

2007

The education of Princess Mary Tudor

Katherine Lee Pierret Perkins

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, kperki9@lsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Perkins, Katherine Lee Pierret, "The education of Princess Mary Tudor" (2007). *LSU Master's Theses*. 1090.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/1090

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

THE EDUCATION OF PRINCESS MARY TUDOR

**A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts**

in

The Department of History

By

**Katherine Lee Pierret Perkins
B.A., Loyola University New Orleans, 2005
December, 2007**

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Victor Stater, and my committee members Dr. Suzanne Marchand and Dr. Christine Kooi for all of their help. Dr. Deborah Harkness has my thanks for her directing my attention to Mary's specific education. My husband, Cody Armond, and my family, friends, and fellow grad students have all contributed to keeping my sanity at a feasible level.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
I: AN INTRODUCTION TO MARY.....	1
II: A BRIEF BACKGROUND CONCERNING TUDOR HUMANISM AND ROYAL EDUCATION.....	4
III: THEORY.....	15
IV: PRACTICE.....	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	62
APPENDIX: THREE PRAYERS COMPOSED BY MARY.....	65
VITA	67

Abstract

Mary Tudor, the first officially crowned queen regnant of England, received a humanist education. A curriculum was recommended for her in multiple writings by Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives. This thesis attempts to synthesize and examine information about the nature of this plan for a princess's education and the extent to which it was implemented.

I. An Introduction to Mary

She was a king's daughter, she was a king's sister, she was a king's wife: she was a queen, and by the same title a king also. ...authorities of Scripture she was able to allege.... Such was her knowledge as well as virtue: neither ever was there a prince on earth who had more of both. (The Bishop of Winchester, in the sermon for Mary I's funeral)¹

Mary Tudor, daughter of King Henry VIII and his first wife, Katherine of Aragon, would in the course of her life go from court darling, Princess of Wales, and heiress presumptive *pro tempore* to "The Lady Mary," the king's illegitimate daughter. When Henry broke the English church away from the Roman Catholic Church in order to annul his marriage with Katherine and try for a legitimate male heir with a new wife, Mary firmly sided with her mother in the matter of the marriage's legality, and the increasing embarrassment her resistance caused Henry led him to humiliate and neglect her. The former princess's status as the self-proclaimed "unhappiest lady in Christendom,"² though it did eventually improve, continued throughout her father's reign and that of her staunchly Protestant – in theology, rather than by expediency as her father had become -- younger half-brother, Edward VI. After Edward's death, there was initially a coup by those opposed to a Roman Catholic on the throne. Upon her forces' defeat of that faction, she became Queen Mary I, the first officially recorded Queen regnant of England, and, soon after, the wife of Philip II of Spain (despite the outrage of many at the very idea of a Spanish king).

Mary's five-year reign is most notable for the restoration of the Roman Catholic Church in England, but her efforts at eliminating Protestantism in England were frustrated. Mary's increasing persecutions of Protestants, memorialized by writers such as

¹ John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials Relating Chiefly to Religion and the Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822), pp. 546-7.

John Foxe, caused her to receive the nickname “Bloody Mary.” That is how she is most remembered, in contrast to the short-lived, bookish and progressively devout Edward and their half-sister Elizabeth I, whose renown for her language skills is just a small fraction of her reputation as a powerful and ingenious queen. In terms of Tudor royal education, Mary’s is not the name that comes to mind. And the inconsistently-applied ideas that Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives suggested for her education were not as revolutionary as they might have been. Ruth Warnicke, despite wishing to emphasize Mary’s education and declaring that “[Mary’s] intellectual and cultural interests have been given perfunctory treatment,” calls the Princess’s education “somewhat limited” in comparison with other possibilities of the time.³ Yet Mary’s education was something of a milestone in theory and a reasonable accomplishment in practice.

Biographer David Loades says that “The evidence for Mary’s educational progress during [her] formative years is mainly circumstantial and not entirely consistent.”⁴ This is quite true. Synthesizing information about the nature and impact of Mary’s education is made difficult by a lack of documentation and occasionally conflicting subsequent assumptions. However, much can be plausibly pieced together if one considers the plans made for her education, what was said of her aptitudes, and the people serving as sources in both instances.

Many accounts have acknowledged in passing that Mary had a substantial education. In her own lifetime and at its end, certainly, it received occasional flattery from those without a grievance against ‘Bloody Mary,’ as evidenced by such things as

² Carolly Erickson. *Bloody Mary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), p. 212.

³ Ruth Warnicke, *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation* (London: Greenwood, 1983), p. 33-6.

⁴ David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1989), p. 43.

the Bishop of Winchester's funeral sermon. Biographers sometimes grouped her in with her family, both her own generation and others, on the subject: "Over-education was one of the penalties Tudor children had to pay for their royal birth," in the words of Beatrice White, who considered too much studying a contributing factor in Mary's poor health.⁵ Biographers have often referred to the curriculum recommended for the princess by Juan Luis Vives, one, Milton Waldman, even saying "His writings prove him to have been, even more than Erasmus or More, a pioneer – as his country was the pioneer among nations – in the sixteenth century movement for the higher education of women."⁶ This statement on closer examination proves to be misleading, but it is an indication of Vives's longstanding reputation. It is he who is most closely associated in the collective memory with Mary's education, and so a study of her education requires examining the extent of the groundbreaking nature of his educational theory, as well as seeing as much as possible how that theory contrasts with the education the princess actually received.

⁵ Beatrice White, *Mary Tudor* (New York: Macmillan, 1935), p.11.

⁶ Milton Waldman, *The Lady Mary* (London: Collins, 1972), p. 29.

II. A Brief Background Concerning Tudor Humanism and Royal Education

“Greek and Latin, [Thomas More] declared, were not prerequisites for salvation, but their study did incline the soul to virtue.”⁷

“The use made of humanist precepts in English education, the extent to which some were developed and applied and others superseded, depended on the purposes for which education was sought and promoted by men of differing aspirations.”⁸

Under the rule of the Tudors, as the ideas of the Renaissance – particularly the more moral Northern variety – began to reach England, education began to matter more than it previously had. Sixteenth-century Britain saw a significant rise in court-sponsored humanism. One broad definition of “humanism” is the “reappraisal of religious and secular thinking through the examination of the literary bases of theology and philosophy.”⁹ It is also sometimes defined as consisting of the *studia humanitatis*: grammar, rhetoric, poetry, philosophy, and history. This particular educational curriculum became associated with an active, extroverted view of the world. A humanist education was also associated, especially as its popularity moved north, with cultivating good moral character. Joan Simon, discussing the problematic definition of humanism, says that:

In its narrowest sense, as it was first used by contemporaries, this term covered scholars who championed literary against scholastic studies, rhetoric and declamation against logic and disputation in the schools. But this move was both a symptom and a cause of much wider developments... the humanist writers who popularized classical learning and literature and new forms of education helped materially to pioneer a new outlook.¹⁰

⁷ Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), p. 30.

⁸ Joan Simon, *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), p. 122.

⁹ Dowling, p. 1.

¹⁰ Simon, p. 61.

This outlook revolved around the development of each human being to his or her (mostly his) full active potential. Classical educational writings “left aside by scholars who had been uninterested in man as an individual, seeking a guide to the use of his powers in a civic context” saw a resurgence.¹¹ Humanism has also frequently been associated with secularization, though it might be better to say that the focus of learning was directed from the clergy to the laity, since the pagan classics were not the entire focus of humanist education, and religion continued to be of particular importance in these cultivated individuals, especially in Northern Europe.

Humanism particularly contrasts with the scholasticism that had traditionally dominated medieval universities. Scholastic philosophers generally attempted to reconcile various philosophical and theological ideas through a back-and-forth analysis of definitions and arguments called the dialectic. The term “schoolmen,” the translation/synonym for scholastics, stressed the connotation of this mode of thought and education, that of isolated academics. Insular universities, intended for the production of clergy, had little interest in gearing their pedagogy towards worldly application. Humanists frequently criticized earlier scholars for pedantry, the most famous stereotype and cliché on the subject being the question of how many angels could dance on the head of a pin. Humanists also considered the authoritative texts upon which scholastics’ studies often relied to be much narrower in scope than the broad range of ancient classical texts they themselves read and analyzed.

While scholastic methods and knowledge tended to be more contemplative and sometimes arcane, humanism in its various forms stressed the use of knowledge and skills in the service of the social order or the cultivation of a godly character. Copious

¹¹ Simon, p. 60.

amounts of classical and scriptural reading, combined with methodological training, were supposed to make sure a child grew up to be a good person and a good citizen. In places like Italy, humanism sometimes went further, thoroughly questioning societal norms. But Hugh Kearney claims that in England, the social critique of “civic humanism” was limited almost entirely to Thomas More’s *Utopia*, which “implied that political power should be much more widely spread than it was, and condemned by implication the life of conspicuous consumption.”¹² Instead “the type of intellectual most likely to flourish under these conditions was the court humanist, all too conscious of how much he owed to his patrons, and all too anxious to prove his loyalty.” The humanist curriculum and outlook did not require a radical political agenda. For the most part, the New Learning was to be used in support of those footing the bill, particularly the monarch and other officials. Nevertheless, the change was still pronounced -- and secularizing. Education was no longer something mostly for potential clergy, briefly provided in diluted form to a few aristocrats for a little sophistication, but fairly necessary for all boys of good families – preferably tutored in small groups rather than a school, most humanists would say.

While sixteenth-century humanism is commonly associated with the shift towards Protestant theology, this is not at all a necessary component of humanist thought and education. Most of the prominent foreign and domestic humanists with an early impact on educational theory in England – such as Desiderius Erasmus, Thomas More, and Juan Luis Vives -- remained Catholic, albeit reform-minded. Education’s importance in developing a proper religious character in each individual did not necessarily extend to real doctrinal disputes with the Church. A more defining quality than radical religious ideology was the interest in getting back to basics. As part of the emphasis on source

¹² Hugh Kearney, *Gentlemen and Scholars* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970), p. 35.

material, classical languages were of course a central focus of humanist scholarship. The revival of the study of Greek texts was a particularly new development. “Both Erasmus and Vives tirelessly demonstrated that Latin, combined with Greek, was the most suitable and desirable medium of learning, as also the gateway to literature comprehending the accumulated wisdom of mankind.”¹³ Classical languages both exercised the mind in their own right and made the foundations of theology, philosophy, and literature more accessible.

Humanists tended to consider the diversity of knowledge of a broad education in the *studia humanitatis* very important. “For Vives, a gentleman needed to be instructed in every philosophical and practical discipline in order to fulfill his social role.”¹⁴ In a time in which education was being more secularized, a preparation for life in the world, the formation of a proper gentleman was key. This generally involved a broad scope of reading, from which Erasmus and others of his circle encouraged pupils to compile notebooks of notable quotations. These notes, as they became popular assignments by both private tutors and schoolmasters, were called “commonplace books.” While popular among early humanists of influence in England, commonplace books would eventually be criticized as encouraging students to be dilettantes at scholarship. Sacrificing depth to breadth was one of the risks to broadening education into a character-building exercise for young gentlemen. As for the education of a proper lady, going beyond sewing and dancing was not as necessary as a boy’s going beyond hunting and related pursuits. Humanist educational ideals had less of an immediate impact on a sex from whom active citizenship could not be expected. Still, building character was one way of staying out of

¹³ Joan Simon, pp. 104-5.

trouble, and feminine education was gradually changing from a possible threat to something to keep a well-born girl occupied.

One of the common pedagogical analogies of the Tudor humanists compared children to gardens. Good qualities and tendencies are to be cultivated in the child's mind, bad ones weeded out. Erasmus in particular points out the need for the tutor to pay attention to what sort of metaphorical soil he is tending.¹⁵ Boys with certain weaknesses might need to be steered further from some subject matter rather than others. In practice, this nod towards tailoring a curriculum to the individual sometimes meant that "pedagogues could use natural difference to justify discriminatory treatment of children on the basis of status or gender."¹⁶ Of course, thorough justification of such things was hardly necessary at the time. Girls' education was in the fifteenth century only beginning to include more than sewing and possibly French. While a reasonable number of well-off girls learned to read, for quite some time few learned to write. Margaret Paston of the well-documented Paston family was occasionally less verbose than the rest because of this half-literacy; "dictation was perhaps inhibitive."¹⁷ Not that inhibition was a bad thing by the standards of the time. After all, if some boys had to be watched carefully because they were susceptible to vice, girls, as a whole, were, according to contemporary conventional wisdom, an even bigger problem. From Greek biology to interpretations of both the Old and New Testaments, the resources of medieval and most early modern

¹⁴ Rebecca W. Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 123.

¹⁵ Bushnell, p. 99.

¹⁶ Bushnell, p. 76.

¹⁷ Colin Richmond, *The Paston Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 42.

thought made women the weaker sex, in character as well as muscle, “lustful, deceitful, talkative, irrational.”¹⁸

The Tudors were something of a starting point for innovations in English education. Most medieval English princes had been entrusted to noblemen, with the occasional chaplain’s assistance, for their education. Practical lessons in jousting, hunting, and other less bookish aspects of court life were therefore often given more emphasis than formal academics. The late Yorkists and Lancastrians did have their sons taught “letters and languages, which can be taken to mean by this date the ability to read, write, and understand English, French, and Latin.”¹⁹ In terms both of literacy and of sports and sermons, royal pupils’ individual attention from noblemen and clerics was certainly better than the large simplified classes of the Church’s chantry schools, but still rarely involved professional pedagogy.

The interest of Henry VIII’s family in education includes the females and is traceable to his paternal grandmother, Lady Margaret Beaufort, and further, certainly before humanism had caught on in England.

There was already a tradition of the 'higher education of women' among the Beauforts, for Margaret's great-aunts are believed to have been the first ladies in England who learned to write. She herself has been considered one of the best letter-writers of her time; she had a very good knowledge of French, and a 'lytell perceyvyng' of Latin; above all she was taught to be a good Christian and a devoted daughter of the Church.²⁰

Praised by people such as Bishop John Fisher for her good memory of important ideas and her fondness for books, Lady Margaret saw to it that others would receive educations beyond what she had. She established the first endowed chair at Oxford University, a

¹⁸ Charles Fantazzi, intro to J. L. Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth Century Manual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. xi.

¹⁹ Nicholas Orme. *English Schools in the Middle Ages*. (London: Methuen, 1973), p. 26.

lecture position at Cambridge that would eventually bring Erasmus to England, and two Cambridge colleges, Christ's and – posthumously, through executors such as Fisher -- St. John's. These colleges were intended to combine theology with a liberal arts education based on the biblical languages and classical authors. Little is recorded about the curriculum arranged for her own son, Henry Tudor, but the future Henry VII's tutor, future Oxford instructor Andreas Scotus, claimed to be quite impressed with the boy's ability to learn quickly. Henry then spent many years in France just as humanist ideas from Italy were beginning to take hold among Parisian intellectuals. Henry also took some interest in Italy itself, and probably thought it might be useful to draw on a few variants of Italian examples as tools to put at his fledgling dynasty's disposal.

Lady Margaret's grandchildren received some of the earliest prototype versions of an English humanist education. Henry VII hired many professional educators to tutor his fledgling dynasty, and while the original heir to the throne, Prince Arthur, may have had a separate curriculum, the royal children shared Gilles Dawes as a common French instructor, while Princess Mary, future Queen of France, is said to have 'inherited' at least one of her brother Henry's other tutors.²¹ Nearly all of the royal tutors appear to have been proponents of the "new learning" to one extent or another. The selection of such people, rather than the more traditional option of priests and aristocrats, possibly indicates that Henry VII wanted to prepare his family with an educational style not yet as common in England as it was in some places.

Arthur's two known tutors were schoolmaster John Rede, beginning when Arthur was five or six and already started on basic literacy, and "poet-orator" Bernard Andre,

²⁰ E.M.G. Routh, *Lady Margaret, a Memoir* (London: Oxford, University Press, 1924), E-text version.

who taught Arthur from age ten until nearly fifteen. Emphasis on a broad spectrum of classical writings was already important in the heir's education: Andre recorded that Arthur read and partially memorized the works of many Greek and Roman poets, orators, and historians and many works by contemporary Italian grammarians before he was sixteen.²² The curriculum was very avant-garde: several of the classical texts had just recently been discovered by Western Europe, and the grammarians were the most fashionable in Italian humanism of the time. While mostly focused on pagans, the curriculum did have a religious aspect; Andre wrote a commentary on writings of St. Augustine for Arthur's educational benefit.

Henry's three known tutors were John Skelton, another "poet-orator," schoolmaster John Holt, and William Hone. Skelton's pedagogical writings were filled with moral exhortations and vernacular poetry. Hone had the least academic or literary qualifications of any of the tutors and, perhaps not coincidentally, was the one transferred to Henry's younger sister. Thomas More personally provided the introduction and conclusion to the Latin textbook written by John Holt, and Lord Mountjoy, a student of Erasmus, was apparently an informal "study-companion" of Henry. After Prince Henry became Henry VIII, Mountjoy wrote to Erasmus, encouraging him to return to England and take advantage of the patronage opportunities at the court. He gave the impression "that Henry had somehow learned to value learning, specifically the kind of *eruditio* in which Erasmus and Mountjoy shared an interest, the New Learning."²³

²¹ David Carlson, "Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22:2 (1991), p. 275.

²² Carlson, p. 256.

²³ Carlson, p. 254.

Humanist education faced some early opposition in England; the universities of Oxford and Cambridge for some time contained a faction called “the Trojans” because they opposed the teaching of Greek, due to some combination of conservative personal tastes and the idea that too much classical learning distracted from theological studies. But royal patronage helped quiet scholastic resistance. From the time of Henry VIII’s accession, the humanities, which had only recently gotten their start in England, flourished. The English humanists of Sir Thomas More’s circle would be far more memorable scholars than their predecessors, and sponsorship was often the route to status and fiscal survival. The king and queen both sponsored humanists and would continue to do so adversarially when the annulment crisis divided them. And when it came time to make arrangements for their eldest child’s education, Henry VIII and his queen already had prior examples of royal humanist pedagogy to draw upon. But of course there was another factor. Margaret Beaufort, the Englishwoman of her time most interested in education, put her efforts toward the improving the education of boys and young men. Henry VIII’s sisters received a probably worthwhile but mostly undocumented education from second-hand tutors. Since Henry and Katherine’s daughter Mary had no living legitimate brothers, the queen would consider this indirect approach much less of an option.

In fifteen centuries, England had seen no more than seven written works devoted to female education, and these were along the lines of “How the Good Wife Taught her Daughter,” a 1430 poem concerning feminine morals.²⁴ Collectively, the body of work on the subject “was not nearly so comprehensive in scope as that contained in the seven

²⁴ Foster Watson, *Juan Luis Vives and the Renaissance [sic] Education of Women* (New York: Longman, 1912), p. 3.

treatises... in the fifteen years between 1523 and 1538.”²⁵ On these, as Foster Watson says, Queen Katherine had a “permeating influence” as a patron and a subject. Foster refers to various works by Juan Luis Vives, Thomas More’s letters to his children’s tutors, a preface by Richard Hyrde to a translation of a treatise by Erasmus, and a Platonic-style dialogue by Sir Thomas Elyot. Most of them were dedicated to the queen or her daughter.

The last of these, Sir Thomas Elyot’s *Defense of a Good Woman*, written at the time of Katherine’s death, is for political reasons only indirectly dedicated to the former queen; the ancient queen Zenobia, praised for her fortitude as well as her intelligence, serves as a stand-in. Elyot wrote the dialogue somewhere between his 1531 book on boy’s education, *The Governour*, in which he mentioned his intention “to make a book onely for ladies,” and 1538. Elyot does not set a curriculum for female education but simply uses an onslaught of classical literary references in the form of a Platonic dialogue to argue for female rationality and capacity for learning as well as female virtue. While Elyot’s priorities for female education involve traditional Christian ideas of woman as a complementary companion to man, it does serve as a progressive “defense” when compared to the misogynistic “straw man” of the dialogue, whose attitude was far from unusual for the time. It is notable that the best this opponent can do is cite the opinion on female imperfection of Aristotle, the greatest authority of scholasticism; an opinion which the humanist defender of good women is quickly able to dissect critically.²⁶

Richard Hyrde’s introduction to the English edition of Erasmus’s *Commentaries on the Lord’s Prayer*, translated by “a young and virtuous well-learned gentlewoman of

²⁵ Watson, p. 4.

²⁶ Elyot, in Watson, p. 223.

nineteen years of age,” was most likely the first Renaissance text in English about women’s education.²⁷ Hyrde’s introduction, too, was a defense and praise of learned women for the most part. The young gentlewoman was Margaret More Roper, daughter of Sir Thomas More. The translation was published in 1524, dedicated to the king’s niece, seven-year-old Frances Brandon.

But the most prominent among treatises of feminine education under the patronage of Henry VIII and his queen were written by the queen’s countryman, Juan Luis Vives, a lecturer at the Flemish university in Leuven who was offered a position at Oxford in 1523, and these treatises were all, exclusively or partially, directed towards the princess’s education. Mary was, after all, potentially the future queen of England, though it is likely that “it was naturally assumed that her husband would govern England if she assumed the throne.”²⁸ Thus the outlined plan for a future queen’s education was not the same as that of a future king, but merely a modified version of the instruction of a good Christian woman.

²⁷ Hyrde, in Watson, p. 159.

²⁸ Loades, p. 33.

III. Theory

Your daughter Mary will read these recommendations and will reproduce them as she models herself on your goodness and wisdom... Therefore, all women will have an example to follow in your life and actions, and in this work dedicated to you, precepts and rules for the conduct of their lives.²⁹

Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives's 1524 publication *De institutione feminae Christianae*, "The Education of a Christian Woman," had a natural patron in the queen of England. Katherine of Aragon, of course, had herself been the daughter of a queen regnant, one who had found it necessary to educate herself later in life. Katherine and her sisters had therefore received – as Vives is quite happy to point out effusively – a humanist education, and she had an interest in the topic.³⁰ This interest was of course compounded by her daughter Mary's educational needs. Mary was seven years old in 1523 when Vives was writing *De Institutione*. Additionally, Vives was getting most of his work in England and was always interested in keeping on good terms with Henry VIII and his queen.

De Institutione was not intended to be applied exclusively to young princesses or even young women in general. Despite the "education" aspect of the title, it is not strictly a book on pedagogy but a guide to good feminine life in three stages: before, during, and after marriage. More and Erasmus referred to the work as *Virginem, Uxor, et Viduam*, "Maiden, Wife, and Widow."³¹ The priority never changes as the stages change; the book is a constant encouragement towards the strengthening of character and the maintaining of a good reputation, which often involved being unseen and unheard.

²⁹ Juan Luis Vives, Charles Fantazzi trans., ed., *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth Century Manual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 50.

³⁰ Vives, p. 47.

³¹ Fantazzi's intro to Vives, p. 15.

Virtuous behavior, specifically chastity, is clearly the chief curriculum of *De Institutione*. Vives clearly considers it the *sine qua non* of a good feminine upbringing. It is interesting to note that despite the much-vaunted revolutionary nature, in the eyes of such persons as Milton Waldman, of Vives's program for female education, he remains more in line with his times than, for instance, Thomas More, who taught all of his children the same way. Vives is from the start clear that there should be a difference, at least in emphasis, on the education of boys and girls, beginning in infancy. He states outright that the morals of a nurse – if a nurse should unfortunately, in Vives's opinion, prove necessary instead of constant mother-child contact – matter more for a girl than for a boy, since the boy will receive moral training outside the home and the girl will not.³² Being spoiled in any way is also much worse for daughters, who, Vives believes, need to be kept more firmly in check to avoid their destruction by vice. That the physical frailty of women was matched by moral frailty was a commonly-held belief of the time, stemming from – among other justifications – an interpretation of *Genesis* which laid the blame for the fall of humanity almost entirely upon Eve's vulnerability to temptation. Vives therefore sets the priorities for education long before the theoretical pupil begins learning to read.

When a Christian girl does begin to read, it should be not merely for its own sake but with the greater goal of virtue in mind, and thus reading should not be exclusively encouraged. From the start, she should simultaneously learn to work with textiles, which Vives links to the “former age of innocence” (perhaps an Edenic reference, but the image of a woman spinning evokes the respected classical matron far more than Eve); he specifies that he believes even a princess or a queen should keep her hands busy with

³² Vives, p. 54.

domestic tasks to stay out of the trouble that can come from the various pastimes of bored women or from other indulgences, which to Vives are much more potentially horrifying than they might appear.

What could she do better than this when free of all the household tasks? She will converse with men, I suppose, or other women. About what? Is she to talk forever? Will she never keep quiet? Perhaps she will think. About what? A woman's thoughts are swift and generally unsettled, roving without directions, and I know not where her instability will lead her.³³

Not passing up a good opportunity to flatter Katherine, Vives takes a moment while praising the textile arts to point out how well all the daughters of Queen Isabella of Castile learned spinning, sewing, and needlepoint.

In discussing reading material, Vives has more to say about what should not be read than what should. A girl, or a grown woman for that matter, should be kept from reading at all if she seems inclined to read anything Vives considered to be among the trashy romances of the time. These vernacular stories generally contained both violence and sensuality, neither of which was appropriate. Vives lists various chivalric romances popular in Spain at the time, such as *La Celestina*, set in a brothel, the *Amadis* series, which at one point involves patricide, and Spanish translations of the legend of Tristan.³⁴ He also lists Bocaccio's *Decameron*. Elsewhere he would be equally contemptuous of young girls' interest in the Arthurian legends, with their deaths and love triangles.

While he does not specify so in this particular work, Vives's condemnation of violence implies he would shelter girls from many of the histories used in classical education as well. And the problem of sensuality required even more attention. Vives suggests that girls be kept away from "the most sagacious and learned Greek and Latin

³³ Vives, p. 59.

poets who sang of love,” citing the advice of Ovid, who considered even his own poetry inappropriate for the morally focused.³⁵ So one should read no Callimachus, Anacreon, Sappho, Propertius, Gallus, or Ovid (composers of erotic epigrams, bacchanalian hymns, general love poetry and, in Ovid’s case, a guide to sexual conquest, the *Ars Amatoria*) although Vives seems to think quite highly of their talent. Vives offers, for those who enjoy poetry, the late-antiquity Christian alternatives of Prudentius, Arator, Prosper, Juvencus, and Paulinus. These Latin poets composed liturgical, hagiographical, and theologically didactic poetry, avoiding any sensuality or frivolity.

Some readers might initially think the very first item of Vives’s recommended reading unusual for a Catholic writing in 1523: the New Testament. But Vives was very much a humanist. He recommends that women of all ages read (or, if not sufficiently literate, hear read) the Bible every day, particularly to review the Gospel and Epistle excerpts before attending Mass and to reflect on another scriptural passage afterwards. Selected “historical and moral” passages from the Old Testament were acceptable, too, along with several Church Fathers. Among the pagans, Plato and Cicero are probably acceptable, but Vives suggests that any woman should consult a trustworthy male about whether they are safe for her to read. He in fact takes this “ask your doctor” approach regarding nearly all books, even apparently virtuous ones, because a woman must never trust her own judgment alone.³⁶

In October 1523, the same year he composed *De Institutione*, Vives wrote a letter to Katherine of Aragon recommending a more specific plan for Princess Mary’s education. Also in the same year, he wrote a similarly-structured letter to Charles

³⁴ Vives, p. 74.

³⁵ Vives, p. 77.

Mountjoy, son of Katherine's chamberlain and Erasmus's former student, William, Lord Mountjoy, also the king's former study-companion. The two letters are often grouped together as *De ratione studii puerilis*, "On a plan of study for children." The noted differences in the two curricula begin with the fact that Charles, four months younger than Mary, is addressed directly, while the princess is not.³⁷ Vives tells Charles that the treatise constitutes a sort of gift to his father, but he clearly does not think Lord Mountjoy needs advice for direct hands-on supervision of how the curriculum is to be implemented. Vives therefore encourages Charles's initiative in his own education while promoting the idea of a carefully supervised learning environment for the princess. There certainly seems to be an implication about their different capacities for initiative in the fact that Charles is told to try to imitate learned Latin speakers, and Mary's tutor – through her mother – is told to position the princess in situations where she will want to imitate good Latin conversationalists. Charles receives a short list of specific grammarians he should read, while Mary's tutor should directly guide her through the basic elements of grammar that Vives specifically describes. Charles is encouraged to ask questions. Mary's tutor must remember to "let her herself be praised, and let others be praised her in presence."³⁸

For both children, Vives recommends sharpening the memory by re-reading something each day in order to recall it by heart the next day. Both are encouraged to practice impeccable Latin conversation with their tutors, fellow-pupils (Vives suggests that each child learn with a handful of others, specifying in Mary's case that they be selected for good behavior) and anyone else with good Latin. Both are encouraged to

³⁶ Vives, pp. 78-9.

³⁷ Letters excerpted in Foster Watson, ed., *Juan Luis Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*. (New York: Longman, 1912), pp.137-49, 241-250.

³⁸ Vives, p. 145.

keep what would come to be called “commonplace books,” writing down interesting things encountered in their reading: useful words, witty or elegant phrasing, and profound maxims, in order to better isolate them for memorization and ready use. Vives recommends Erasmus’s *Colloquies* to both Mary and Charles as one such source of proverbs and good phrasing, as well as “useful to piety.”³⁹ The *Colloquies* provide interesting insight into the religious end of Mary’s education, as several of Erasmus’s dialogues therein are on that subject. ‘The Shipwreck,’ for instance, is a critique of popular cultic practices regarding the saints, in terms of lack of necessity in intercession, the impropriety of turning prayers into bargains, and in the focus on location -- tied up with the concept of pilgrimages – that required the place to be invoked as well as the person. “Ridiculous! As if the saints did not dwell in Heaven!”⁴⁰ There is still, of course, a substantially Catholic tone, when at one point Erasmus thoroughly criticizes blind over-reliance on ritual, “But with Protestation over and over beforehand, that I don’t find Fault with the Sacraments and Rites of the Church, but rather highly approve of them.”

One particular distinction in the reading material between Mary and Charles is the attitude toward the histories. Vives recommends the historical works of Tacitus, Caesar, and Sallust to Charles. On the other hand, “with no great trouble, [Mary] can learn history from Justinus, Florus, and Valerius Maximus.”⁴¹ These are not particularly high-quality historians but mostly summarizers of previous work by such as Livy, Sallust, and Pompeius Trogus, a sort of ‘Cliffs Notes’ for those who could not handle more advanced authors. Pedagogues such as Roger Ascham, tutor to Edward VI and Elizabeth I, would

³⁹ Vives, in Watson, p. 147.

⁴⁰ Desiderius Erasmus, N. Bailey trans. *Colloquies*. Available at <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/14031/14031.txt>.

⁴¹ Vives, in Watson, p. 147.

later criticize these ‘epitomes’ for making students weaker in knowledge of both style and substance. Vives, however, must have preferred them for female students. One issue probably involved here is avoiding the details of the more martial subject matter; Vives discouraged girls’ reading about violence in *De Institutione*, and Mary, princess or not, probably still needed safeguarding as well as simplification. Separately from his list of historians, Vives recommends Latin translations of the Greek biographer and moralist Plutarch, whose concern was less with history itself than with analyzing strength of character.

In both letters, Vives speaks slightly differently of poetry than he does in *De Institutione*, but the minor differences between the two letters are noticeable. When dealing with women in general, Vives’s priority was keeping them away from the virtue-destroying verses of writers like Ovid. His recommendation, after the moral diatribe, seemed to offer the Christian poets to those women inclined towards poetry in an “if you must” fashion. When recommending poetry for Mary, Vives goes slightly further. To the liturgical and didactic poets listed in *De Institutione*, he adds Sidonius, a fifth-century bishop whose verses were less about piety than about politics. Vives doubtless would have considered Sidonius’s politically oriented work less relevant for any other woman, but sufficiently Christian to include in a slightly -- and reluctantly-- politicized education. But Vives’s poetic recommendation to Mary goes beyond Christianity. “Nor are the heathen poets to be omitted – particularly Lucan, Seneca the Tragedian, and a good part of Horace.”⁴²

Vives does not ignore concerns for Charles’s morals, there is no recommendation of Ovid or Sappho or any of their talented, immoral colleagues. But Charles receives a

slightly different list from Mary. After a discussion of the cognitive and emotionally rewarding merits of poetry in general, he heartily recommends Virgil first and foremost, along with Horace, Lucan, and Seneca. He also says, “Silius Italicus has shown great industry,” faint praise, but an apparent recommendation all the same, and one Mary did not receive.⁴³ Ti. Catius Silius Italicus was a Roman whose *Punica*, an epic poem about Rome’s wars with Carthage, served as a poor man’s *Iliad*. Vives goes on to say that “Also the poets of our own religion should be read.”⁴⁴ He then recommends the same Christian poets as he did to Mary, with one difference. Sidonius is replaced by Servilius, probably (since none of the Roman Servilii seem to have composed poetry) referring to the pen name of a contemporary Fleming named Jan Knaep, known for compiling proverbs.

There seems to be more than a matter of writing style to this different order of not-quite-identical recommendations. Virtue is a higher priority for Mary than for Charles, and so the heathen poets are the afterthought, while the broader priorities for Charles make the Christian poets the afterthought. Vives's high praise of Virgil to Charles and omission of him for Mary highlight the lack of fiction in the princess's curriculum. Perhaps he deemed the weaker female mind and will less able to tell fact from fantasy, and otherwise fine stories might furnish "gateway reading" to the hated romances. Additionally, of course, Virgil's finest work, the *Aeneid*, begins with the declaration “I sing of arms,” bringing into play Vives’s views on weapons and violence. The Punic Wars could hardly have been a seemly subject for a young lady, either. Epic

⁴² Vives, in Watson, p. 147.

⁴³ Vives, in Watson, p. 246.

⁴⁴ Vives, in Watson, p. 246.

poetry thus showcases the same problem as many histories: the value of the classical text is not enough, in Vives's mind, to counterbalance the disruption of feminine delicacy.

Vives's main concession to Mary's position is to suggest Erasmus's *Institutio Principis Christiani*, "Education of a Christian Prince," and More's *Utopia*, which deal, of course, with the more virtuous side of statecraft – and which were by an interesting coincidence both written in the year of Mary's birth, 1516. The *Institutio Principis*, dedicated to a very different Charles, Mary's cousin and on-and-off fiancé, the future Charles V (and also Mary's future father-in-law), is a lengthy exhortation that a prince be a knowledgeable public servant and a leader of good character. Erasmus clearly prefers that he be a peaceful one; all his recommendations deal with peacetime affairs until the eleventh and final chapter, which urges that all options and implications be considered before a prince resorts to war. In the *Institutio Principis*, Erasmus advises a prince's tutors to approach many written works with caution because the content of those authors' accounts would give a young prince bad examples of wrath and tyranny.⁴⁵ Among these are the Arthurian legends, which Erasmus finds both morally inappropriate and poorly written. But even writers that Erasmus admires and recommends elsewhere are problematic when they could encourage any latent tyrannical impulses in a boy who would have so much power. In Erasmus's case, at least, Vives would not need to worry about Mary's delicate feminine sensibilities' being damaged for an instant by real talk of violence.

It seems important that while Vives discusses Greek with Charles Mountjoy, the only times Greek is mentioned regarding Mary's education is including the Greek iota in the exhortation that she be taught proper pronunciation and a brief reference in the

discussion of etymology.⁴⁶ One can reasonably conclude that any Greek she was intended to learn would be solely isolated terms adopted into Latin or English. This seems supported by Vives's reputation elsewhere for incorporating just a little of Greek knowledge to a Latin lesson to give an added touch of erudition without making students exert themselves too much. "One of the criticisms frequently urged against Vives is that he used Latinised Graecisms very frequently [...] Though there was by 1538 considerable enthusiasm in the aspiration of learning Greek, there was little knowledge of that language as yet even amongst the learned."⁴⁷ Greek was more associated with poetry and oratory than the religious uses that were clearly most important to Vives; while reading of the New Testament in Greek was becoming more and more important, it was far from widespread. Vives recommends to Mary the Latin *Paraphrases of the New Testament* which Erasmus wrote based on the Greek.

The mention of Greek is not the only instance in which more space is devoted to discussing pronunciation for Mary and discussing rhetorical style for Charles. Despite the depth of education he recommends for females, the focus is still slightly skewed – second, of course, to moral cultivation – toward the ability of the accomplished young lady in basic conversation, rather than towards scholarly research or formal eloquence. She should not speak too much, of course; various passages in *De Institutione* extoll the virtues of feminine silence and the perils of excessive speech. Vives declaration that “The custom to give praise to a woman for her ability to converse wittily and eloquently with men for hours on end is something that is welcomed and prescribed by the ordinances of

⁴⁵ Bushnell, p. 127.

⁴⁶ Vives, in Watson, pp.39-41.

⁴⁷ Foster Watson, trans. *Tudor Schoolboy Life: The Dialogues of Juan Luis Vives* (London, J.M. Dent, 1908), p. xxxv.

hell, in my opinion.” is only one of these.⁴⁸ But the ability to properly answer questions put to her is of far more importance to a lady than something like rhetoric, since she should never be trying to sway someone else’s judgment with her own. Even the future queen was expected to be relying on the judgment of others. Vives opposed any attempt by women to teach others except by their quiet example, citing multiple quotations of St. Paul on the need for wives to be silent learners and concluding his point with the following return to the idea of female temptation:

Therefore, since woman is a weak creature and of uncertain judgment and is easily deceived (as Eve, the first parent of mankind, demonstrated, whom the devil deluded with such a slight pretext) she should not teach, lest when she has convinced herself of some false opinion, she transmit it to her listeners.⁴⁹

And so it makes sense that rhetoric would be a subject for boys only in his eyes, and this distinction extended even to Mary. Vives does recommend the Roman orator Cicero in both *De Institutione* and the letter, but mostly for his moral substance. Carefully selected dialogues of Plato – “especially those concerning the government of the State,” -- are also recognized as a morally instructive possibility – no doubt in translation, as with Plutarch.⁵⁰ Plato’s most prominent writing on that subject is the Republic, with its emphasis on a carefully educated elite (with similarly educated wives) governing society. Translations of Plato at the time often had sections on such things as communal marriage, nakedness, and other inappropriate material excised.

Some of the indirect address and emphasis on a relatively kid-gloves treatment of the student by those around her may relate to the princess’s rank in comparison with a lord’s son, but the comparatively passive role Vives envisions for Mary probably had

⁴⁸ Vives, p.130.

⁴⁹ Vives, p. 72.

more to do with her gender. Charles, who grew up to actively attend the House of Lords before dying during a military campaign at age 28, was not the only pupil Vives advised to study in an active, rather than strictly reactive, fashion. Years later, when he was writing a textbook called the *Linguae Latinae Exercitatio*, also called the “School Dialogues,” which was published in 1539, Vives not only dedicated the work to the eleven-year-old Prince Philip, he made the boy – who would grow up to be Philip II and Mary’s husband – the protagonist of the twentieth dialogue of the work, “The Boy Prince.”⁵¹ While the emphasis of the passage is on the importance of listening to one’s tutors, the prince is portrayed as rightfully asking many questions – simple ones such as “How can I pursue my duty?” or “How can we learn from the dead?” -- to better understand the importance of his studies and is generally given slightly more agency than seemed to be implied for the princess.⁵²

Vives did address Mary directly when writing from Bruges in July 1524.

Satellitium Vel Symbola, (“The Bodyguard, or Mottoes”) is a collection of 213 numbered Latin maxims or in some cases collected by Vives. A few descriptive sentences from Vives, also in Latin, accompany most of the pithy mottoes. The title is explained in the dedicatory epistle: the moral instruction is meant to serve as a *satellitium anima*, “bodyguard of the soul,” which is implied to be the only bodyguard a ruler actually needs.⁵³ Vives informs Mary that innocence, and thereby the love of her people, is the

⁵⁰ Vives, in Watson, p. 147.

⁵¹ Watson, *Tudor Schoolboy Life*, p.172.

⁵² Watson, *Tudor Schoolboy Life*, p.178.

⁵³ Vives, in Watson, pp. 151-2.

best protection she could possibly have. He echoes this in Maxim 65: “*Magnum satellitium, amor*” (“a great bodyguard, love”)⁵⁴.

While it is nowhere near as well-known today as *De Institutione* and is not even available translated in full, the *Satellitium* was used by others in addition to Mary. Her brother Edward’s tutors apparently assigned it to the young prince, and later, the Czech humanist poet Georg Carolides edited and reformatted the work in the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁵⁵

Moral instruction, which was so much a part of *De Institutione*, is in full swing here. The first motto is “*Scopus vitae Christi*” (“The Mark: the life of Christ”), referring to a goal, and the ensuing description hails following Christ’s example in all things as the most important of all the precepts the reader should learn.⁵⁶ The last motto, 213, is “*Mente Deo defixus*” (“Fixated mentally on God”)⁵⁷, bookending the work nicely with religious concentration. Guarding one’s virtue is, of course, also key. Motto 6 is “*Suspicionibus, securis*” (“For suspicions, an axe”), which is followed by an explanation which translates “Suspensions must neither be indulged nor turned aside lightly, but beaten back with an axe.”⁵⁸ Even the appearance of immorality must be scrupulously avoided. The metaphor used is either an interesting landscaping variation of the standard Tudor-era analogy between education and gardening, or rather inappropriately violent imagery by Vives’s own declared standards.

⁵⁴ J.L. Vives, “Satellitium Vel Symbola,” *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini, Opera Omnia...*(London: Gregg, 1964), Vol. IV p. 42. All motto translations mine.

⁵⁵ Georgii Carolidae a Carlsberga Farraginis Symbolicae, e satellitio Viviano, Centuria Prima. http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camena/del2/books/deliciae2_5.html.

⁵⁶ Vives, “Satellitium,” p. 32.

⁵⁷ Vives, “Satellitium,” p. 64

⁵⁸ Vives, “Satellitium,” p. 33.

The 42nd and 43rd mottoes are philosophical advice: “*Disce vivere*,” (“Learn to live”) and “*Disce mori*” (“Learn to die”). The explanation states that “It is equally necessary to learn both to live properly and to die properly. No one will die properly who will not have lived properly, and it is often an exercise in life that we may live well, lest we die with uneven minds.”⁵⁹ Vives seems to be concerned both with the quality of one’s life and the peace of one’s soul. The 80th and 81st mottoes make a similarly matched pair: “*Da caecus*” (“Give blind”), and “*Accipe oculus*” (“Accept visibly”).⁶⁰ Vives counsels that one should never seek gratitude, but always show it. The 85th motto is particularly succinct advice; the maxim itself is only one word. “*Matura*,” which means “ripe” or “timely.” Vives’s explanation then begins “*Quod aliter dicitur: festina tarde: Augustui verbum apud Suetonium*,” (Which was said differently: Hasten Slowly: Augustus’s words to Suetonium”).⁶¹ Augustus’s favorite motto, more commonly rendered in Latin as “*festina lente*,” is then explained by Vives in terms of balancing gravity and efficiency in all one’s actions. Suetonius is one of several classical authors whom Vives cites throughout the *Satellitium*, but does not recommend for Mary’s normal reading curriculum. Possibly these excerpts were sufficiently simplified and censored for her.

Echoing Vives’s stress elsewhere on the importance of a woman’s restricting her speech, he warns of the potential harm of gossip in 156: “*Frenum in lingua*” (“A bridle on the tongue”).⁶² He might also seem to be thinking too far ahead with the 178th motto, which warns a readership consisting chiefly of an eight-year-old girl to avoid “Being a

⁵⁹ Vives, “*Satellitium*,” p. 38.

⁶⁰ Vives, “*Satellitium*,” p. 44.

⁶¹ Vives, “*Satellitium*,” p. 45.

⁶² Vives, “*Satellitium*,” p. 55.

child twice,” drawing on an old proverb. “*Bis pueri senes,*” (“Old men are twice boys”).⁶³ But Vives, as was evidenced in *De Institutione*, liked to plan ahead to all aspects of life, and probably thought that the weaker female character was even more susceptible to lapsing into inappropriate childishness.

The 52nd and 53rd mottoes combine two recurring themes of *the Satellitium*, matters of virtue and matters of rank. The former, “*Nobilitatem, non unus dies*” (“The first day [day of birth] does not give nobility”), cites in its description Juvenal’s Eighth Satire, which claims “one can fill the whole atrium with wax portraits of one’s ancestors, but virtue is the sole nobility.”⁶⁴ The following maxim, “*Generositas virtus, non sanguis*” (“Good breeding is virtue, not something in the blood”), repeats the point. Considering the work’s royal audience, Vives’s promoting the idea might at first come across as rather radical for the time, particularly if taken literally. As a humanist who would soon write on the need for public assistance of the poor – listing pragmatic reasons but also invoking the Christian ideal of common living – he might seem a likely candidate for revolutionary political expression. And coming from a family of Spanish *conversos*, Vives would have had to deal with grating and dangerous Spanish opinions about ‘*limpieza de sangre*’ (‘cleanliness of blood’) and may indeed have looked askance, personally, at anything to do with superior bloodlines. But considering that background, and the fact that his family was executed by the Inquisition, he also likely knew about the seriousness of saying the wrong thing to the wrong people, and would not have been too socially antagonistic in a work intended for such an audience. “*Generositas virtus, non sanguis*” was a classical concept revived by various humanists during the Renaissance.

⁶³ Vives, “*Satellitium*,” p.58.

⁶⁴ Vives, “*Satellitium*,” p.39.

The outright denial of nobility should be seen more as a rhetorical flourish than an attempt to convince his reader of a little egalitarian fact. The main point of these phrases would be to emphasize the cultivation of good behavior and to set it above the individual's flaunting of birth.

Vives addresses Mary's position or future position on several occasions. He had mostly neglected distinctions of rank in *De Institutione* as he specified that his recommendations of, for instance, working with one's hands applied to all women, even queens. In the *Satellitium*, Vives addresses virtues specific to Mary's situation: those involved in statesmanship. Motto 121 is "*Princeps, multis consulendo*" ("A prince must deliberate for many"),⁶⁵ and Motto 210 is "*Persona publica, privatam deponere*" ("In a public role, put down the private").⁶⁶ Both, of course, emphasize a responsibility to the public and de-emphasize personal interests and desires.

Vives has several reminders for a young lady who might eventually have a great deal of power in the 49th, 50th, and 51st selections: "*Terret imperium.*" ("Power terrifies") is the issue at hand. Keeping in mind the next two mottoes could be an appropriately feminine way to mitigate it. These are "*Blandum imperium imperiosum*" ("Charm; a powerful power") and "*Domitrix omnium patientia*" ("Patience is the conqueress of all").⁶⁷ The latter manages to cite both the words of the otherwise-unseemly classical poet Virgil and the example of fortitude provided by the Christian martyrs; an interesting humanist combination.

Of particular interest in Mary's reading list is Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, published in the year of her birth. In "The Lives of Juan Luis Vives," Beauchamp,

⁶⁵ Vives, "Satellitium," p. 50.

⁶⁶ Vives, "Satellitium," p. 63.

Hageman, and Mikesell say that Vives and the queen, both interested in the issue of poverty, may have discussed the book at length at court.⁶⁸ Vives was well-acquainted with More and an admirer of his work, and of course Sir Thomas was popular with the royal couple.

The first section of *Utopia*, the “Discourse on Counsel,” must have been particularly interesting reading for royalty, considering that it discusses whether serving at court could possibly be worth the trouble and whether princes ever really listen. With the possible exception of Plato’s *Republic*, Vives’s recommendation of this satirical critique on the social and political ills of Christendom is his greatest concession to the possibility that Mary might actually have to rule one day. It is a slightly surprising choice in a few minor points. That, for instance, Utopian women are given military training as emergency auxiliaries certainly does not fit well with Vives’s assertions of “what has a young woman to do with weapons, the very mention of which is unbecoming to her?”⁶⁹ Vives no doubt also hoped Mary would spend as little time as possible on the passage concerning affianced couple’s viewing of each other naked.

Thomas More would certainly not have objected to the Princess’s reading his work. In terms of female education, he had personally gone much further than Vives’s ideas. More once wrote to this children’s tutor, drawing on the gardening metaphor of education, that male and female students would not see “any difference in harvest time,” because both were rational human beings.

⁶⁷ Vives, “Satellitium,” p. 39.

⁶⁸ V. W. Beauchamp, E.H. Hageman, and M. Mikesell, eds. *The Instruction of a Christian Woman* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 2002), Preface.

⁶⁹ Vives, p. 73.

I do not see why learning in like manner may not equally agree with both sexes; for by it reason is cultivated and (as a field) sowed with the wholesome seed of good precepts, it bringeth forth excellent fruit. But if the soil of woman's brain be of its own nature bad, and apter to bear fern than corn (by which saying many do terrify women from learning) I am of opinion, therefore, that a woman's wit is the more diligent by good instructions and learning to be manured to the end the defect of nature of nature may be redressed by industry.⁷⁰

Alongside their brother, Margaret, Elizabeth, and Cecily More, foster sister Margaret Giggs, and stepsister Alice Middleton learned Latin, Greek, logic, mathematics, philosophy, and astronomy.⁷¹ The two Margarets even had an inclination for studying medicine, and their father encouraged them to continue their studies in this and theology even after they were married. This thorough and ongoing education produced impressive results. Though her work is no longer extant, Margaret Roper is known to have written Greek and Latin poetry, worked in the style of the late Roman author Quintilian, and matched her father's treatise on "The Four Last Things" with her own discussion of death in a friendly competition More declared something of a tie. As she grew up, she joined the circle of Erasmus's correspondents, who had nothing but praise for "More's whole school." Her most prominent existing work is tangentially tied to the publication of Vives's *De Institutione*. The English edition, *A Very Frutefull and Pleasant Booke called the Instruction of a Christen Woman*, was translated by one of the More family tutors, Richard Hyrde, possibly at the initial instigation of the queen herself. This was the same Hyrde who provided a defense of female education as the introduction to Margaret's translation of Erasmus's Latin commentary on the Lord's Prayer.

Vives also mentions the More girls' first-rate education and its chastity-reinforcing results early in *De Institutione*. More's curriculum, however, was far more

⁷⁰ More, quoted in Watson, p. 179.

exacting than his – for girls, at any rate. While Vives encouraged some composition, he did not recommend that Mary’s tutor use one of the More family’s main methods for learning linguistic precision, “double translation” from English to Latin to English again. He nevertheless had spoken well of the practice elsewhere. No one ever intended for Mary to write letters to Erasmus. That the More girls systematically learned Greek and Mary did not is symptomatic of the fact that, while humanist, the plan of education for Mary was less of a “Renaissance” education than the More girls’ broader, science-inclusive education. While the historians recommended by Vives are known only for their simplification and abridgement of works of Greek and Roman history by such authors as Livy and Tragos, More sent his daughters straight to the source. Vives only brings up the name of Livy himself – to the Queen, as opposed to Charles, for whom Livy is the first recommendation – to say that Mary should be introduced to the exemplary moral tale of Lucretia, famous for her extensive wool-spinning and her choice of death before living with violated chastity. Dramatized biographical excerpts such as that that were the closest Vives got to recommending straight fiction for Mary, since Homer and Virgil were not to considered seemly. And even then, it had to be restricted to the most morally useful excerpts. The appeal of Lucretia’s virtue to Vives is clear, which probably made the story worth the violence. The More girls, however, apparently read Livy extensively, as well as Sallust, another noted Roman historian whom Vives recommended to Charles and not Mary, whose work was filled with political conspiracies. More was quite intent on cultivating modesty and virtue in his daughters as well, but he apparently did not much fear that reading unfortunate histories would in itself damage those good qualities.

⁷¹ R.W. Chambers, *Thomas More* (Ann Arbor, U. Michigan Press, 1965), p. 182.

More almost completely ignored contemporary prejudices about women's intellectual and moral capacities in terms of his daughters' education. Yet Vives, who constructed his curriculum around those concerns, is more readily associated with pioneering women's education. This may perhaps illustrate the 'advantage' of keeping one's radical new ideas couched in the sensibilities of one's time: they have a much better chance of gaining contemporary acceptance, and in both the short and long terms, attention will be paid. How much attention was paid to the curriculum in terms of the princess herself, of course, is another matter.

IV. Practice.

By 1525 Mary could read and write, both in English and in simple Latin, had some command of French, and could probably understand the Spanish in which her mother conversed with her physician and apothecary. She could also play competently upon the lute and virginals, sing, dance...⁷²

In considering Mary's actual education, it is important to remember that while the queen clearly took a substantial interest in her daughter's education and commissioned or accepted suggestions for the curriculum – Vives's book dedications and letters were to Katherine, Mary's Latin assignments were reviewed by her mother -- any final decisions on expenditures and other arrangements for Mary would have been subject to the king's permission or veto. The two parents did not necessarily see eye to eye on what their daughter needed.

Katherine's mother, Isabella, was the regnant queen of Castile. Not having received a rigorous education as a child, Isabella brought in excellent Spanish and Italian scholars after gaining the throne and managed to scrape one together. She also made sure her daughters received a good humanist education – though not the same as their brother's. Katherine therefore had in mind a very different example of a sole princess's potential than did her husband. For Henry, there were only two politically significant aspects of Mary's life. One was a sign of hope: that the couple could indeed have healthy children, that “by the grace of God, the sons will follow.”⁷³ The other issue was her marriage prospects: something that takes up a vastly greater portion of extant documents' references to the princess than anything to do with her education. Henry and his ministers were constantly presenting her as a potential bride to foreign heads of state and

⁷² Loades, p. 32.

⁷³ *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Reign of Henry VIII*, vol 2.1, #1585.

their sons, particularly the Holy Roman Emperor and the King of France. Several engagements were formalized, broken, re-negotiated, and abandoned again.

Disagreements over dowry were one issue, but the another was that some of the marriage negotiations were meant more to disrupt other alliances, such as any growing between the Empire and France, than to actually end in a marriage.

The only aspect of Mary's education that Henry appeared really involved in was what he considered the fun part: music. He is most likely responsible for the fact that at the age of four the princess welcomed visitors with "pleasant pastime in playing at the virginals, that they greatly marvelled and rejoiced the same, her young and tender age considered."⁷⁴ Early and intensive keyboard lessons were something Mary had in common with her Hapsburg cousin, the future Mary of Hungary. Although she also learned some Latin, Mary of Hungary, with two older brothers --one of them Charles V -- was much more valued from the start for the benefit she could provide them through an early beneficial marriage than through the assistance she would eventually render in governing the Netherlands: the less scholarly pursuits of music and riding remained her two most notable interests and talents, and she was known as a great patroness of the former.⁷⁵

Many people have assumed that Juan Luis Vives not only produced a plan for the Princess Mary's education, but had the full charge of it. Numerous casual secondary references -- for example, Tudor biographers such as Milton Waldman and Anthony Martiensen -- label him as the Princess's tutor. This was probably not so. He is never mentioned in that capacity in the Princess's early years, and he is not listed in her

⁷⁴ *L&P Henry VIII*, Vol. 3.1 #896.

household accounts. Moreover, Vives's dedication to the first *Letter on the Education of Children* certainly implies that someone else will be implementing the curriculum. "You have ordered me to write a brief plan of study according to which thy daughter Mary may be educated by her tutor [...] I was content to point out details as with a finger. He will explain other matters."⁷⁶ It might be noted that Vives is not listed as part of Mary's household in 1528, when Mary returned to court from Wales and "the queen at the same time request that he would this winter teach the princess Latin."⁷⁷ One might interpret this to mean that he could teach while being paid from other accounts or that the record was otherwise unreliable in this matter, and thus make it less certain if he did not teach Mary both before and after her time in Wales. But as the records in 1528 also depict him as occupied in different parts of the country and elsewhere on behalf of the queen in the annulment issue, it is frequently recognized that any tutelage was minimal and a pretext for his assistance to the queen.⁷⁸

Vives, in his dedications to *De Institutione* and the first *Letter on the Education of Children*, implies that Katherine is in direct primary control of Mary's education. David Loades, although he acknowledges that there is no record of a schoolmaster in the Princess's household accounts before she was nine doubts these implications. Loades downplays Katherine's role in her daughter's education by pointing out that "Mary spent long periods in each year away from her mother."⁷⁹ Nevertheless, this is not long before he

⁷⁵ Glenda Thompson, "Mary of Hungary and Music Patronage" in *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15:4 (1984), pp. 403-6.

⁷⁶ Vives, in Watson, p. 137.

⁷⁷ L&P Henry VIII vol 4.2 #4990.

⁷⁸ L&P Henry VIII vol 4.2 #4875.

⁷⁹ Loades, p. 31.

mentions that she was “in and out of court every few weeks, and seldom more than a day’s ride away.”⁸⁰

Katherine wrote the following to Mary in 1525, as the Princess of Wales was setting off for a new life and would not be so close to her mother as she previously was. “As for your writing in Latin, I am glad that ye shall change from me to Master Federston, for that shall do you much good to learn by him to write right.”⁸¹ This, a private letter from Katherine herself, seems to indicate fairly well that Katherine, who still wished to continue seeing some of Mary’s assignments once Federston was done with them, saw herself in a primary role in Mary’s education. It is also, with some support from the fact that 1525 marks the first time a schoolmaster receives payment as a member of the princess’s household. This seems a fairly clear ruling that Mary was not previously taught by any outsider of note, much less Vives, for another schoolmaster would have merited a mention, and Richard Federston, while certainly competent, would never have been considered a new improvement over Vives. The same applies to Thomas Linacre, sometimes referred to as Mary I’s Latin tutor. He would certainly have merited more mention if he were (since Linacre dedicated some pedagogical material to Prince Arthur and others of that generation, it is possibly another of several cases of Mary’s being mistaken for her namesake aunt). Elderly and in poor health by 1523, Linacre did dedicate a revised grammar in Latin called *Rudimenta Grammatices* to Mary, “the darling and glory of England,” with encouragement about developing good Latin fundamentals.⁸²

Even if a schoolmaster had been paid from the queen’s account instead, there would be no reason for Katherine not to mention the previous experience in her letter. It

⁸⁰ Loades, p. 39.

⁸¹ L&P Henry VIII, vol 4.1 #1519.

is still true that Katherine may not have exclusively, as Garret Mattingly believed, “taught her her ABC, guided her childish pen, ordered her reading and corrected her Latin exercises”⁸³ up to the age of nine; in particular, some tutoring might have been done by the princess’s household chaplain, Henry Rowle. It nevertheless seems reasonable that Katherine’s early schoolmistress capacity was more than just platitudes to a patron.

In terms of how much Mary’s education followed Vives’s plan, one aspect seems now unknowable. Vives recommended, as he did with all students, that Mary be taught alongside a small group of handpicked classmates. Several secondary sources, such as Anthony Martienssen’s biography of Katharine Parr, have given a sort of ‘class roster’ for Mary’s education. They say that the princess was instructed alongside the Parr sisters, daughters of one of her mother’s ladies, and her first cousins the Brandon sisters.⁸⁴ It would be hard to believe that such a precise idea of Mary’s company – and its inclusion of her future stepmother Katharine Parr, with whom she would share some enthusiasm for religious literature -- would be made up out of whole cloth. The Brandon’s family relationship and the Parr’s court connection render the idea of this royal classroom possible. Unfortunately, Martienssen also believes that Vives taught the class personally, which remains unlikely. This would call that particular set of information into question. In her biography of Katharine Parr, Susan James holds the opposite view of the “classmates” idea, saying “This is quite probably untrue for besides the fact that there is no evidence that Vives actually taught the princess personally – or

⁸² Watson, p. 14.

⁸³ Loades, p. 31.

⁸⁴ Anthony Martienssen, *Queen Katherine Parr* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 21.

ever left Spain for that matter – Kateryn was four years older than Mary.”⁸⁵

Unfortunately, James’s information on the subject is also questionable. There are considerable records of Vives’s leaving Spain: letters dated elsewhere, visits to More, his assistance to the queen, and his tenure as an Oxford lecturer. Some biographers, incidentally, believe Katharine Parr was only two years older than Mary. On balance, one is left simply unable to assume that Vives’s exhortation for fellow-pupils was ever followed.

Nevertheless, it is interesting and helpful to note what little is known about the learning of these alleged classmates of Mary’s, as they were at least her rough contemporaries in the English elite and reasonably familiar faces. Katharine Parr has the reputation of having received very little formal education, but the foundation of this idea is weak, based mostly on two notes in poor Latin that Katharine probably did not write.⁸⁶ Her sister Anne is said to have “delighted in Cicero” and claimed that their mother modeled the sisters’ education after Thomas More’s family “school.” While nothing indicates that Katharine Parr was anywhere near as educated as any of the More girls, some effort seems to have been made, judging by Katharine’s signed childhood notes within a surviving Latin book of her father’s.⁸⁷ In all, it seems unlikely that Mistress Parr had neglected to see to her daughters’ academic training, particularly considering the trend being set by having an educated princess close in age. The Parr sisters’ education likely did not include the same rigorous Catholicism that Mary’s upbringing did; they were as adults committed to the new religion.

⁸⁵ Susan James, *Kateryn Parr* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), p. 28.

⁸⁶ James, p. 24, 32.

⁸⁷ James, p. 30.

Varying and vague accounts of the Brandon sisters' education keep the idea of judging Mary by her contemporaries and supposed companions tricky. Frances Brandon, who was the same age as Mary, is in various places said to have been "elaborately educated" and to have had no rigorous training outside of riding and hunting.⁸⁸ Of course, one must consider Lady Frances's family before dismissing her and her sister Eleanor in terms of learning. The Brandon sisters' mother was another Mary Tudor, Henry VIII's younger sister, the Duchess of Suffolk and former Queen of France. The Duchess had tutors enough in her early years (though they were informal hand-me-downs), as well as some further language instruction as an adult, to indicate that education was not unimportant to her. Of additional evidence is the education that Lady Frances and her husband, Henry Grey, arranged for their own daughter. Lady Jane Grey, an age-mate of Mary's half-brother Edward, was just as thoroughly educated in the classics and in theology – specifically Protestant theology -- as he, reading Plato in Greek for pleasure. It seems unlikely that education simply skipped a generation completely. It should be noted in comparison to Mary that the Brandon sister's religious education was either not very thorough or did not stick. Frances in particular, though she raised her daughter to be an extremely convinced Protestant, effortlessly converted in accordance with political shifts herself. The fact that Richard Hyrde, who was associated with those close to the queen, drew attention to Frances's prospective education in his introduction to an Erasmus translation might be considered a sign that Frances's formal lessons were not neglected as well as an indication that Mary's training was not always lonely.

The princess certainly experienced a certain degree of isolation. Mary was sent off to Ludlow as Princess of Wales (although without a formal legal creation as such,

⁸⁸ Watson, p. 11.

despite being called by the title) when she was nine in 1525. Her presence there was of course symbolic, both because of her age and because Henry still harbored small lingering hopes of an eventual Prince of Wales. Nevertheless, Mary was the heiress presumptive, and an impression had to be made. Her governess was a distant relative, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury, and her household was reasonably substantial, with scores of yeoman, grooms, and ladies, generally having titular responsibility for aspects of the stables, food supplies, and the princess's person. John Voysey (or Voisie, or Vesey, or Voisey, or, in fact, Harman, Voysey being an adopted name), Bishop of Exeter, was Lord President of the Princess's Council in Wales.

She probably saw him and the other members of the council on occasion, but had only a little contact with the people of Wales, except epidemiologically. When contagious illness was possibly affecting the area in May of 1528, Voysey wrote that "My Lady Governess and the Council think that those of the Council who are occupied with the suitors thronging the court should not come into the Princess's presence."⁸⁹ That the countess and the council were concerned with second-hand and not direct exposure indicates that Mary's practical political education at Ludlow was not too extensive. She apparently had no regular involvement with the throngs at court themselves.

The Princess remained more than two years in the west, with occasional visits at court with her parents – particularly for special occasions in the marriage-bargaining process. One might have expected some training by experience for her future role. But as her miniature court traveled around Wales and Gloucestershire, Mary only exercised one area of power in Wales. "The lady Princess has, by the King's placard, authority to kill or

⁸⁹ *L&P Henry VIII*, Vol 4.2, # 4238.

give deer at her pleasure in any forest or park within the room that is appointed to her."⁹⁰

She did give orders in 1526 requesting deer for specific persons. This could have served as a chance for hunting lessons, but this is never explicitly said.

Voysey is in several later sources (and under numerous spellings) called the princess's tutor. Some claim that this took place after she was recalled to Eastern England, some before. Writing in the first half of the seventeenth century, Peter Heylyn confuses the issue altogether:

In which condition, the poor Princess had no greater comfort than what she could gather from her books, in which she had been carefully instructed by Doctor John Voisie, alias Harman, appointed her tutor by the King, and, for his good performance in that place of trust, advanced by him to the see of Exon, anno 1529, and afterwards made Lord President of Wales: which fell out better for the tutor than it did for the pupil.⁹¹

Voysey, Henry's former dean of the chapel and an associate of Cardinal Wolsey, was made Bishop of Exeter in 1519, before Mary was even in need of education, and Lord President of Wales four years before 1529.⁹² It certainly was not a position that later removed him from the princess's presence. Since Heylyn is confused about everything else, it seems unreasonable to take his word that Voysey was ever in charge of the princess's actual education. Heylyn's assumptions may stem from the medieval tradition of appointing bishops to the position of royal schoolmaster. Mistakes on the subject are not all the same. A hometown biography of 'Bishop Vesey' even claims he acquired the position in her birth year, 1516 – but this was not the case.⁹³

⁹⁰ *L&P Henry VIII*, Vol 4.2, # 2431.

⁹¹ Peter Heylyn, James Roberts, ed., *Ecclesia Restaurata: Or, A History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849), p. 68.

⁹² *L&P Henry VIII passim*.

⁹³ "Bishop Vesey," found at <http://www.birmingham.gov.uk>.

Heylyn's misidentification may be exacerbated by a few modern accounts in the same way that so many others are easily misidentified as Mary's tutor: some people possibly read too many direct everyday connections into the flourishing system of patronage and court connections. Political favors and functions, in a government based around the person of the monarch, are easily associated with personal relationships, even when those personal ties are only a minor point of royal tribute – such as sending a textbook to a child rather than teaching her oneself, as was the case with Thomas Linacre or, in a much more thorough and involved fashion, Vives. And so Mary is retroactively assigned many potential pedagogues just as she at the time went through countless engagements to various princes that amounted to nothing.

Only one person until the final year of Mary's education is ever recorded in state papers as being specifically hired for educational purposes. Richard Featherstone (or Fetherston, or Federston) was, in all likelihood, Mary's very first schoolmaster. That job also accorded him a connection with the princess's Council in Wales, probably to guide her through whatever minimal information was necessary to keep her somewhat aware of events. Giles Dawes (or Daues, or Dues), Mary's instructor in French, who may also have tutored her father and his siblings, was generally credited and paid as a "gentleman waiter." In a list of the king's New Year's gifts of 1528, Featherstone and Dawes are listed as a group with a lute-player who was probably named Peter de Brescia or Peter Carmelianus (He was at any rate a member of Mary's household and not to be confused with the Peter Carmelianus who was Henry VII's Latin secretary), and all are given the

equal amount of 20.75 ounces of plate.⁹⁴ This combination makes it likely that the musician was also a prominent instructor of the princess.

Languages – classical and modern – and music are curricula that can be flaunted, and the exhibition of Mary’s learning in these fields is documented by occasions in which it is displayed. In languages, Mary was most certainly schooled thoroughly in French and Latin. Just as Vives did not plan for more than a few words of Greek in his layout of the curriculum, Mary does not seem to have been acquainted with much more than a few words of the language. She also seems to have had instruction in Italian. There is contention as to whether the princess spoke Spanish. Some sources say she did -- the Venetian ambassador called her a “mistress of five languages,” English, Latin, French, Spanish and Italian, and said that she “not merely understands but fluidly converses in four of them [...] the latter she does not venture to speak”— and it would seem reasonable enough considering her parentage.⁹⁵ A witness in her court, however, would later say “Her Majesty does not speak Castilian, though she understands it,” explaining why an interpreter was present for Mary’s conversations with the Duchess of Alva.⁹⁶ Her falling in and out of practice in the language due to erratic use is always a possibility, as is the conceivable use of an interpreter for reasons of dialect: most people in Alva spoke Catalan, after all, not the Aragonese variant of Castilian Spanish. At any rate, Katherine is said to have sent Mary letters in Spanish during the annulment crisis – secretly, due to Henry’s forced separation of mother and daughter – so she must have retained some grasp of it throughout her youth.

⁹⁴ *L&P Henry VIII*, Vol 4.2, #3748.

⁹⁵ Giovanni Micheali *Calendar of State Papers, Venice and Northern Italy*, Vol 6.2 (1557), p. 169.

⁹⁶ *State Papers Spanish* Vol. XIII (1554), p. 12.

Dawes had a somewhat immersive rather than systematic approach to teaching French. He would later argue against the first French grammar, written by John Palsgrave (mistakenly named in some encyclopedias as Mary's French tutor; the Princess Mary he actually instructed was her aunt, the Queen of France) because according to Dawes, French could not be held to a set of infallible rules the way classical languages could. Dawes instead focused on being able to converse easily and readily on a variety of subjects in the language; not far, actually, from Vives's Latin-oriented recommendation.

The technique seems to have been reasonably successful. Claude Dodieu, the secretary of the French Embassy, was present in 1527 when Henry introduced his eleven-year-old daughter to a delegation and took the opportunity to show off some of her education. There are previous occasions of foreign visitors being specifically escorted to the four-year-old princess's presence-chamber to hear her play, but unlike Dodieu's, these early accounts do not include reference to her spoken foreign language skills. "He told them all to speak to the Princess in French, Latin, and Italian, in all of which languages she answered them."⁹⁷ Aside from the Queen, there were no Spaniards present in the court at just that moment, and so as there was no reason to speak Spanish, Dodieu cannot lend much to the debate of Mary's knowledge of the language.

The princess could, of course, write as well as speak. When she was eleven, Mary added to the great preponderance of paper devoted to her tentative engagement to Francis I by corresponding with him in French. And it was in fact in the same year, apparently (despite age-related confusion even among relative contemporaries) even before her eleventh birthday, that Mary produced an English translation of a lengthy Latin prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas, for which she received much praise. The translation

was in fact, well done; “the perspicuity apparent in the construction proves that Mary had the command of her own language, as well as the knowledge of it – points which do not always meet with proper attention in a classical education.”⁹⁸ Incidentally, the choice of prayer is possibly, although not necessarily, an indication of deviation from Vives’s recommended humanist curriculum, from which the scholastic Aquinas, often the central thinker of a medieval academic curriculum, seems conspicuously absent. Nevertheless, the prayer asks, at length and with much variation, for the ability to be more virtuous, and thus it is still within the purview of Vives’s main theme. A small excerpt illustrates this point:

Lord, let all worldly things be vile to me for thee, and that all thy things be dear to me, and thou, good Lord, most specially above them all. Let me be weary with that joy which is without thee, and let me desire nothing beside thee. Let the labour delight me which is for thee, and let all rest weary me which is not in thee. Make me to lift my heart oftentimes to thee, and when I fall, make me to think and be sorry with a steadfast purpose of amendment.⁹⁹

The princess’s linguistic accomplishments were clearly quite respectable, even early on. Her rendition of the prayer was heavily praised for its quality by the court translator, Lord Morley, whose declaration that Mary was at that early age “so ripe in the Latin tongue, that rathe [rarely] doth happen in the women-sex, that your grace could not only properly read, write, and construe in Latin, but furthermore translate any hard thing of the Latin into our English tongue,”¹⁰⁰ came many years later, when Mary’s position was such that flattery merely for flattery’s sake would seem pointless. And if perhaps the use of Spanish was lost as Mary left her childhood, Latin was not, as her later writings as an

⁹⁷ *L&P Henry VIII*, vol. 4.2 #1412.

⁹⁸ Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1872), p. 109.

⁹⁹ Missal of Mary Tudor, quoted in Strickland, p. 109.

¹⁰⁰ Morley, quoted in Strickland, p. 108.

adult, however rare, would show. It is interesting to note what a surviving copy of the prayer, or rather, a note at the end of it, indicates about Mary's later status in life. In her signature of this note, Mary identified herself as the child of King Henry and Queen Katherine. It is interesting to note everything in this signature after "Marye, child of K" was blotted out of the book, since it was illegal to own any writing which claimed the legitimacy of Katherine of Aragon's marriage to Henry and her status as queen, rather than Dowager Princess of Wales, the title she bore before marrying Henry.

Mary was brought back from Wales when she was nearly 13 in late 1528. It was in November of 1528 that Cardinal Wolsey noted Henry had stepped up his struggle with the queen to the extent that "he will not suffer the princess to come into her company; which should be a very grievous thing to the Queen, as at her age the Princess should be near her for better education."¹⁰¹ Mary's education did go on for some time, but it would be continually affected by the situation. After Featherstone had previously supported and advised Katherine during the annulment crisis, Henry in 1533 brought into the schoolmaster position an ally of his in the Great Matter, Richard Wollman (or Wolman, or Woleman). The following year, after failing to agree with the Act of Succession – which declared the King's first marriage invalid, his daughter illegitimate, and the children of Anne Boleyn heirs to the throne – Featherstone was imprisoned for treason and eventually executed, as was Mary's governess, the Countess of Salisbury, a few years later.

Wollman was Henry's former almoner, responsible for managing Henry's official charitable distributions. He had been involved in Henry's efforts to annul his first since before those intentions became open, and in 1537 he would be listed as part of the

committee that composed *The Institution of the Christian Man* or “Bishop’s Book,” which helped establish the independent Church of England.¹⁰² It would be difficult to find a scholar more in Henry's pocket, which was saying something at the time, but the king had neglected for too long to exercise educational control over his daughter. The new schoolmaster did not last long. Mary’s formal education ended in October of that year, when she was seventeen. Particularly considering Mary’s recurring ill health, her education might not be considered to have been cut short – her brother, Edward, laid his studies aside when he was several months shy of fifteen, for instance – but the official stopping-point came when Henry dissolved his ‘illegitimate’ daughter’s household and transferred her to that of the infant Princess Elizabeth. Mary continued to be separated from her mother for nearly all the remainder of Katherine’s life, so for some time there would hardly have been anyone around willing to engage the frequently ill former princess in anything scholarly.

Heylyn may have been mistaken on many things, but in the matter of Mary’s lacking any consolation but books, he was closer to accurate. In October 1541, the French ambassador wrote to his master about the Lady Mary, whose situation had been described to him by one of her chamberwomen, who may have been the wife of musician Peter Brescia/ Carmelianus. Mentioning the isolated Lady’s skill in French and Latin, he says that she “enjoys books of *lettres humaines*, which were her solace in sleepless nights at the time that she was molested.”¹⁰³ She had also, apparently, had opportunity to keep in some practice with her music.

¹⁰¹ *L&P Henry VIII* Vol 4.2 #4981.

¹⁰² Sidney Lee, ed. *Dictionary of National Biography* (New York: Macmillan, 1900), Vol. 62, p. 319.

¹⁰³ *L&P Henry VIII*, Vol 16 # 1253.

Mary would as an adult revisit her scholarly skills with encouragement from her final stepmother Katharine Parr, who whatever the level of her education was certainly an enthusiastic amateur in devotional literature. Mary contributed to a translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrase of the New Testament*, a project edited overall by author Nicholas Udall and commissioned by Katharine Parr, which would in Edward's reign be placed in nearly every church in England. Mary, whose reading list as a child had included Erasmus's original, translated a large portion of the "Paraphrase of the Gospel of St. John" before illness forced her to leave the completion of the section to her chaplain, Francis Mallet. Katharine was particularly thrilled with Mary's "very excellent and useful work," and urged her to involve her name in the publication. Although – as with most of the contributors – Mary's name appears nowhere in the front attribution of the 1549 book, she is credited in Udall's preface. Udall praises her as a "peerless flower of virginity" – Vives would no doubt be proud – "...furthering both us and our posterity in the knowledge of God's word, and to the more clear understanding of Christ's gospel."¹⁰⁴ But while praise of her learning did not come out of nowhere, Mary did not have the extensive involvement in publication of devotional materials that her stepmother did. Mary composed during her brother's reign three now almost-entirely-forgotten prayers that she included in various letters. These were "A prayer of the Lady Mary to the Lord Jesu: against the assault of vices," "A meditation touching adversity, made by my Lady Mary's Grace, 1549," and "A prayer to be read at the hour of death."¹⁰⁵ Mary had been in particularly ill health in 1549, so the subject is not entirely surprising. The first of the prayers, like Mary's youthful translation of St. Thomas Aquinas, pleads for strength of

¹⁰⁴ Udall quoted in Loades, p. 118.

¹⁰⁵ Strype, ed. *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Items 288-290.

character. The second reflects on the meaning and necessity behind the hardships of the temporal world. The third strikes something of a reformist chord; the hypothetically-dying Mary declares that she has no good works to offer and asks only for grace and mercy. Emphasizing the importance of grace in salvation over that of works was a tendency among some Catholic reformers as well as the Protestant Reformation.

These were English compositions with a few significant Latin quotations thrown in. There are not, as is the case with Elizabeth, any extant translation exercises by Mary from this period. Her scholarly endeavors were probably not very prolific at all. It may be interesting to note that although Mary's accession was considered by many to be a blow to lovers of the gospel, Udall only rarely found personal reasons to regret his words. Queen Mary was a continual patron of his work as a dramatist; Udall's "Respublica" was performed the Christmas after her coronation, and he was commissioned for more "interludes" later.

Mary's contribution to the *Paraphrases* translation is often used as a brief proof of the book's religious conservatism, as hers is notorious. On the other hand, it is sometimes considered evidence of an attempt by Katharine Parr to bring her stepdaughter around on the issue of the new religion. It has even been claimed that Mary herself, as queen, ordered banned as heretical the translation she had helped make.¹⁰⁶ If true, that would certainly showcase Mary's commitment to the Catholic tendency to avoid heresy by restricting vernacular scriptures. When she was a child in Wales in 1526, it had of course been Bishop Voysey and not she who received instructions to destroy copies of the English New Testament and other prohibited books, including an educational treatise

¹⁰⁶ James, p. 228.

by Erasmus.¹⁰⁷ All of Erasmus's works would eventually make it onto the Papal Index of Prohibited Books. It is true, as Loades says regarding Mary's giving little priority to monasteries, that "Education had clouded her piety with contemporary humanism, and her priorities were those of the generation of Erasmus."¹⁰⁸ But Mary had far too much emotionally invested in being a faithful daughter of the Church – to one extent or another – to throw in her lot wholeheartedly with Erasmus's work.

It is significant to point out, however, that though her education had deviated somewhat from Vives's humanist Catholic model, it was still very much humanist as well as very much Catholic. Something may well have sunk in as the young princess was copying down the criticisms of pilgrimages in Erasmus's *Colloquies*, for instance. As fervently devoted as she was to the Mass and the purity of the sacraments, she was much more interested, judging by words and funding, in scripture and sermons than shrines and saint-cults. The Marian church supported the doctrine of transubstantiation through scriptural and patristic citation rather than the pedantic arguments of the scholastics or fantastic medieval accounts of miraculous use of the sacrament.¹⁰⁹ It was clearly Catholic humanist writers, going back to the sources, who had Mary's full support in the restoration of the faith. When the teenage Mary had not yet been reconciled with her father and was, as reputed, needing solace in her isolation, her mother sent her Latin books which contained Biblical and patristic writings – one of the authors was St. Jerome, one of Vives's particular recommendations – and Mary was said to have reviewed a Gospel reading daily throughout her adult life, which follows Vives's suggestion exactly. She therefore continued a lifelong interest in the same classical and

¹⁰⁷ *L&P Henry VIII*, Vol 4.2, #2607.

¹⁰⁸ Loades, p. 331.

religious texts which had been intended to form good character in her early years, just as she clung to the religion of her early years.

And while she had very quietly adhered to the papal supremacy before taking the throne, Mary proved willing to disagree with Pope Paul IV in support of her husband and Cardinal Reginald Pole, who happened to be a distant cousin of Mary's as well as the son of her governess, the Countess of Salisbury, who had been executed for treason mostly because of her émigré son's writings against the annulment. The connection with her upbringing may be part of why Mary relied upon Pole so frequently. Pole, whose views were closer to humanist ideas than the Pope's, had "taken the strictures of Catholic reformers against bishops' accepting secular positions so seriously that he was not even a member of the council," but he was nevertheless the queen's closest advisor.¹¹⁰

When the pope attempted to recall Pole, annoyed that the cardinal was not sufficiently encouraging the queen towards foreign policy decisions the pope preferred, Mary politely refused. It is interesting to note, in terms of Mary's Latin communication, that while her letters to Pole and to other bishops are in Latin, Pole replied in English, noting that he was not a foreigner.¹¹¹ Pole himself had an interesting opinion of Mary's education: he declared at the start of her reign that God had put her through the "school of tribulations" in preparation for saving her country.¹¹² This would be accomplished, of course, once she could fully restore obedience to Rome and end English heresy. Pole was less conservative in some ways than the pope, and certainly less violent in his attitude toward heretics than some of Mary's ecclesiastical advisors (although Pole did not widely

¹⁰⁹ Lucy Wooding in Duffy and Loades, ed. *Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 247-9.

¹¹⁰ Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 11.

¹¹¹ Thomas Mayer, *Reginald Pole* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 210.

prevent the executions of heretics, either), but that did not change the need, in his advice, to focus on the essential restoration of Catholicism. And Mary, for the most part, listened.

Considering Vives's caution that women should not trust their own judgment, it is interesting to note that in discussing her relationships with her ministers, Loades says that Mary "had insufficient experience managing her own affairs and was psychologically dependent."¹¹³ On the other hand, Vives would probably have been less than happy to find that her submission to her husband was not particularly strong in matters of political relevance, not quite as frequent as her reliance on Pole, who was a family connection and a church authority in one. Philip was severely constrained by the terms of the marriage treaty. "He was to observe all laws and customs of the realm, not intrude his own servants into English offices, and not involve England in the perpetual Hapsburg struggle with France."¹¹⁴

Still, the oft-repeated lessons of demure femininity certainly did not completely fail to sink in. She would certainly never stress her independence or use the masculine comparisons to herself that her sister Elizabeth would in her rhetoric. Mary, when she addressed soldiers, would never state that she had "the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England, too," as Elizabeth did in her speech to the troops at Tilbury in 1588. She also used references to herself as a Prince far less frequently in her rhetoric – although the term was used in her very brief speech at Guildhall during Wyatt's rebellion, buttressed by a more feminine maternal metaphor.

¹¹² *Calendar of State Papers, Venice and Northern Italy*, Vol 5 (1555), p. 199.

¹¹³ Loades, p. 320.

¹¹⁴ Loades, p. 210.

And I say to you, on the word of a Prince, I cannot tell how naturally the mother loveth the child, for I was never the mother of any; but certainly, if a Prince and Governor may as naturally and earnestly love her subjects as the mother doth love the child, then assure yourselves that I, being your lady and mistress, do as earnestly and tenderly love and favour you. And I, thus loving you, cannot but think that ye as heartily and faithfully love me; and then I doubt not but we shall give these rebels a short and speedy overthrow.¹¹⁵

She was, perhaps, hedging her bets, counterbalancing such an assertive princely image as much as possible with the maternal one. Earlier in the speech, when she had mentioned her coronation oath, she pointed out the ring she received and the “marriage” it symbolized. Elizabeth is much more well-known for pointing out this symbolism, probably because she was much more confident in her rhetoric and her image-spinning as the Virgin Queen.

Mary, in fact, was fairly limited in terms of rhetoric in the first place. Her religious translations were good, her ability to listen and respond in various languages praised, but there is nothing to indicate that her lessons broke with Vives enough to ever study oratory or fill her commonplace book – which unfortunately does not survive -- with terms of persuasion rather than personal conscience. Elizabeth, who apparently shared a tutor with her brother, was exposed to and later made use of Greek orators that Vives had recommended to Charles Mountjoy, but not for Mary. Whereas the vigorous double-translation technique had not been of importance to Vives for Mary’s Latin studies, tutor Roger Ascham proudly boasted of the double-translations of the Greek orator Demosthenes that Elizabeth accomplished.¹¹⁶ In contrast to Vives’s very gender-separated pedagogical works, Ascham’s *The Scholemaster* does not set Elizabeth apart from his other past students but merely places her foremost among them. Likewise it is

¹¹⁵ Mary, quoted in John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (London: Seeley, 1893 reprint), p. 414.

Ascham who recorded Lady Jane Grey's commentary about reading Plato in Greek as an escape from parental pressures. Ascham had clearly not found it necessary to categorize female education in the same way Vives had.

Elizabeth...in addition to her better (oral) academic training, also had the experience of watching Mary make mistakes [...] [Mary's] experiences alone were not enough to prepare her to rule when her education had given her conflicting underpinnings that a "good Christian woman" was to be silent and submissive, and her councilors had shared these views. These were the same views that Elizabeth had to struggle against as sovereign, but she made use of her strong academic background to help her win this struggle by means of her rhetoric.¹¹⁷

Unlike Elizabeth's case, there is no record of Mary having given a speech from the throne at the opening of her first Parliament. Appropriately enough, the occasion focused around the Mass which took place.¹¹⁸

Although she received praise for her small involvement in the New Learning, Mary probably received more for her accomplishments in music. When presenting Mary to Dodeu and the ambassadors, the king quickly and unsurprisingly turned the subject to her musical skills. "She then played very well on the spinet [a small variant of the harpsichord]. She is the most accomplished person of her age."¹¹⁹ Henry began very early in cultivating this accomplishment. Even before she began playing at court somewhere between three and five, he was exposing her to keyboard music. The Venetian organist and friar Dionysius, or Dominic, Memo was at court in Mary's early years, and apparently one day when she was two "the moment she cast her eyes on the reverend Dionysius Memo, who was there, she commenced calling out in English 'Priest,

¹¹⁶ Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster* (London: Constable, 1909), p. 96.

¹¹⁷ Vosevich, Kathi. "The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors," Mary E. Burke, Jane Donaweth, Linda L. Dove, Karen Nelson, eds. *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*. (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000), p. 73.

¹¹⁸ Loach, p. 40.

priest' and he was obliged to go and play for her." It might seem a strange way of phrasing a song request, but it was apparently what was expected from Henry's daughter. Henry afterwards made a point of praising the organist on his and the princess's behalf.¹²⁰ Memo is generally considered to have been responsible for Mary's early instruction on the virginal, which like the spinet is a small variety of harpsichord. Her instruction on the instrument was later taken over by a "Mr. Paston" until 1537, and from 1536 to 1545 she also had in her employ yet another "gentleman" named Simon Burton, who had previously been a virginal-player for Henry within the Privy Chamber.¹²¹ Mary became quite adept in playing both the previously mentioned harpsichords and the regal, a small portable organ.

Music lessons were, in fact, the one part of Mary's education which formally continued after the termination of all her other education in 1533 when she was seventeen. Having probably studied the lute under Carmelitanus / De Brescia, she went on to share her brother Edward's lute instructor, Phillip van Wilder, a "groom of the Privy Chamber," well into her twenties. The lessons were probably appreciated; shortly after van Wilder's death, the new Queen Mary in fact hired his sons as chamber musicians. She did not abandon her skills after becoming queen; in 1557, the Venetian ambassador remarked on her particular excellence with the clavichord and the lute, "When intent on it...she surprised the best performers, both by the rapidity of her hand and by her style of playing."¹²²

¹¹⁹ *L&P* vol. 4.2, #1412.

¹²⁰ *L&P* vol 2, #3976.

¹²¹ Andrew Ashbee, "Groomed for Service: Musicians in the Privy Chamber at the English Court," *Early Music*, 25:2 (1997), p.190.

¹²² Giovanni Michaeli, *Calendar of State Papers, Venice and Northern Italy*, Vol 6.2, p. 169.

Mary's musical education was of particular use in passing the time during her isolated two years in Wales. Her governess, the Countess of Salisbury, was to see that Mary would "pass her time most seasons at her virginals or other instruments musical, so that the same be not too much and without fatigue or weariness [...] at other seasons to draw."¹²³ Variety in music seems to have been more useful for relieving boredom than drawing, which the princess did not practice continually and of which nothing remains. Riding became a more lifelong hobby, though still a less prominent interest than music, but nothing seems to have been recorded of when and how she learned. Mary's riding habits included the hunt, an interest she had acquired from her parents; she kept a kennel of Italian greyhounds.¹²⁴

It seems that Mary learned reasonably well the textile skills that Vives hoped would prevent idle hands and their resulting troubles. In September 1544, Katharine Parr wrote a letter to her eldest stepdaughter that, among other things, thanked Mary for the purse she had personally embroidered and given to Katharine. The Venetian ambassador would also comment on her needlework. By the time Vives was writing the *De Institutione*, however, Mary was already developing a lifelong interest in some of the very idle amusements Vives was hoping girls would avoid through needlework. In what Vives would doubtless have considered a failure to keep the right sort of staff around an impressionable girl (although the countess herself was fairly conservative and respectable, she apparently could not be everywhere), Mary learned card-playing from the servants in relatively early childhood and never really lost the habit. Apparently such "shameful" diversions were not just a choice of "dealing out playing cards instead of

¹²³ Katherine of Aragon, quoted in Strickland, p. 107.

¹²⁴ Erickson, p. 192.

battening the wool or reading her prayerbook”¹²⁵ – Mary as an adult managed to do all of these.

Vives also devoted an entire chapter of *De Institutione* to dancing, its absence among respectable people of both the classics and the Bible, and the fact that “such women do not frequent places where there is dancing unless obliged to through some duty, and they conduct themselves in such a way as to give the impression that they do not wish to be there.”¹²⁶ He had either forgotten who his English patrons were, thought his commentary could counteract the frequent dancing Mary was exposed to at her parents’ court, or merely intended the chapter for his other readers. Mary danced with her father at court, and also performed further. “But the princess appeared soon after, not only as a partner for her royal sire [...] but as a dancer in court ballets and a performer in comedies – no slight infringement of the rigorous rules prescribed for her education.”¹²⁷ She for instance danced with courtiers at a 1527 banquet with the French delegation, in celebration of her engagement of the time to the French King’s second son. The 11-year-old Mary was decked out in excessive jewelry and participated in a complicated dance of “groups and figures” which her father eventually joined her in.¹²⁸

Henry had in fact not paid any attention to anything written about carefully sheltering Mary from all circumstances lacking in virtue. His way of paying notice to his adult daughter’s purity, and the excellent reputation she had regarding it, was supposedly to send a friend, Sir Francis Bryan, to speak as foully as possible to her and see if she was

¹²⁵ Vives, p. 93.

¹²⁶ Vives, p. 151.

¹²⁷ Strickland, p. 111.

¹²⁸ *L&P* Vol. 4 #211.

sufficiently offended.¹²⁹ She was. This occurred at one of the masques which Vives would have hoped Mary would have nothing to do with, and despite the apparently preservation of her reputation, Vives would not doubt have seen the circumstance itself as a substantial problem. While Vives did not so directly condemn hunting and riding, considering his concerns over any sort of roughness and too much presence in public, it is likely that he also would have been disappointed by Mary's acquisition of those hobbies.

Edward's Protestant tutors were somewhat more directly involved in their attempt to instill proto-puritanical feelings. One of his Latin exercises in May 1546 was a letter to his stepmother asking her "to preserve his dear sister from the enchantments of the evil one, by beseeching her to attend no longer to foreign dances and merriments, which do not become a most Christian princess."¹³⁰ This reproach most likely applied to Mary's gambling habit, as well.

Aside from her independent patronage of music and literature, Mary did not as queen neglect the family tradition of academic patronage. Gifts from the queen tripled the revenue of the struggling Oxford University. Cardinal Pole, whom Thomas More once called "as noble as he is learned in all branches of letters," was made chancellor of both Oxford and Cambridge. In this position, his priorities were circumventing heresy and making the administration more efficient.¹³¹ Pole's attempts to bring some of the Counter-Reformation to English academia were haphazard, but Marian Oxford was said to be steeped in "upbeat, pugnacious, and articulate" early modern Catholicism.¹³²

¹²⁹ Erickson, p. 333.

¹³⁰ *L&P*, Vol 21.

¹³¹ Mayer, p. 293-5.

¹³² Elizabeth Russell, 'Marian Oxford and the Counter-Reformation', in C. M. Barron and C. Harper-Bill (ed.) *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society* (Woodbridge:Boydell, 1986), p. 218-20.

It is difficult to see the educated princess in the bitter and worried queen whose hostility towards Protestants caused her to receive the reputation of “Bloody Mary.” The “school of tribulation” may have affected her more thoroughly than the best-laid plans of Vives, the tutor who did not actually teach her. Nevertheless, the program of study was clearly not completely ignored, not by Mary and not those later interested in female education.

She had not, on balance, received precisely the education and upbringing that had been planned for her, but the Catholic humanist education certainly took effect. She may have had limitations her siblings did not on her lessons, but reading five languages, in three of which she could speak and compose fluently, along with extensive biblical and patristic reading, is hardly shabby. Her education was, of course, more thorough than many in England and certainly more thorough, even in the elites, than most girls’. “Peerless flower of virginity” though she may have been, Mary was not the paragon of all the virtues which Juan Luis Vives was trying to inculcate through his ideas on female education, but she certainly picked up many of her habits from an early, impressionable age, whether they were an appropriate part of the education of a Christian princess or not.

Bibliography

Primary:

Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster*. London: Constable. 1909 Reprint.

Calendar of State Papers, Spanish

Calendar of State Papers, Venice and Northern Italy.

Carlsberga, Georgii Carolidae. *Symbolicae, e satellitio Viviano, Centuria Prima*.

http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camena/del2/books/deliciae2_5.html

Foxe, John. *Acts and Monuments*. London: Seeley. 1839 edition.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Reign of Henry VIII.

Strype, John, ed. *Ecclesiastical Memorials Relating Chiefly to Religion and the Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822.

Vives, Juan Luis. Charles Fantazzi trans., ed., *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth Century Manual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Vives, Juan Luis. *De ratione studii puerilis* reprinted in Watson

Vives, Juan Luis. "Satellitium Vel Symbola." *Joannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini, Opera Omnia*. London: Gregg, 1964. Vol. IV

Secondary:

Ashbee, Andrew. "Groomed for Service: Musicians in the Privy Chamber at the English Court," *Early Music*, 25:2 (1997), pp.185-97.

Barron, C.M. and C. Harper-Bill, eds., *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society: Essays Presented to F. R. H. Du Boulay*. Woodbridge:Boydell, 1986.

Beauchamp, V. W., E.H. Hageman, and M. Mikesell, eds., "The Lives of Juan Luis Vives" in *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 2002.

Erickson, Carolly. *Bloody Mary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978.

Bushnell, Rebecca W. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Carlson, David. "Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22:2 (1991), pp. 253-79.

- Chambers, R. W. *Thomas More*. Ann Arbor: U. Michigan Press, 1965.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Duffy, Eamon, and David Loades, eds. *Church of Mary Tudor*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Heylyn, James Roberts, ed., *Ecclesia Restaurata: Or, A History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1849 Reprint.
- James, Susan. *Kateryn Parr*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Kearney, Hugh. *Gentlemen and Scholars*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- Loach, Jennifer. *Parliament and Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Loades, David. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992.
- Martienssen, Anthony. *Queen Katherine Parr*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Mayer, Thomas. *Reginald Pole*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Orme, Nicholas. *English Schools in the Middle Ages*. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Richmond, Colin *The Paston Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Routh, E.M.G. *Lady Margaret, a Memoir*. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Simon, Joan. *Education and Society in Tudor England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Queens of England*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1872.
- Thompson, Glenda. "Mary of Hungary and Music Patronage" in *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15:4 (1984), pp. 401-18
- Vosevich, Kathi. "The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors." In M. Burke, J. Donaweth, L. Dove, K. Nelson, eds. *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*. Syracuse: Syracuse University. Press, 2000.
- White, Beatrice. *Mary Tudor*. New York: Macmillian, 1935.
- Waldman, Milton. *The Lady Mary*. London: Collins. 1972.

Warnicke, R. *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation*. London: Greenwood, 1984.

Watson, Foster. *Juan Luis Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*. New York: Longman, 1912.

Watson, Foster. *Tudor Schoolboy Life: The Dialogues of Juan Luis Vives*. London, J.M. Dent, 1908.

Appendix: Three Prayers Composed by Mary.
In Stryke, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*

1. A prayer of the Lady Mary to the Lord Jesu; against the assaults of vices

Most benigne Lord Jesu! Behold me, wretched beggar and most vile sinner, prostrate here before the feet of thy mercy. Behold the wounds, sores, griefs, and vices of my soul, (which, alas! I have brought into the same by sin,) that they may be healed.

Most Merciful Lord Jesu! have pity upon mine infirmities, captivity, and infelicity: by means whereof my miserable [soul?] is pressed down to earthly things and divided into [sundry?] desires.

Most loving Jesu! I beseech thee for thy great loves sake, which caused thee to deliver thy soul into the hands of sinners to be bound and crucified: and which also did force thee to remain three hours upon the cross, more than the nails either of thy hands or feet had power to do. For they charity I humbly desire thee to loose the yoke of my captivity and to deliver me from all vices, concupiscence, and evil inclinations, to defend me from all the assaults of mine enemies, and in the time of temptation to help me.

Moreover, quench and pluck up by the roots in me all private love, all inordinate motions, passions, and affections, all provokings, readines, and inclinations to pride, wrath, envy, and vainglory, with such other like. For it is in thy power only to deliver me from these things.

Sweet Jesu! Fulfill me with thy grace and most perfect charity. Make me to continue in goodness, that I may eschew all occasion of sin, strongly overcome temptations, subdue the flesh to the spirit, persecute and banish sin, and obey thy inspirations; escape the deceits and frauds of the Devil, never consent to any sin, nor nourish anything that should displease thee. But cause me most fervently to thirst for thy honor, laud, and glory, most faithfully to prefer the same, and to give and submit myself wholly to thy will.

My Lord God, give me grace to cleave to thee only with a clean and pure heart, that I may unite and knit to thee without separation by a most chaste and fervent love.
Amen

2. A meditation touching adversity, made by my Lady Mary's grace, 1549.

This natural life of ours is but a pilgrimage from this wandering world, and exile from our own country: that is to say, a way from all misery to thee (Lord), which art our whole felicity. And less the pleasantness and commodity of this life should withdraw us from the going to the right and speedy way to thee, thou dost stir and provoke us forward, and as yet ward prick us with thorns, to the intent we should covet a quiet rest and end to our journey.

Therefore sickness, weepings, sorrow, mournings, and in conclusion all adversities, be unto us as spurs; with the which we being dull horses, or rather very asses, are forced not to remain long in this transitory way.

Wherefore, Lord, give us grace to forget this wayfaring journey, and to remember our proper and true country. And if thou do add a weight of adversity, add thereunto

strength, that we shall not be overcome with that burden: but having our mines continually erected and lift up to thee, we may be able strongly to bear it.

Lord! All things be thine! Therefore, do with all things, without any exception, as shall seem convenient to thine unsearchable wisdom. And give us grace never to will but as thou wilt. So be it.

3. A prayer to be read at the hour of death

O Lord Jesu! Which art the health of all men living, and the everlasting life of them which die in faith, I wretched sinner, give and submit myself wholly unto thy most blessed will.

And I being sure that the thing cannot perish which is committed unto thy mercy, willingly I know leave this frail and wicked flesh, in hope of the resurrection; which in better wise it will restore to me again.

I beseech thee, most merciful Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wilt by thy grace make strong my soul against all temptations; and that thou wilt cover and defend me with the buckler of thy mercy against all assaults of the Devil.

I see and know that there is in myself no help of salvation, but all my confidence, hope and trust is in thy most merciful goodness.

I have no merits nor good works which I may allege before thee. Of sins and evil works (alas!) I see a great heap.

But through thy mercy I trust to be in the number of them to whom thou wilt not impute their sins; but take and accept me for righteous and just, and to be an inheritor of everlasting life.

Thou, merciful Lord, wert born for my sake. Thou didst suffer both hunger and thirst for my sake. Thou didst preach and teach, thou didst pray and fast for my sake. Thou didst all good works and deeds for my sake. Thou sufferedst most grievous pains and torments for my sake. And finally, thou gavest thy most precious body to die, and thy blood to be shed on the cross for my sake.

Now, most merciful Saviour, let all these things profit me which thou hast most freely given me, that has given thyself for me. Let thy blood cleans and wash away the spots and foulness of my sins. Let thy righteousness hide and cover my unrighteousness. Let the merits of thy passion and blood be the satisfaction for my sins.

Give me, Lord, thy grace, that my faith and salvation in thy blood waver not in me, but ever be firm and constant; that the hope of thy mercy and life everlasting never decay in me; that charity wax not cold in me.

Finally, that the weakness of my flesh not be overcome with the fear of death. Grant me, merciful Father, that when death hath shut up the eyes of my body, yet that the eyes of my soul may still behold and look upon thee: that when death hath taken away the use of my tongue and speech, yet that my heart may cry and say unto thee *In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum*; that is, O Lord, into thy hand I give and commit my soul: *Domine, Jesu, accipe spiritum meum*; Lord Jesu, receive my soul unto thee. Amen.

Vita

Katherine Lee Pierret Perkins was born in Lafayette, Louisiana. She attended the Louisiana School for Math, Science and the Arts in Natchitoches, LA and, in 2005, received a Bachelor of Arts in history and classical studies from Loyola University New Orleans. She lives in Baton Rouge with her husband and will receive a master's in History in December 2007.