67.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 101.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 110.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 f. 128.
- BL Add. MSS 28050 ff. 150-151.
- BL Add. MSS 28569 f. 130.
- BL Add. MSS 28569 f. 168.
- BL Add. MSS 29558 f. 43.
- BL Add. MSS 29558 ff. 45-46.
- BL Add. MSS 29605 f. 14.
- BL Add. MSS 33579 ff. 1-8.
- BL Add. MSS 33588 f. 44-49.
- BL Add. MSS 33588 f. 56.
- BL Add. MSS 35796 f. 5.
- BL Add. MSS 38579 ff. 33-38
- BL Add. MSS 38579 ff. 51-77
- BL Add. MSS 3871.
- BL Add. MSS 40631 f. 33.
- BL Add. MSS 4149 ff. 22-25b.
- BL Add. MSS 4149 f. 306139b
- BL Add. MSS 45388 f. 6.

BL Add. MSS 45388 f. 10.
BL Add. MSS 45388 f. 11.
BL Add. MSS 47013A f. 29.
BL Add. MSS 47013A f. 71.
BL Add. MSS 47213 f. 128.
BL Add. MSS 47913 f. 38.
BL Add. MSS 47913 ff. 43-44.
BL Add. MSS 47913 f. 45.
BL Add. MSS 47913 f. 59.
BL Add. MSS 47963 ff. 53-56.
BL Add. MSS 47963 ff. 68-71.
BL Add. MSS 47963 ff. 98-99.
BL Add. MSS 47963 ff. 126-127.
BL Add. MSS 47963 ff. 139-143.
BL Add. MSS 48218 f. 4.
BL Add. MSS 48218 f. 34.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 36-37.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 71-72.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 73-74.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 109-110.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 128-129.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 141-144.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 145-147.
BL Add. MSS 48218 f. 152.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 178-179.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 192-193.
BL Add. MSS 48218 ff. 196-198.
BL Add. MSS 48218 f. 199.
BL Add. MSS 28218 f. 213.
BL Add. MSS 50261 f. 43.
BL Add. MSS 50261 f. 45.
BL Add. MSS 50261 f. 61.
BL Add. MSS 61422 f. 34.
BL Add. MSS 61422 f. 76.
BL Add. MSS 61668 f. 131.
BL Add. MSS 61668 f. 135.
BL Add. MSS 71686.
BL Add. MSS 75295.
BL Add. MSS 75609.
BL Add. MSS 78915.
BL Add. MSS 78915 ff. 1-2.
BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 5.
BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 11.
BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 110.
BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 67.
BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 73.

BL Add. MSS 78915 f. 146.
BL Add. MSS Ch. 55589.
BL Egerton MSS 111.
BL Egerton MSS 1705 f. 21.
BL Egerton MSS 1705 ff. 29-30.
BL Egerton MSS 2552 f.24b.
BL Egerton MSS 2645 f. 175.
BL Lansdowne MSS 12 f. 1.
BL Lansdowne MSS 12 f. 76.
BL Lansdowne MSS 34 f. 7.
BL Lansdowne MSS 71 f. 174.
BL Lowe MSS f. 81

MS P450:1, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas.

Printed Sources

- Aberdeen, The Marchioness of. *More Cracks With 'We Twa.'* London: Methuen, 1929.
- Acheson, Katherine O., ed. *The Diary of Anne Clifford, 1616-1619*. New York: Garland, 1995.
- Ackroyd, Peter. *London: The Biography*. New York: Anchor Books, 2000.
- Adams, Simon. "Dudley , Lettice, Countess of Essex and countess of Leicester (1543–1634)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/8159>, accessed 26 Sept 2010]
- Airlie, Mabel ,Countess of. *In Whig Society: Compiled from the Hitherto Unpublished Correspondence of Elizabeth Viscountess Melbourne and Emily Lamb Countess Cowper, Afterwards Viscountess Palmerston*. London: Hodder Stoughton, 1921.
- *Thatched with Gold: The Memoirs of Mabel Countess of Airlie*. London: Hutchinson, 1962.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd ed. London: Verso, 2006.
- Anderson, Nancy F. "The 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill' Controversy: Incest Anxiety and the Defense of Family Purity in Victorian England." *The Journal of British Studies* 21: 2 (Spring, 1982): 67-86.

- Anglesey, Marquess of, ed.. *The Capel Letters: Being the Correspondence of Lady Caroline Capel and Her Daughters with the Dowager Countess of Uxbridge from Brussels and Switzerland, 1814-1817*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1955.
- Anon. *An abstract of the bloody massacre in Ireland. Acted by the instigation of the Jesuits, priests, and friars, who were chief promoters of those horrible murthers; prodigious cruelties, barbarous villanies, and inhumane practices, executed by the Irish Papists upon the English Protestants, in the year 1641. And intended to have been acted over again, on Sabbath Day, December the 9th 1688. But by the wonderful providence of God was prevented*. Scotland, 1700.
- Anon. *Arguments Inviting all Faithfull Marriners to Ingage Cheerfully in Englands Honourable and Just Cause, Against the Irish Rebels and Their Adherents, now Robbing at Sea, and About to Invade this Nation*. London, 1649.
- Anspach, Elizabeth Berkeley Craven. *Memoirs of the Margravine of Anspach Written by Herself*. London: Henry Colborn, 1826.
- Ashdown, Dulcie M. *Ladies-in-Waiting*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.
- Ashton, D.J. "Hungerford, Walter, Baron Hungerford of Heytesbury (1503–1540)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14183>, accessed 11 Nov 2010].
- Asmussen, Susan Dwyer. "Being Stirred to Much Unquietness: Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England." *Journal of Women's History* 6:2 (1994): 70-89.
- Bailey, Joanne. *Unquiet Lives: Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Bailey, John, ed. *The Diary of Lady Frederick Cavendish*. New York: Stokes, 1927.
- Ball, Graham, Michael Leapman and Nick Cohen. "Controversial Biography of the Queen Was Censored Before Publication." *The Independent*, Jan. 14, 1996. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/controversial-biography-of-the-queen-was-censored-before-publication-1323830.html>
- Balsan, Consuelo. *The Glitter and the Gold*. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Bamford, Francis and the Duke of Wellington, eds. *The Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot, 1820-1832*. London: MacMillan, 1950.
- Barros, Carolyn A. and Johanna M. Smith, eds. *Life Writings by British Women, 1660-1815*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2000.

- Battersea, Constance. *Reminiscences*. London: Macmillan, 1922.
- Beard, Madeleine. *English Landed Society in the Twentieth Century*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bedford, John, Duke of, *A Silver-Plated Spoon*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959.
- Bennett, Judith M. *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- , "Women's History: A Study in Continuity and Change," *Women's History Review* 2:2 (June 1993): 173-184.
- Bernard, G.W. *The Power of the Early Tudor Nobility: A Study of the 4th and 5th Earls of Shrewsbury*. Sussex: Harvester, 1985.
- , "Introduction: The Tudor Nobility in Perspective." In *The Tudor Nobility*, edited by G.W. Bernard, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.
- Bessborough, Earl of, ed. *Lady Charlotte Guest: Extracts from her Journal, 1833-52*. London: John Murray, 1950.
- Bindoff, Stanley T., et. al. *The House of Commons, 1509- 1558: I. Appendices, Constituencies, Members A-C*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1982.
- Bird, William. *A Treatise of the Nobilitie of the Realme Collected Out of the Body of the Common Law, with Mention of Such Statutes as are Incident Hereunto, Upon a Debate of the Barony of Aburgavenny: With a Table of the Heads Contained in this Treatise*. London: A.N., 1642.
- Bonfield, Lloyd. "Marriage, Property, and the 'Affective Family'." *Law and History Review* 1:2 (Autumn 1983): 297-312.
- Breger, Jennifer. "Rothschild, Hannah de, Countess of Rosebery." *Jewish Women: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia*
<http://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/rothschild-hannah-de-countess-of-rosebery>
- Breitenberg, Mark. "Anxious Masculinity: Sexual Jealousy in Early Modern England." *Feminist Studies* 19:2 (1993): 377-398.
- Brenan, Gerald and Edward Philips Statham. *The House of Howard*. London: Hutchinson, 1907.

- Brewer, J.S., ed. *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, 1575-1588: preserved in the Archepiscopal Library at Lambeth By George Carew, Lambeth Palace Library*. London: Longman, Green, 1868.
- *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England*. 21 vols. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1867; reprint ed., Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1965.
- Brunelle, Gayle K. "Dangerous Liaisons: Mesalliance and Early Modern French Noblewomen." *French Historical Studies* 19:1 (1995): 75-103.
- Bucholz, R.O. "Seymour , Elizabeth, duchess of Somerset (1667–1722)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21925>, accessed 17 April 2010].
- Bulloch, John. "The Duchess of Gordon in Caricature." *Scottish Notes and Queries* 2nd Ser. 5 (Nov. 1903): 65-67.
- Burke, Bernard. *A Genealogical History of the Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited, and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire*. London: Harrison, 1866.
- Burke, John. *A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire*. London: Henry Colburn, 1840.
- Burke, John. *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland Enjoying Territorial Possessions or High Official Rank but Unvested with Heritable Honours*. London: Henry Colburn, 1838.
- Burke, Peter. "The Language of Orders in Early Modern Europe." In *Social Orders and Social Classes in Europe Since 1500: Studies in Social Stratification*, edited by M.L. Bush. London: Longman, 1991.
- Burke's Peerage and Baronetage*. 106th ed. Charles Mosley, editor-in-chief. Crans, Switzerland: Burke's Peerage, 1999
- Bury, Lady Charlotte. *The Diary of a Lady-in-Waiting*. London: John Lane, 1908.
- Byrne, Muriel St. Clare. *The Lisle Letters*. 6 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere*. Pascual de Gayangos, et. al., eds. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1888.

- Campbell, Liza. *A Charmed Life: Growing Up in Macbeth's Castle*. New York: St. Martin's, 2006.
- Cannadine, David. *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy*. New York: Vintage, 1999.
- Cannon, John. *Aristocratic Century: the Peerage of Eighteenth Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- , "Carteret, John, second Earl Granville (1690–1763)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2006. [http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/4804, accessed 24 March 2010]
- Canny, Nicholas. *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, First Earl of Cork, 1566-1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Cardigan and Lancastre, Countess of. *My Recollections*. London: Eveleigh Nash, 1909.
- Cartwright, Julia, ed. *The Journals of Lady Knightley of Fawsley, 1856-1881*. London: John Murray, 1915.
- Casady, Edwin. *Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1938.
- Castle, Egerton, ed. *The Jerningham Letters, 1780-1843: Being Excerpts from the Correspondence and Diaries of the Honourable Lady Jerningham and of Her Daughter Lady Bedingfield*. London: Richard Bently, 1896.
- Chalus, Elaine. "Elite Women, Social Politics, and the Political World of Late Eighteenth-Century England." *The Historical Journal* 43: 3 (Sep. 2000): 669-697.
- Chandos, Cassandra, Duchess of. *The Continuation of the History of the Willoughby Family*. A.C. Wood, ed. Eton: The Shakespeare Head Press, 1958.
- Charmley, John. *Duff Cooper: The Authorized Biography*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1986.
- Childs, Jessie. *Henry VIII's Last Victim: The Life and Times of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2006.
- Clark, Ira. "The Widow Hunt on the Tudor-Stuart Stage." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 41:2 (Spring 2001): 399-416.

- Clark, J.C.D. *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice During the Ancien Regime*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- , "Review." *English Historical Review* 101 (Jan. 1986): 180-183.
- Clifford, Arthur, ed. *The State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*. Edinburgh: Constable, 1809.
- Clifford, Henry. *The Life of Jane Dormer, Duchess of Feria*. London: Burns and Oates, 1887.
- Clinton, Elizabeth. *The Countess of Lincolnes Nurserie*. Oxford: John Lichfield, 1622.
- Cokayne, George E. *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom, Extant, Extinct, or Dormant*. New edition. Edited by Vicary Gibbs. London: The St. Catherine Press, 1910-1959.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Collins, Arthur. *The Peerage of England: or, an Historical and Genealogical Account of the Present Nobility. Containing the Descent, Creations, and Most Remarkable Actions*. 4th ed. London: W. Taylor, 1717.
- "Consistory Court, Doctors' Commons." *The Times* April 15, 1815 #9496, p. 3.
- "Consistory Court, Doctors' Commons." *The Times* May 17, 1816 #9837, p. 3.
- Cooper, Elizabeth. *The Life and Letters of Lady Arabella Stuart, Including Numerous Original and Unpublished Documents*. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1866.
- Cornwallis-West, Mrs. George (Lady Randolph Spencer Churchill). *The Reminiscences of Lady Randolph Churchill*. London: Edward Arnold, 1908.
- Cowper, Mary Clavering, Countess. *Diary of Mary Countess Cowper, Lady of the Bedchamber to the Princess of Wales, 1714-20*. London: J. Murray, 1864.
- Crawford, Patricia. "Women's Published Writings, 1600-1700." In *Women in English Society, 1500-1800*, edited by Mary Prior, 211-74. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Cressy, David. "Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* No. 113 (Nov. 1986): 38-69.

- Croker, John Wilson, ed. *Letters to and from Henrietta, Countess of Suffolk and Her Second Husband the Hon George Berkeley from 1712-1767*. London: J. Murray, 1824.
- Dabhoiwala, Faramarz. "The Construction of Honour, Reputation, and Status in Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 201-213.
- Daugherty, Leo. "Stanley, William, sixth earl of Derby (bap. 1561, d. 1642)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/72296>, accessed 23 Oct 2010]
- Davidoff, Leonore. *The Best Circles: Society, Etiquette, and the Season*. London: Croom Helm, 1973.
- Davis, John. "Primrose, Archibald Philip, fifth earl of Rosebery and first earl of Midlothian (1847–1929)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2009. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35612>, accessed 23 Aug 2010]
- "Death of the Marquess of Hastings." *The Times*, Nov. 11, 1868, #26279, p. 10.
- Debate on bills to allow marriage with a dead wife's sister: May 15, 1841, pg. 2 #17671; Nov. 1, 1845, pg. 11 #19070; March 19, 1847, pg. 4, #19501; March 6, 1850, pg. 6 #20429; April 25, 1855, pg. 6 #22007; Aug. 16, 1860, pg. 7 #23700; March 7, 1866, pg. 8 #25439; Feb. 15, 1870, pg. 4 #26674.
- De Beer, E.S. "Historical Allusions in Absalom and Achitophel." *Review of English Studies* 7:28 (October, 1956): 410-415.
- Debrett, John. *The Peerage of England, Scotland and Ireland: Or the Ancient and Present State of the Nobility, Vol. II: The Peerage of Scotland*. London: W. Owen, 1790.
- Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage*. Kingston Upon Thames: Kelly's Directories, 1976-.
- Denis, George Ravenscroft. *The Cecil Family*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1914.
- Diamond, Michael. *Victorian Sensation, or, the Spectacular, the Shocking, and the Scandalous in 19th Century Britain*. London: Atheneum, 2003.
- Dickens, A.G., ed. *Clifford Letters of the Sixteenth Century*. Durham: Surtees Society, 1962.

Dickson, P.G.M. and J.V. Beckett. "The Finances of the Dukes of Chandos: Aristocratic Marriage, Inheritance, and Debt in Eighteenth Century England." *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 64:3/4 (2001): 309-355.

"The Dollar Princesses." *Time* (Dec. 21, 1959).
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,865177,00.html>.

Donaldson, Gordon. *All the Queen's Men: Power and Politics in Mary Stewart's Scotland*. London: Batsford, 1983.

-----, *Scotland: James V-James VII*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

"The Dowager Duchess of Sutherland." *The Times*, Oct. 28, 1868, #26267, p. 9.

Dregstra, Henk, Sheila Ottway, and Helen Wilcox, eds. *Betraying Our Selves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000.

Durant, David N. *Bess of Hardwick: Portrait of an Elizabethan Dynast*. New York: Atheneum, 1978.

Eaves, Richard G. *Henry VIII and James V's Regency, 1524-1528: A Study in Anglo-Scottish Diplomacy*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1987.

Ellenberger, Nancy W. "Constructing George Wyndham: Narratives of Aristocratic Masculinity in Fin-De-Siecle England." *Journal of British Studies* 39:4 (Oct 2000): 487-517.

Ellis, Steven G. *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the British State*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

"Elopement." *The Times*, Feb. 27, 1805, #6267, p. 2.

"England's Lost Country Houses,"
http://lh.matthewbeckett.com/houses/lh_yorkshire_warterpriory.html

Erickson, Amy Louise. "Coveture and Capitalism." *History Workshop Journal* 59:(2005): 1-16.

-----, "Common Law vs. Common Practice: the Use of Marriage Settlements in Early Modern England." *Economic History Review* 2nd ser. 43 (1990): 21-39.

Erskine, Mrs. Stewart, ed. *Twenty Years at Court: From the Correspondence of the Hon. Eleanor Stanley... 1842-1862*. London: Nisbett, 1916.

- Fiennes, Celia. *Through England on a Side Saddle: In The Time of William and Mary. Being the Diary of Celia Fiennes. With an Introduction by the Hon. Mrs. Griffith.* London: Field and Tuer, 1888.
- Findley, Sandra and Elaine Hobby. "Seventeenth Century Women's Autobiography." In *1642, Literature and Power in the Seventeenth Century: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature, July 1980*, 11-36. Essex: University of Essex Press, 1981.
- Fletcher, Anthony. "Manhood, the Male Body, Courtship, and the Household in Early Modern England." *History* 84:275 (1999): 419-436.
- Forbes, Lady Angela. *Memoirs and Base Details*. London: Hutchinson, 1921.
- Fortescue, G.M. *The Fortescue Papers*. New series, vol. I. London: Camden Soc., 1871.
- Foss, Arthur. *Dukes of Britain*. London: Herbert, 1986.
- Foster, Vere, ed. *The Two Duchesses: Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire, Elizabeth Duchess of Devonshire. Family Correspondence of and Relating to Georgiana Duchess of Devonshire...* London: Blackie and Son, 1898.
- Foyster, Elizabeth. "Marrying the Experienced Widow in Early Modern England: the Male Perspective." In *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Sandra Cavallo and Lynden Warner. New York: Pearson, 1999.
- Fraser, William. *The Lennox, vol. I: Memoirs*. Edinburgh: C.T. and A. Constable, 1874.
- Freedman, Sylvia. *Poor Penelope: Lady Penelope Rich, an Elizabethan Woman*. Kensal Press, 1983.
- Friedman, Alice T. "Architecture, Authority, and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House." *Assemblage* 18 (August, 1992): 40-61.
- "Portrait of a Marriage: the Willoughby Letters of 1585-1586." *Signs* 11 (Spring 1986): 542-55.
- Gairdner, James, ed. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII: Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England*. 21 vols. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1862-1910. Reprint ed., Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1965.
- Gay, Edwin F. "The Temples of Stowe and Their Debts: Sir Thomas Temple and Sir Peter Temple, 1603-1653." *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 2:4 (July, 1939): 399-438.

- Gerschenkron, Alexander. "On the Concept of Continuity in History," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106:3 (May 1962): 195-209.
- Gladstone, Mary. *Her Diaries and Letters*. London: Methuen, 1930.
- Goff, Cecilie. *A Woman of the Tudor Age*. London: John Murray, 1930.
- Goldsmith, Joan. "All the Queen's Women: the Changing Place and Perception of Aristocratic Women in Elizabethan England, 1558-1620." PhD diss., Northwestern University, 1987.
- "A Gossiping Letter of the Eighteenth Century," *Notes and Queries* 6th ser, vol. 11 (Jan-June, 1895): 442-443.
- Grace, F.R. "Life and Career of Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk." M.A. thesis, Nottingham University, 1961.
- Graham, Elspeth et. al. eds. *Her Own Life: Autobiographical Writings by Seventeenth Century Women*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Graham, Elspeth, Hilary Hinds, Elaine Hobby and Helen Wilcox. "'Pondering All These Things in Her Heart': Aspects of Secrecy in the Autobiographical Writings of Seventeenth Century Englishwomen." In *Women's Lives/Women's Times: New Essays on Auto/Biography*, edited by Trev Lyn Broughton and Linda Anderson, 51-72. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Gray, Thomas. *Gray's Letters*. Duncan C. Tovey, ed. London: Bell and Sons, 1912.
http://www.archive.org/stream/lettersofthomasg03grayuoft/lettersofthomasg03grayuoft_djvu.txt
- Green, M.A.E. Wood. *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain*. London: Colburn, 1846.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Greig, James, ed. *Diaries of a Duchess: Extracts from the Diaries of the First Duchess of Northumberland, 1716-76*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- Grey, Jane and S.J. Gunn. "A Letter of Jane, Duchess of Northumberland in 1553." *English Historical Review* 114:459 (Nov. 1999): 1267-1271.
- Griffin, R. and Lord Bay Brooke, eds. *The Private Correspondence of Lady Jane Cornwallis, 1613-44, from the Originals in the Possession of the Family*. London: Bentley, Wilson, and Fley, 1842.

- Gronow, Lees H. *The Reminiscences and Recollections of Captain Gronow, 1810-1860*. London: John C. Nimmo, 1900.
- Grosvenor, Caroline and Charles Beilby, eds. *The First Lady Wharnclyffe and Her Family, 1779-1856*. London: Heinemann, 1927.
- Gunn, S.J. "Brandon, Charles, first duke of Suffolk (c.1484–1545)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/3260, accessed 26 March 2011].
- Habakkuk, H.J. *Marriage, Debt, and the Estates System: English Land Ownership, 1650-1950*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Halkett, Anne. *Autobiography of Anne Lady Halkett, 1622-99*. Edited by John Gough Nicols. Westminster: Camden Society, 1875.
- Halkett, Anne. *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Anne Lady Fanshawe*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- The Hamilton Papers: Letters and Papers Illustrating the Political Relations of England and Scotland in the XVI Century, Formerly in the Possession of the Dukes of Hamilton now in the British Museum*. Edited by Joseph Bain. Edinburgh: Her Majesty's General Register House, 1890.
- Hammer, Paul. *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Hannay, Margaret P. " 'O Daughter Heare': Reconstructing the Lives of Aristocratic Englishwomen." In *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, edited by Betty S. Travitsky and Adele F. Seef, 35-63. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994.
- Harris, Barbara. *English Aristocratic Women, 1450-1550: Marriage and Family, Property and Careers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- "Marriage Sixteenth Century Style: Elizabeth Stafford and the Third Duke of Norfolk." *Journal of Social History* 15 (1982): 371-82.
- "A New Look at the Reformation: Aristocratic Women and Nunneries, 1450-1540." *Journal of British Studies* 32:2 (April 1993): 89-113.
- "Power, Profit and Passion: Mary Tudor, Charles Brandon and the Arranged Marriage in Early Tudor England." *Feminist Studies* 15 (1989): 59-89.

- "Review of *An Open Elite?*" *Journal of Social History* 120:1 (Autumn, 1986): 201-204.
- "Women and Politics in Early Tudor England." *Historical Journal* 33:2 (June 1990): 259-81.
- Harvey, Sheridan. "The Cooke Sisters: A Study of Tudor Gentlewomen." PhD diss., Indiana University, 1981.
- Hasler, P.W. *The House of Commons, 1558-1603*. London: Published for the History of Parliament Trust by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1981.
- Hattendorf, John B. "Shovell, Sir Cloudesley (*bap.* 1650, *d.* 1707)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25470, accessed 26 Aug 2010]
- Hayton, David, Eveline Cruikshanks, and Stuart Handley. *The House of Commons, 1609-1715*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Head, David. "'Beying Ledde and Seduced by the Devyll:' The Attainder of Lord Thomas Howard and the Tudor Law of Treason." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 13:4 (Winter 1982): 3-16.
- *The Ebbs and Flow of Fortune: The Life of Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1978.
- Heal, Felicity. "Reputation and Honour in Court and Country: Lady Elizabeth Russell and Sir Thomas Hoby." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 161-178.
- Herrup, Cynthia. "'To Pluck Bright Honour From the Pale Faced Moon:' Gender and Honour in the Castlehaven Story." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 137-159.
- Hill, Bridget. "Women's History: A Study in Change, Continuity, or Standing Still?" *Women's History Review* 2:1 (1993): 5-22.
- Hill, Christopher. "Review of *An Open Elite?*" *Renaissance Quarterly* 38:2 (Summer, 1985): 337-340.
- "His Grace, the Late Duke of Northumberland..." *Then mes*, June 8, 1786 #456, p. 3.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Calendar of Manuscripts of the Most Honourable, the Marquess of Salisbury... Preserved at Hatfield House*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1906.

- , *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle and Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1925.
- , *Report on the Manuscripts of Mrs. Stopford-Sackville of Drayton House, Northamptonshire*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, Vol I, 1904.
- , *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, Vol II, 1903; Vol III, 1904; Vol IV, 1909; Vol VII, 1913.
- Holland, Elizabeth Vassal Fox, Lady. *The Journal of Elizabeth Lady Holland (1791-1811)*. Edited by the Earl of Ilchester. London: Longmans, Green, 1908.
- Holland, Karen Ann. "Joan Desmond, Ormond, and Ossory: The World of a Countess in Sixteenth Century Ireland." PhD diss., Providence College, 1995.
- Hollingsworth, T.H. "A Demographic Study of British Ducal Families." *Population Studies* 11 (1957): 4-26.
- Hood, Sarah. "The Impact of Protestantism on the Renaissance Ideal of Women in Tudor England." PhD diss., University of Nebraska, 1977.
- Horn, Pamela. *Ladies of the Manor: Wives and Daughters in Country-House Society, 1830-1918*. London: Alan Sutton, 1991.
- Horstman, Allen. *Victorian Divorce*. London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Howson, Gerald. *Burgoyne of Saratoga: A Biography*. New York: Times Books, 1979.
- Hufton, Olwen H. *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1996.
- Hutton, Sarah and Marjorie Hope Nicholson, eds. *The Conway Letters: the Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry Moore and their Friends*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Ilchester, Earl of, ed. *Elizabeth, Lady Holland to her Son, 1821-45*. London: John Murray, 1946.
- , ed. *Journal of Elizabeth, Lady Holland*. London: Longmans, 1908.
- Ilchester, Countess of and Lord Stavordale, eds. *Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox, 1745-1826*. London: John Murray, 1901
- Ingram, David. "Blumberg and the Philosophical Grounds of Historiography." *History and Theory* 29:1 (February 1990): 1-15.

Ives, Eric. *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: "The Most Happy."* London: Blackwell, 2004.

Jack, Sybil M. "Wolsey, Thomas (1470/71–1530)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29854, accessed 29 Aug 2010]

Jalland, Patricia. *Women, Marriage, and Politics, 1860-1914*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

J.G.E. *Englands Hope, against Irish Hate*. London : Printed by VV.VV. for Thomas Heyes, 1600.

Kennedy, A.L., ed. 'My Dear Duchess': *Social and Political Letters to the Duchess of Manchester, 1858-1869*. London: John Murray, 1956.

Kingsford, William. *The History of Canada*, Vol. V (1763-1775). Toronto: Rowsell and Hutchinson, 1892.

Kinsley, James. "Historical Allusions in Absalom and Achitophel." *Review of English Studies* 6:23 (July 1955): 291-297.

Klass, Gary M. *Just Plain Data Analysis: Finding, Presenting, and Interpreting Social Science Data*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2008.

"Lady Dudley and Ward." *The London Time* Dec. 12, 1791, #2204, p. 2.

Lambert, Angela. *Unquiet Souls: A Social History of the Illustrious, Irreverent, Intimate Group of British Aristocrats Known as 'The Souls.'* New York: Harper and Row, 1984.

Lancaster, Henry. "Thynne, Thomas, first Viscount Weymouth (*bap.* 1640, *d.* 1714)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27424, accessed 17 April 2010]

Langford, Paul. *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

"The Late Countess Dowager of Cork." *The Times* June 2, 1840, #17373, p. 7.

"The Late Duke of Rutland, K.G." *The Times* Jan. 21, 1857, #22583, p. 9.

"The Late Marchioness of Tweeddale." *The Times* March 8, 1870, #26692, p. 9.

"Law Report, Sheriff's Court." *The Times* July 20, 1808, #7418, p. 2.

- Lawson, Lesley. *Out of the Shadow: the Life of Lucy, Countess of Bedford*. London: Hambleton, 2007.
- Lederer, Edith M. "Sarah Ferguson Will Keep Her Job." *Daily News* (Los Angeles) July 20, 1986, 13.
- Lemmings, David. "Marriage and the Law in the Eighteenth Century: Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1753." *The Historical Journal* 39: 2 (Jun., 1996): 339-360.
- Lemon, Robert and Mary Anne Everett Green, eds. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-1580*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1856.
- Lever, Trehsam, ed. *The Letters of Lady Palmerston: Selected and Edited from the Originals at Broadlands and Elsewhere*. London: John Murray, 1957.
- Leveson-Gower, Hon. F., ed. *Letters of Harriet Countess Granville, 1810-1845*. London: Longmans, Green, 1894.
- Leveson-Gower, Sir George and Iris Palmer, eds. *Hary-O: the Letters of Lady Harriet Cavendish, 1796-1809*. London: John Murray, 1940.
- Lewis, Judith Schneid. *In the Family Way: Childbearing in the British Aristocracy, 1760-1860*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1986.
- , "'Tis a Misfortune to Be a Great Ladie': Maternal Mortality in the British Aristocracy, 1558-1959." *The Journal of British Studies* 37: 1 (Jan. 1998): 26-53.
- , "When a House is not a Home: Elite English Women and the Eighteenth Century English Country House." *Journal of British Studies* 48 (April 2009): 336-363.
- Lister, Beatrix, ed. *Emma, Lady Ribblesdale: Letters and Diaries*. London: Chiswick, 1930.
- Loades, David. *The Tudor Court*. Totowa, N.J.: Barnes and Noble, 1987.
- Loftis, John. "Introduction." In *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshaw*, edited by John Loftis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Londonderry, Marchioness of. *Retrospect*. London: Frederick Muller, 1938.
- "Lord Allendale." *The Times* Feb. 14, 1907, #38256, pg. 10.
- "Lord Anglesey and Lady Marjorie Manners." *The Times* Aug. 5, 1912, pg. 6, #39969.

- Lunt, James. *John Burgoyne of Saratoga*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch, 1975.
- MacCarthy, Fiona. *Last Curtsey: The End of the Debutantes*. London: Faber and Faber, 2006.
- Mackin, Judith. "The Life of Katherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk." MA thesis, Utah State University, 2000.
- Malcolmson, A.P.W. *The Pursuit of the Heiress: Aristocratic Marriage in Ireland, 1740-1840*. Ulster: Ulster Historical Society, 2006.
- Manley, Deborah. "Elwood , Anne Katharine (1796–1873)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48643>, accessed 27 Sept 2010]
- Margaux, Adrian. "Eloppements, Some Famous." *The Strand Magazine* 32 (July-December, 1906): 623-629.
- "Marriage Between Lady H. Lambert and Lt. Woodgate of the Royal Navy," Royal Navy History.
http://www.royalnavy.org/lib/index.php?title=Marriage_between_Lady_H._Lambert_and_Lt._Woodgate_of_the_Royal_Navy
- "Marriage Between Lady Honora Lambert and Lieutenant Woodgate of the Royal Navy." *The Times* June 20, 1805 #6364, pg 2.
- "Marriage of the Duke of Norfolk." *The Times* November 22, 1877, #29106, p. 6.
- "The Marriage of Frederick, Sixth Earl of Beauchamp." *The Times* Feb. 19, 1868 #26051, p. 9.
- "Marriage of Lord Roseberry." *The Times* March 21, 1878; #29208, pg. 5.
- "Marriage of the Marquess of Bute." *The Times* April 17, 1872, #27353, p. 12.
- Marshall, Rosalind K. "Douglas, Lady Jane (1698–1753)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ww2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/7905>, accessed 3 Feb 2010]
- Martienssen, Anthony. *Queen Katherine Parr*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1973.
- Mascuch, Michael. *Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591-1791*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

- Mason, H.A., *Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1959.
- McCahill, Michael W. "Open Elites: Recruitment to the French Noblesse and the English Aristocracy in the Eighteenth Century." *Albion* 30 (Winter 1998): 599-626.
- McCahill, Michael and Ellis Archer Wasson, "The New Peerage: Recruitment to the House of Lords, 1704-1847." *The Historical Journal* 46:1 (March, 2003): 1-38.
- Meads, Dorothy M., ed. *Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599-1605*. London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1930.
- Mendelson, Sara Heller. "Stuart Women's Diaries and Occasional Memoirs." In *Women in English Society, 1500-1800*. Edited by Mary Prior, 181-210. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Merriman, Roger, ed., *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902; reprint ed. 1968
- Mertes, Kate. *English Noble Household, 1250-1600: Good Governance and Politic Rule*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Millar, Mary S. "Hope, Henry Thomas (1808–1862)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42186>, accessed 4 Nov 2010] .
- Mingay, G.W. *The Gentry: the Rise and Fall of a Ruling Class*. London: Longman, 1976.
- Mintz, Max M. "Burgoyne, John (1723–1792)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4013>, accessed 28 June 2010]
- Mitchison, Rosalind. *A History of Scotland*. London: Methuen, 1970.
- Mitford, Deborah, Duchess of Devonshire. *Wait for Me!: Memoirs*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.
- Mitford, Nancy, ed. *The Ladies of Alderly: Being the Letters Between Maria-Josephina, Lady Stanley of Alderly and her Daughter-in-Law, Henrietta Maria Stanley, During the Years 1841-1850*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1967.
- , ed. *The Stanleys of Alderly: Their Letters Between 1851-1865*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1968.
- Moody, Joanna, ed. *The Private Life of an Elizabethan Lady: the Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599-1605*. Stroud: Sutton, 1998.

- Montagu, Mary Wortley, Lady. *The Works of the Right Honourable Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Including her Correspondence, Poems, and Essays*. London: R. Phillips, 1803.
- Montgomery, William. *The Montgomery Manuscripts, 1603-1706: Compiled From Family Papers*. Belfast: James Cleeland, 1859.
- Moore, Wendy. *Wedlock: How Georgian Britain's Worst Husband Met his Match*. London: Phoenix, 2009.
- Muir, Kenneth. "Unpublished Poems in the Devonshire MS." *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society* 6:9 (1947): 253-282.
- Muirhead, James. "The Law of Marriage and Divorce." *The Westminster Review* 82 (July and October, 1864): 206-218.
- Myers, Anne M. "Construction Sites: the Architecture of Anne Clifford's Diaries." *English Literary History* 73 (2006): 581-600.
- Nevill, Lady Dorothy. *Leaves from the Note-Books of Lady Dorothy Nevill*. London: MacMillan, 1907.
- . *Life and Letters of Lady Dorothy Nevill*. London: Methuen, 1919.
- . *My Own Times*. Edited by Ralph Nevill. London: Methuen, 1912.
- . *The Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill*. Edited by R. Nevill. London: T. Nelson, 1906.
- Newdigate-Newdegate, Lady Anne. *Gossip from a Muniment Room: Being Passages in the Lives of Anne and Mary Fytton, 1574-1618*. London: David Nutt, 1897.
- "News in Brief." *The Times*. Jan. 29, 1788. #880129, p. 3.
- "News in Brief." *The Times*. July 11, 1791. #2072, p. 2.
- "News in Brief." *The Times*. Feb. 11, 1792. #2227, p. 3.
- Noble, Mark. *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell*. London: G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1787.
- Norwich, John Julius, ed. *The Duff Cooper Diaries, 1915-1951*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2005.

- O'Day, Rosemary. *Cassandra Brydges, Duchess of Chandos, 1670-1735: Life and Letters*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007.
- O'Hanlon, Terry. "Queen Did Not Want to Know." *Sunday Mirror*, Jan. 14, 1996.
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4161/is_19960114/ai_n9700934/
- Paine, Lauren. *Gentleman Johnny: The Life of General John Burgoyne*. London: Robert Hale and Co., 1973.
- "Parliamentary Intelligence." *The Times* June 2, 1815, #9537, p. 2.
- Paston, George. *Mary Wortley Montagu and Her Times*. London: Methuen, 1907.
- Payling, S.J. "The Economics of Marriage in Late Medieval England: the Marriage of Heiresses." *Economic History Review* 54 (Aug. 2001): 413-29.
- Pearson, Daphne. *Edward de Vere (1550-1604): the Crisis and Consequence of Wardship*. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2005.
- Pearson, John. *The Serpent and the Stag*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1984.
- Perry, Maria. *The Word of a Prince: A Life of Elizabeth I from Contemporary Documents*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990.
- Peters, Christine. "Gender, Sacrament and Ritual: the Making and Meaning of Marriage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 169 (2000): 63-96.
- Plowden, Alison. *Lady Jane Grey and the House of Suffolk*. New York: Franklin Watts, 1986.
- Pollock, Linda. "Teach Her to Live Under Obedience: the Making of Women in the Upper Ranks of Early Modern England." *Continuity and Change* 4 (1989): 231-58.
- . *With Faith and Physic: the Life of a Tudor Gentlewoman: Lady Grace Mildmay, 1552-1620*. New York: St. Martin's, 1995.
- Pomfret, Thomas. *The Life of the Right Honourable and Religious Lady Christian[a], Late Countess Dowager of Devonshire*. London: William Rawlins, 1685.
- Poole, James. *Advice to the Ladies. A poem: with an Elegiac Complaint on the Death of the Inimitable Alexander Pope Esq. By a Norfolk Gentleman*. London: M. Cooper, 1745.

- Probert, Rebecca. *Marriage Law and Practice in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Rathbone, Hannah Mary Reynolds. *Lady Willoughby; or, Passages from the Diary of a Wife and Mother in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: A.S. Barnes, 1854.
- Rawson, Maude S. *The Life and Letters of Elizabeth of Hardwick and Her Circle*. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1910.
- Read, Conyers. *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth*. London: Cape, 1960.
- “Reviews of Books.” *The Times* Nov. 11, 1901, # 36609, p. 4.
- Rich, Mary. *Autobiography of Mary Countess of Warwick*. Edited by T. Crofton Croker. London: Printed for the Percy Society, 1848.
- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- “Gender, Genre and History: Seventeenth Century English Women and the Art of Autobiography.” In *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, edited by Mary Beth Rose, 245-278. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Rothery, Mark. “The Reproductive Behavior of the English Landed Gentry in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries.” *The Journal of British Studies* 48:3 (July, 2009): 674-694.
- Round, J. Horace. *Peerage and Pedigree: Studies in Peerage Law and Family History*. London: J. Nisbet, 1910.
- Royle, Edward. *Modern Britain: A Social History, 1750-1985*. London: E. Arnold, 1987.
- Rubinstein, W.D. *Men of Property: the Very Wealthy in Britain Since the Industrial Revolution*. New Brunswick, 1981.
- Russell, Lady Rachael. *Letters of Lady Rachel Russell; from the manuscript in the library at Woburn Abbey. To which is Prefixed, an Introduction, Vindicating the Character of Lord Russell Against Sir John Dalrymple, &c.* London, 1801.
- *Some Account of the Life of Rachael Wriothesley Lady Russell. By the Editor of Madame du Deffand’s Letters. Followed by a Series of Letters from Lady Russell to her Husband, William Lord Russell, from 1672-1682; Together with Some Miscellaneous Letters to and from Lady Russell. To which are added, eleven letters from Dorothy Sidney Countess of Sunderland, to George Saville Marquis of Halifax in the year 1680. Published from the originals in the possession of His*

- Grace the Duke of Devonshire*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Browne, 1820.
- St. Helier, Lady. *Memoirs of Fifty Years*. London: Edward Arnold, 1909.
- Scalingi, Paula L. "The Scepter or the Distaff: the Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516-1607." *The Historian* 41 (1978): 59-75.
- Schoenberger, Nancy. *Dangerous Muse: The Life of Lady Caroline Blackwood*. (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2001.
- Schutte, Kimberly. *A Biography of Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox (1515-1578): Niece of Henry VIII and Mother-in-Law of Mary Queen of Scots*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2002.
- "Not for Matters of Treason, but for Love Matters': Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox and Tudor Marriage Law." In *In Laudem Caroli: for Charles Nauert*. Edited by James V. Mehl, 171-187. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1988.
- "Scotland's Lost Country Houses." <http://www.slch.org.uk/a.html>.
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman. *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature: Reading Women's Lives, 1600-1680*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Sessions, William A. *Henry Howard, the Poet Earl of Surry: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Shanley, Mary Lyndon. "Marriage Contract and Social Contract in Seventeenth Century English Political Thought." *The Western Political Quarterly* 32:1 (March, 1979): 79-91.
- Sharpe, Judith, "Continuity and Change: Women's History and Economic History in Britain." [*The Economic History Review*, new series 48:2 (May, 1995): 353-369.
- Sherburn, George. "Walpole's Marginalia in 'Additions to Pope' (1776)." *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 1:4 (July 1938): 473-487.
- Sitchel, Walter Sydney. *Bolingbroke and His Times* (London: James Nisbett, 1901).
- Slater, Miriam. "The Weightiest Business: Marriage in an Upper Gentry Family in Seventeenth Century England." *Past and Present* 72 (Aug. 1976): 25-54.
- Smith, E.A. *Whig Principles and Party Politics: Earl Fitzwilliam and the Whig Party, 1748-1833*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975.

- Smith, Richard. *The Life of the Most Honourable and Vertuous Lady: the La. Magadlen Viscountess Montagu*. 1627.
- Smith, Sidonie. *A Poetics of Women's Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Snell, K.D.M. "English Historical Continuity and the Culture of Capitalism: The Work of Alan MacFarlane." *History Workshop* no. 27 (Spring, 1989): 154-163.
- Southall, Raymond. *The Courty Maker: An Essay on the Poetry of Wyatt and His Contemporaries*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964.
- Stearnes, Peter N. "Gender and Working Class Identity in Britain During the 1950s." *Journal of Social History* 34:4 (Summer, 2001): 773-795.
- Spring, Eileen. "The Heiress-at-Law: English Real Property Law from a New Point of View." *Law and History Review* 8:2 (Autumn 1990): 273-296.
- Statutes of the Realm*. London: Record Commission, 1810-28, 28 Hen. VIII. c. 24.
- Stevens, John. *Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court*. London: Methuen, 1961.
- Stevenson, David. "Halkett, Anne, Lady Halkett (1623–1699)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11934>, accessed 5 Oct 2010].
- St. Helier, Lady. *Memoirs of Fifty Years*. London: Edward Arnold, 1909.
- Stirling, A.M.W., ed. *The Letter Bag of Lady Elizabeth Spencer-Stanhope, 1806-1873*. 2 vols. London: John Lane, 1913.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.
- and Jeanne Fawtier Stone. *An Open Elite? England, 1540-1880*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- *Uncertain Unions: Marriage in England, 1660-1753*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Stretton, Tim. "Widows at Law in Tudor and Stuart England." In *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Sandra Cavallo and Lynden Warner. New York: Pearson, 1999.
- . *Women Waging Law in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Stuart, Lady Louisa. *Lady Louisa Stuart: Selections from Her Manuscripts*. New York: Harper, 1899.
- . *Some Account of John, Duke of Argyll and His Family*. (London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1863.
- Stuart, Louisa and Home, James A. *Letters of Lady Louisa Stuart to Miss Louisa Clinton*. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1901.
- Sturt, Charles. *Report of the Cause of Charles Sturt, esq., Plaintiff and the Marquis of Blandford, Defendant, for Criminal Conversation with the Plaintiff's Wife*. London: J. Ridgeway, 1801.
- Surtees, Virginia. "Beauclerk , Lady Diana (1734–1808)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1848, accessed 11 Nov 2010].
- Swinton, Blanche Arthur Georgina. *A Sketch of the Life of Georgiana, Lady de Ros...* London: J. Murray, 1893.
- Tadmor, Naomi. "Early Modern English Kinship in the Long Run: Reflections on Continuity and Change." *Continuity and Change* 25:1 (May, 2010): 15-48.
- Tague, Ingrid H. "Love, Honor, and Obedience: Fashionable Women and the Discourse of Marriage in the Early Eighteenth Century." *The Journal of British Studies* 40:1 (Jan., 2001): 76-106.
- "The Duchess of Gordon's Ball." *The Times*. Feb. 12, 1799, #4407. pg. 4.
- thePeerage.com, "A genealogical survey of the peerage of Britain as well as the royal families of Europe." Compiled by Darryl Lundy. http://www.thepeerage.com/index.htm.
- Thomas, David. "The Social Origins of Marriage Partners of the British Peerage in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *Population Studies* 26 (1972): 99-111.
- Thompson, E.P. *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture*. New York: New Press, 1993.

- . *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Pantheon, 1964.
- Thompson, Edward Maunde. *Correspondence of the Family of Hatton: Being Chiefly Addressed to Christopher, 1st Viscount Hatton, A.D. 1601-1704*. Volume I. London: Camden Society, 1878.
- Thompson, F.M.L. "Desirable Properties: The Town and Connections in British Society Since the Late Eighteenth Century." *Historical Research* 64:154 (June, 1991): 156-171.
- , "Life After Death: How Successful Nineteenth Century Businessmen Disposed of Their Fortunes." *Economic History Review* 43 (Feb. 1990): 40-61.
- , "Russell, John, Sixth duke of Bedford (1766–1839)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/24322>, accessed 29 Dec 2010].
- , "Stitching It Together Again," *Economic History Review* 45 (May, 1992): 362-375.
- Thomson, Katherine. *Memoirs of Viscountess Sundon, Mistress of the Robes to Queen Caroline, Consort to George II...* London: H. Colburn, 1848.
- Thorne, R.G. *The House of Commons, 1790-1820. Vol. I: Survey*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1986.
- Thornton, W.W. "Court of Appeals of Kentucky. Johnson, Admr., v Hunt." *The American Law Register* (1852-1891) 31:12 new series volume 22 (December 1883): 777-782.
- Todd, Barbara. "The Virtuous Widow in Protestant England." In *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* edited by Sandra Cavallo and Lynden Warner. New York: Pearson, 1999.
- Travitsky, Betty S. "Clinton, Elizabeth, Countess of Lincoln (1574?–1630?)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2007 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/40933>, accessed 23 April 2010]
- , "Reprinting Tudor History: the Case of Catherine of Aragon." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50:1 (Spring 1997): 164-174.
- Trill, Suzanne. "Introduction." In *Lady Anne Halkett: Selected Self-Writings*, edited by Suzanne Trill. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Trim, D. J. B. "Bertie, Peregrine, thirteenth Baron Willoughby of Willoughby, Beck, and Eresby (1555–1601)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/2275>, accessed 24 March 2010]

"Two Fashionable English Weddings." *The New York Times*, August 4, 1912.
http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=1&res=9904E1DE1F3CE633A25757C0A96E9C946396D6CF

Untitled. *The Times*, June 2, 1785, #135, p. 4.

Untitled. *The Times*, May 29, 1788, #1085, p. 3.

Untitled. *The Times*, May 21, 1795, #95021, p. 3.

Untitled. *The Times*, June 15, 1797, #3921, p. 2.

Untitled. *The Times*, May 29, 1801, #5120, p. 3.

Untitled. *The Times*, May 5, 1804, #6015, p. 2.

Untitled. *The Times*, Oct. 31, 1814, #9355, p. 3.

Vickery, Amanda. *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

"Views of Gosford Castle." <http://www.gosford.co.uk/castle.html>

Walford, Edward. *Old and New London*, Vol. 5. 1878. Accessed through "British History Online," <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45229>

Warnicke, Retha. "The Eternal Triangle and Court Politics: Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, and Sir Thomas Wyatt." *Albion* 18 (1986): 565-79.

----- "Grey, Frances, duchess of Suffolk (1517–1559)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008.
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/view/article/65987>, accessed 26 Sept 2010].

----- "Private and Public: the Boundaries of Women's Lives in Early Stuart England." In *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, edited by Jean Brink. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1993.

----- *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983.

- Warwick, Frances Greville, Countess of. *A Woman and the War*. New York: George H. Doon, c. 1916.
- Wasson, Ellis. *Aristocracy and the Modern World*. London: Palgrave, 2006.
- Weigall, Rose, Lady. *The Correspondence of Priscilla, Countess of Westmoreland*. London: John Murray, 1909.
- Welch, Edwin. *Spiritual Pilgrim: A Reassessment of the Life of the Countess of Huntingdon*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1995.
- Williams, Neville. *All the Queen's Men: Elizabeth I and Her Courtiers*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.
- Wilson, Margaret, ed. *Memoirs of Miss Mellon, Afterwards Duchess of St. Albans*. London: Remington, 1886.
- Wormald, Jenny. *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure*. London: G. Philip, 1988.
- Wyndham, Hon. Mrs. Hugh, ed. *Correspondence of Sarah Spencer, Lady Lyttleton, 1787-1870*. London: John Murray, 1912.
- Ziegler, Philip. *Man of Letters: The Extraordinary Life and Times of Literary Impresario Rupert Hart-Davis*. New York: Carroll and Graf, 2004.