This article will focus on two representations of Lady Margaret Beaufort, King Henry VII’s mother. It will examine Bishop John Fisher’s *Mornynge Rememбраunce*, delivered a few weeks after Lady Margaret’s death in 1509, which provides a representation from a close contemporary of hers. It will also look at Rowland Lockey’s portrait *Lady Margaret Beaufort at prayer*, painted c.1598. By assessing both the sermon and the portrait this article will look at different representations of Lady Margaret Beaufort.

This article will examine Fisher’s *Mornynge Rememбраunce*¹ and Rowland Lockey’s portrait *Lady Margaret Beaufort at prayer* (figure 1). It will begin with a brief historical background that will help grasp a better picture of Lady Margaret’s life. This work intends to provide further understanding of her through both her funeral sermon (written and delivered by her friend and spiritual advisor) and through Lockey’s portrait, which is a copy of an earlier work and was painted several decades after her death. This article will consider that although her sermon gives an overall representation of her it is biased and just like the portrait, it only depicts some aspects of her life.

Lady Margaret Beaufort was not just Henry VII’s mother, she was also a very accomplished, intelligent yet complex woman. She was born on 31 May 1443 to John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset and Margaret Beauchamp of Bletsoe. After her father’s death in 1444, her wardship and marriage was given to William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk who, in a desperate attempt to secure his son’s position married him to Margaret in 1450 because she was a rich and sole heiress. However, this marriage was later dissolved and her wardship was transferred to the king’s half-brothers, Jasper and Edmund Tudor.² She was married to Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond, but the marriage was short-lived as he died in 1456 leaving a twelve-year-old Margaret six months pregnant. Henry Tudor was born at Pembroke Castle on 28 January 1457 and the birth was a difficult one leaving Margaret with permanent physical damage.

She was not able to conceive more children after this. She soon remarried Sir Henry Stafford, the Duke of Buckingham’s second son. Margaret took an active role in the negotiations of this marriage. Buckingham was a very powerful magnate and by marrying Stafford Margaret knew she could get not only the necessary protection for herself and her son but also avoid having a husband imposed on her.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid. pp.39-40.
The Staffords supported the Lancastrians but when Edward IV ascended the throne in 1461, Sir Henry switched alliances and by doing this protected Margaret’s estates. However, she was separated from her son and his wardship and marriage was given to William Lord Herbert as a reward for the capture of Pembroke Castle. 4 1469-71 proved challenging and during this time Lady Margaret and Stafford ‘looked to their own interests.’ 5 But when Edward IV regained the throne Stafford had been once more by his side, safeguarding both his wife’s and his own interests again. Unfortunately, Margaret was not able to protect her son as he was a Lancaster and Henry Tudor had to flee into a long exile. 6 After Stafford’s death in 1471, Margaret married Thomas Lord Stanley. This marriage was convenient for both as she gained influence and protection in the Yorkist court and he obtained life-interest in her estates and also amplified his territorial influence. This marriage brought her closer to the Woodville family and this connection would prove fruitful in the future. 7 Throughout the Wars of the Roses she showed her political savviness, survival skills and also her complete devotion to her son, evidenced in her participation of conspiracies to overthrow King Richard III and place her son on the throne instead. 8

Bishop John Fisher first met Lady Margaret Beaufort at court at Greenwich in 1494. At the time he was serving as Senior Proctor at Cambridge University. After this meeting he joined her service and eventually became her spiritual advisor. 9 He was a theologian and a pastor and throughout his life the university was a vital part of him as it gave him a platform for patronage and influence. 10 Interestingly, Fisher’s works were usually written or published at the instance of others rather than by his own initiative. 11 However, Lady Margaret’s funeral sermon could have been the exception because they were close and he had a high opinion of her. 12 The Mornynge Remembraunce was delivered in July 1509 and followed the format of initially praising the dead person, then expressing compassion for the dead person, and finally consolation for the ones left behind. Fisher skilfully integrated this format with the chosen scriptural text, which was ‘a conversation between Christ and Martha during the episode of the raising of Lazarus’ 13 comparing Lady Margaret with the ‘blessyd woman Martha.’ 14 Even though Fisher greatly concentrates on Lady Margaret’s spiritual qualities including her charities, her piety, and self-discipline, he also gives a detailed account of her noble birth and royal lineage, her character, and marriage.

---

4 Ibid. p.41.
5 Ibid. p.57-58
6 Ibid
7 Ibid. pp.58-59.
13 Ibid. pp.41-42.
Fisher’s admiration for Lady Margaret comes across in the sermon as he greatly extolls her life. Additionally, the tone of the sermon was one of hope and resurrection.15

Rowland Lockey’s portrait *Lady Margaret Beaufort at prayer* is currently at St John’s College, University of Cambridge. Rowland Lockey (1565/7 – 1616) was an English goldsmith and painter. He did an eight-year apprenticeship under Nicholas Hilliard. One of his most well known paintings was *The Family of Sir Thomas More* based on Holbein the younger’s painting. The commissioning of this type of painting during this time was common as it was an ancestor-obsessed period.16

*Lady Margaret Beaufort at prayer* is a donor portrait that was presented to St John’s College by Julius Clippersby in 1598.17 Unfortunately there is no information as to why Julius Clippersby donated the portrait to the college. Furthermore, there is also conflicting information regarding the donor as Art UK states that Julius Clippersby donated it whereas in *Artists of the Tudor Court* by Roy Strong states that Juliana Clippersby or Clipesby donated it. This article will use the information given in Art UK as St John’s College also confirmed this information. It is a full-length memorial painting planned for public display. It depicts Lady Margaret kneeling in prayer wearing her vowess or widow attire.18 Her royal rank is clearly emphasized as she is underneath a canopy, which is richly embroidered with a Tudor Rose above her head and on the back her personal coat of arms and her badge, the Beaufort Portcullis, are seen. Moreover, the Beaufort Portcullis is seen in the stained glass window as well as throughout the dark cloth surrounding the room. Thus, due to the decoration displayed it seems she is at one of her private chapels.19 By showing Lady Margaret in this intimate setting rather than the usual landscape or ecclesiastical setting shows a departure of the usual depiction of donor paintings from the late fifteenth century.20

Hepburn argues that it is possible to see Lockey’s portrait as a reliable copy of an earlier painting done during Lady Margaret’s lifetime.21 Even though in the portrait Lady Margaret is seen wearing a widow or vowess attire, her hood has a fashionable gable shape at the front, similar to those shown in portraits of Elizabeth of York,22 (figure 2), and her barbe is seen worn over the chin, as according to her rank.23 The likeness and detail of her neckwear and hood can be compared with earlier surviving representations such as her tomb in Westminster Abbey, (figure 3).

20 Ibid. p.123.
21 Ibid. pp.126-129.
22 Ibid.
Figure 2. Unknown artist, *Elizabeth of York*, late 16th century, based on a work of c.1500. Oil on panel, 565 mm x 416 mm. © National Portrait Gallery, London.

Figure 3. Pietro Torrigiano, *Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond*, c.1526. Tomb effigy, marble and bronze, 2.30 m x 1.20 m x 1.55 m. © The Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey.
The painter Meynart Weyck drew the design and gave one copy to the sculptor Pietro Torrigiano who was in charge of producing the gilt-bronze tomb effigy. Weyck was commissioned to draw a picture and image as Torrigiano needed a likeness and Weyck had supposedly already painted her.24 Another surviving representation is the portrait published by Edward Harding in 1801 (figure 4). Unfortunately there is no information about the artist of this portrait. Moreover, Lockey’s portrait is very similar to Harding’s portrait and Lucas Horenbout’s miniature c.1530,25 not only in the likeness of her features but also in the details of her hood, including the ‘tippet’, which is the narrow strip of cloth that hangs at the back of the hood. Lockey’s portrait is most certainly a copy of an earlier anonymous work, probably the one mentioned in Edward VI’s Royal Collection in 1549-1550.26

25 For Horenbout’s miniature see Hepburn, ‘The portraiture of Margaret Beaufort’, p.124.
Lockey’s portrait depicts Lady Margaret’s royal rank whilst at the same time shows another important aspect of her life, that of a devoutly religious person. Although she seems to be wearing a ‘simple’ attire it can be seen that it is made of rich cloths. Additionally she is wearing three rings which are clearly displayed, which, at that time only the wealthy or royals were able to afford. The rings had different uses including ‘sign of affluence and rank; used as a seal; seen as a token of love; or a mark of religious faith.’

Interestingly, the canopy gold cloth and that covering the prayer-desk in front of her are richly embroidered with a pattern of foliage woven into it in black thread, which seems to have been out of style after c.1530. Unfortunately, it is not possible to know if Meynart Wewyck painted the portrait belonging to the Royal Collection mentioned in Edward VI’s inventory, and which it is thought could have been the one used by Lockey to paint his portrait. Moreover, there is no information on whether the half-length formats of Lady Margaret’s portraits were done during her lifetime or after her death. The amount of Lady Margaret’s portraiture as a whole can be seen as a good example of the use of a single image over a period of nearly a century, to ‘serve different functions in different contexts in different artistic media.’

Lady Margaret was a very religious person and as seen in the portrait she is wearing a religious attire and kneeling in prayer with her book of hours in front of her placed on a richly cloth cushion. In the funeral sermon, Fisher described her as, ‘Mercyfull also and pyteous she was unto such as was grevyed and wrongfully troubled, and to them that were in Poverty, or sekeness, or ony other mysery … To God and to the Chirche full obedient.’ During the late fifteenth century pious people were confessing more than once a year, especially those who had spiritual guides, as they were adopting the confessional as a manner of spiritual guidance. Similarly, people used to receive the Host once a year, yet Lady Margaret did so every month, which was perceived as a something extraordinary. Furthermore, through her patronage Lady Margaret helped develop the cult of the Holy Name of Jesus, and eventually establishing it as a feast.

Her devotion to be a good Christian included attending several masses each day kneeling down and her age or pain did not deter her from doing so, ‘dayly herde four or five Masses upon her knees … though all this long time her knelynge was so paynful, and so paynful that many tymes it caused in her backe payne and disease.’

---

28 Hepburn, ‘The portraiture of Margaret Beaufort’, p.129.
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34 Fisher, Baker, Hymers, *The funeral sermon of Margaret, countess of Richmond and Derby, mother to King Henry VII*, p.129.
Therefore, due to her known devotion, it is not surprising that she should be portrayed in that manner in the portrait. Bishop also emphasises her charity towards those most in need, ‘Poore folks to the nombre of twelve she dayly and nyghtly kepte in her House, Gyvyng them lodynge, mete and drynke and cloothyng … and mynystrynge unto them with hero owne hands.’ Another important aspect of her life depicted in both artefacts is the fact that she took the vow of chastity during her husband’s lifetime, as mentioned by Fisher in the sermon, ‘As for chastite … yet in her husband’s dayes, long time before that he deyede, she opteyned of him licence, and promysed to lyve chaste.’ However, the real motives of why she decided to take this step whilst her husband was still alive are not very clear because there were some like Fisher who attributed this to her piety, whilst others thought it could have been to strengthen her relationship with her son. Jones and Underwood argue that it is important to look at her piety through her private motivations and her social duty. Although not a queen, Lady Margaret was the King’s mother and she had an influential and constant presence at court. Christine de Pizan stated that a queen’s piety should be apparent in the charity she was involved in, for instance, gifting the sick and poor, going on pilgrimages, or acting as a mediator between the king and his subjects. In many respects Lady Margaret acted as the queen and as seen from her sermon she fulfilled some of the expected duties of a queen. In some ways her piety led to her interest in the education system of England because she was interested in spreading the Christian doctrine.

Her piety and her love of books, important aspects of her life, are depicted in both Lockey’s portrait and her funeral sermon, ‘Right studious she was in Bokes, which she had in grete number, both in Englysh and in Frenshe.’ Although, apart from her piety and love of books, her interest in the education system and spreading of the Christian Doctrine could have been influenced to an extent by Fisher who not only had close links to Cambridge but as a clergy man was very interested in spreading the Doctrine. Lady Margaret founded Christ’s and St John’s Colleges at Cambridge, translated devotional treatises from French, established lectureships in both Oxford and Cambridge (still ongoing), and was patron to printers, artists and to the clergy. During the sixteenth century, portraits of women reading depicted them in their different social roles, illustrating the diverse meanings reading had for these women, for instance, showing their responsibility, or their attitudes of frivolity or piety. Furthermore, the majority of women in the portraits belonged to the elite. In Lockey’s portrait Lady Margaret is seen kneeling yet surrounded by royal emblems,
thus stressing her royal rank, with a book of hours placed prominently in front of her. By showing her reading a book of hours her piety is expressed whilst at the same time illuminating the centrality of the types of books women were reading at the time.\textsuperscript{45} Christine de Pizan argued in *The Book of the Three Virtues* that a lady needed to have an appropriate and good education in order to be able to fulfil her responsibilities.\textsuperscript{46} However, defining what constituted a good and appropriate education as well as how they achieved it can be challenging because records of aristocratic education from late medieval England are limited. However, education was linked to social preservation of the social structure, and aristocratic and gentry women most likely knew how to read.\textsuperscript{47}

Lady Margaret was a Royal Mother as well as an independent woman and she was able to balance these two aspects of her life quite remarkably. Her royal status is displayed both in the portrait as in the sermon. Interestingly, Fisher refers to her throughout the sermon as a ‘noble Prynces’, although he does acknowledge at the beginning that she is a countess. Lady Margaret was very conscious of stressing her royal rank and this can be observed when she decided to change her signature from ‘M Richmond’ to ‘Margaret R’. This change was very ambiguous and left unclear whether the ‘R’ meant Richmond or Regina.\textsuperscript{48} It is unknown whereas this change in her signature was deliberate or not. When Henry VII came to the throne he named her *femme sole* through an Act of Parliament, with both economic and judicial power making her an independent, albeit still married woman. This was very important because it created a precedent for married English noblewomen.\textsuperscript{49} This gave her power to administer her own estates of which Fisher extolls her fairness in administering justice, ‘her owne housholde with mervaylous dylygence and wysedome this noble Prynces ordered … provided men lerned … to admynyster ryght and justyce to every party.’\textsuperscript{50} Furthermore, the fact that she took the vow of chastity in 1499 whilst her husband was still alive helped her gain more independence. By this time Stanley’s position within the royal family had started to diminish and after she took the vow he was welcomed at her home and allocated his own rooms but was treated as a friend and not a spouse.\textsuperscript{51}

Lady Margaret led a complex life, similar to some of her contemporaries, where there was a mixture of duties and rights.\textsuperscript{52} She always put her son’s best interests first even if that meant that he could not be by her side.\textsuperscript{53} A new dynasty was bound
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\textsuperscript{48} Jones, Underwood, *The King’s mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby*, p.86.
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\textsuperscript{52} Jones, Underwood, *The King’s mother*, p.171.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid. p.58.
to encounter challenges and Lady Margaret was instrumental in helping strengthen her son’s reign. As seen in the portrait, the amount of royal emblems as well as the piety could be considered a very good propaganda effort, as it was sending the message that not only the Tudors had a ‘rightful’ claim to the throne but that they were pious people, obeying God’s will. And through the sermon, Fisher talked not only about her immense piety but equally emphasized her royal rank from her direct lineage from King Edward III as well as being King Henry VII’s mother and King Henry VIII grandmother. Bishop Fisher had a high opinion of Lady Margaret, including her humanity, which comes across the quote below taken from a segment of her funeral sermon. In addition, as a clergyman he valued her monastic life and perceived this as a virtue that needed to be extolled, and by providing a detailed list of everyone that would be affected by her death, he gave a clear portrayal of the reach of her patronage, influence, and great impact she made in so many people’s lives. For instance, it is interesting how he refers to her as a ‘moder’ to the students of both universities as though her role of Royal Mother extended to them by nurturing and guiding them through her patronage and interest in education and spreading of the Christian doctrine.

All Englonde for her dethe had cause of wepynge. The poore Creatures that were wonte to receive her Almes, to whome she was always pyteous and mercyfull; the Studyentes of both the Unyversytees, to whome she was a Moder; all the Learned Men of Englonde, to whome she was a veray Patroness; all the vertuous and devoute persone, to whom she was a lovyngge Syster; all the good relygyous Men and Women, whome she so often was wonted to vysyte and conforte; all good Preests and Clercks, to whome she was a true defendresse; all the Noblemen and Women, to whome she was a Myrroure and Exampler of honoure; all the comyn people of this Realme, for whome she was in theyr causes a comyn Medyatryce, and toke right grete displeasure for them; and generally the hole Realme hath cause to complayne and to morné her dethe.

Although the sermon provides a detailed account of her life and good deeds it overlooks an important aspect of her life such as her political role not only through the Wars of the Roses but also after her son’s ascension to the throne. Interestingly, the sermon equally denied her avarice, which was well documented at the time. This document gives an overall representation of Lady Margaret but it is biased and just like the portrait, it only depicts some aspects of her life. The bias in the sermon could be attributed to Fisher’s proximity to her and wanting to present the best image as he had a high opinion of her. However, it is also important to consider that after her death, and per her will, Fisher still had to fulfil her planned foundation of St

55 Ibid. p.121.
56 See Jones, Underwood, The King’s mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby.p.82; Crawford, Letters of the Queens of England, 1100-1547, p.148.
John’s College at Cambridge and securing the college’s future. Moreover Fisher, being seasoned in court life, understood the importance of being on good terms with Henry VIII if he wanted to complete this goal. This could have been one of the reasons why Fisher decided to focus on her spiritual life and patronage and not include her political role.

Both artefacts show her royal rank, piety and love of books. Yet, due to the medium, the sermon allows the possibility to provide more information about Lady Margaret than the portrait does. However, the portrait does show her apparent true likeness and even though she is kneeling and at prayer she is fearlessly looking up, displaying her strength. Similarly, the sermon shows her strength through the description of the tribulations she endured during her lifetime highlighting the fact that she did not give up and continued fighting for what she believed was rightfully hers and her family’s. Likewise the sermon mentions her patronage of universities, which as mentioned earlier was another important aspect of her life. And through this patronage she was able to establish, probably more than any other medieval queen, her influence on future generations. In short, these artefacts can be considered to a certain extent accurate representations of Lady Margaret Beaufort but both have limitations and even though they are helpful to get a better understanding of her they do not show the whole picture of who she was.
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