

© 2014

VALERIE SCHUTTE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

“TO THE MOOSTE EXCELLENT AND VERTUOUSE QUEENE MARYE”:
BOOK DEDICATIONS AS NEGOTIATIONS WITH MARY I

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Valerie Schutte

August, 2014

UMI Number: 3671189

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3671189

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

“TO THE MOOSTE EXCELLENT AND VERTUOUSE QUEENE MARYE”:
BOOK DEDICATIONS AS NEGOTIATIONS WITH MARY I

Valerie Schutte

Dissertation

Approved:

Accepted:

Advisor
Dr. Michael Graham

Department Chair
Dr. Martin Wainwright

Committee Member
Dr. Constance Bouchard

Dean of the College
Dr. Chand Midha

Committee Member
Dr. Michael Levin

Dean of the Graduate School
Dr. George Newkome

Committee Member
Dr. Hilary Nunn

Date

Committee Member
Dr. Susan Wabuda

ABSTRACT

Printed book and manuscript dedications were at the juncture between the actual interests (and reading abilities) of Tudor royal ladies and the beliefs and hopes of those who wrote and printed them on what was suitable for royalty and how royal ladies might be persuaded in certain directions. This dissertation argues that dedications, and the negotiations that accompanied them, reveal both contemporary perceptions of how statecraft, religion, and gender were and the political maneuvering attempting to influence how they ought to be. In particular, this dissertation provides a case study of these textual negotiations as they related to Queen Mary I. The fact that Mary received eighteen manuscript dedications and thirty-three printed book dedications shows that even by the middle of the sixteenth century manuscripts and print competed for value and prestige among patrons.

This study begins with an introductory chapter on printed dedications to Lady Margaret Beaufort and the six consorts of Henry VIII. After this background chapter, the remainder of the study focuses on Mary, first considering dedications directed to her while she was a princess. This study next turns to printed dedications that Mary received while she was queen, as the majority of them were religious in nature, specifically addressing a return to Catholicism. The next chapter examines dedicated manuscripts directed to Mary, as well as all dedications to Philip while he was King of England. The

final chapter considers Mary's personal library, demonstrating that Mary used her books to reflect her role in returning England to the true religion and that she valued books as much as precious items as she did for the knowledge that they held.

Importantly, this dissertation is a revisionist approach to book history and Marian studies. My study contributes to the new historiography of how women, specifically royal women, were involved in book creation, production, and dissemination, through the relatively underused sources of dedications. Importantly, this dissertation offers the first comprehensive catalogue of all book and manuscript dedications to Mary and all books that were known to have been in Mary's personal library.

DEDICATION

To Blake and Victoria for their never-ending support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. LADY MARGARET BEAUFORT AND THE WIVES OF HENRY VIII.....	29
Lady Margaret Beaufort.....	30
The Six Wives of Henry VIII.....	59
Conclusion	93
III. DEDICATIONS TO A PRINCESS.....	95
IV. PRINTED DEDICATIONS TO A QUEEN	128
Obedience	133
Classical Literature and Philosophy.....	151
Return of the True Religion	161
Conclusion	182
V. MANUSCRIPT DEDICATIONS TO MARY.....	184
Dedications by Henry Parker, Lord Morley	186
Individual Manuscript Dedications.....	199
Dedications to King Philip.....	218
Conclusion	237
VI. BOOKS OWNED BY MARY.....	240

King Edward and Queen Mary Binder.....	243
All Other Books in Mary's Possession.....	262
Conclusion	283
VII. CONCLUSION.....	285
WORKS CITED.....	293
APPENDICES.....	318
APPENDIX A. INGHELBERT HAGUE'S DEDICATION TO THE <i>HEREFORD</i> <i>BREVIARY</i> GIVEN TO LADY MARGARET BEAUFORT.....	319
APPENDIX B. ENGLISH EDITIONS OF JUAN LUIS VIVES'S <i>THE</i> <i>INSTRUCTION OF A CHRISTEN WOMAN</i>	320
APPENDIX C. BOOKS IN MARY'S LIBRARY.....	321

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Tudor queens of England, both consorts and regnants, have been the topic of much academic research. From biographies to sexual and political histories, Tudor queens have been thoroughly examined. However, their role in the development and patronage of print, specifically through book dedications directed to them, still needs attention. The study of book dedications provides insight into the political and social impact of print by showing how dedications could be used for patronage and as tools of power. Book dedications are often the first words in any early modern printed book following the title, but they have generally been skipped over in favor of studying the body of the text. The dedications to the Tudor queens of England are particularly interesting when considering patronage and power. Lady Margaret Beaufort, the mother of Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, his wife, the six queens consort of Henry VIII, and the two queens regnant, Mary I and Elizabeth I, received more than 250 dedications in a period of just over one hundred years. While this is interesting in itself, when considered in light of the novelty of print in England and the assumed inferiority of queens to kings, the dedications can be used to extract social and political meaning.

Book dedications show the importance of women to royal patronage of printed books in the first century of English print. I will argue that book dedications were an

arena in which men and women negotiated patronage, politics, religion, and gender roles. In dedications, patrons and clients, or queens and clients, negotiated patronage arrangements (including favor and payment); the politics of marriage, divorce, and religion; and the appropriate education and power of women. In particular, I will provide a case study of these textual negotiations as they related to Mary I. Specifically for Mary, book a dedications give insight into expectations of her role in returning England to the Catholic Church and into women's expected virtue. Texts dedicated to Mary as a princess reflected an agenda of education, preparing the young Mary for the possibility of her rule. Dedications to Mary as a queen overwhelmingly address Mary's role in the Catholic restoration of England. On a most basic level, the dedications illuminate the patronage relationships surrounding the production of these texts.

For the purposes of this dissertation, "negotiation" should be understood as a dialogue between Mary and her dedicators; essentially, a process whereby men appealed to Mary so as to achieve a collective advantage in which Mary became a more educated, virtuous, and Catholic reformist which would result in the betterment of England. In some instances, dedicators received nothing in return for their dedications, while in other instances there is evidence that Mary rewarded her dedicators, indicating that she valued their advice. For example, Mary had a long-term patronage relationship with Henry Parker, Lord Morley which resulted in Mary and Morley exchanging New Year's gifts of books and payments nearly every year beginning in 1536.

Understanding book dedications, or books in general, as negotiations is a novel approach to book history.¹ In 2010, Cynthia Brown edited a collection of essays on books and documents associated with Anne of Brittany to show how Anne influenced culture at the French court.² Essays explore topics from patronage, to print culture, to language. Brown's monograph on Anne of Brittany also has a chapter that uses book dedications as its main primary sources and argues that contradictions between dedications and the actual text of a book suggest that male French authors were ambivalent about their female patrons and probably did not expect them to read their books beyond the dedication.³ Pete Langman has also edited a collection of essays that examines how printers, authors, and readers interacted and affected one another.⁴ This collection specifically addresses negotiations over authority and legitimacy, as books were influenced from both the bottom and the top of society. Much like both of these edited collections, my study seeks to understand the interactions of culture, religion, and book dedications.

¹ When narrowing my dissertation topic around book dedications, I had just read a copy of Barbara Rosenwein's *Negotiating Space*, which greatly influenced how I came to understand dedications. Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunities in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

² Cynthia Brown, ed., *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents* (Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2010).

³ Cynthia Brown, *The Queen's Library: Image-Making at the Court of Anne of Brittany, 1477-1514* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).

⁴ Pete Langman, ed., *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011).

Likewise, Natalie Zemon Davis and Sharon Kettering have offered studies exploring patronage and gift giving in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France.⁵ Davis's study explores how gift giving is a key element to understanding social relationships. She suggests that gifts cemented social relationships, while inducing both voluntary and obligatory responses from the gift receiver, thereby enhancing and troubling social relations. Sharon Kettering suggests that gift giving required an obligatory response from the recipient, leading to an expected patron-client relationship. Both giving rewards and giving service were required in order to maintain a patronage relationship. These two books provide a backdrop for understanding when and why Mary chose to reward some dedicatees and chose to ignore others.

I will begin my study by going back slightly into the fifteenth century, when print first entered England and Margaret Beaufort was one of its biggest supporters. Margaret Beaufort, while not a queen, was mother to Henry VII. She was a major patroness of William Caxton, the first printer in England. She was the first royal lady, then, to negotiate print patronage and the monarchy's role in this social system; she commissioned books, translated works, and had many books dedicated to her. Significantly, she received dedications to printed works while manuscripts were still the dominant form of publication. Elizabeth of York only received one dedication, and it was shared with Margaret Beaufort, so Elizabeth will be briefly included in my discussion of Lady Margaret. Also included in the chapter on Margaret Beaufort will be a discussion of dedications to the six wives of Henry VIII, as the first actual queens to benefit from

⁵ Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000); Sharon Kettering, *Patronage in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).

printed dedications. These women had much at stake in power and religious politics, and shifting queens were reflected in books with shifting dedications and subject matter. As recipients of at least seventeen dedications, Henry's queens received dedications that lay the groundwork for how their clients dedicated printed books to queens. Moreover, many dedications to Henry's wives mention Mary or develop around political situations involving Mary.

After this background chapter, the remainder of the study will be focus Mary I, as the first queen regnant who had books dedicated to her. I will examine how authors and printers attempted to compete for her patronage while at the same time instruct her in the arts of monarchy, politics, and religion. For Mary, her place as a ruling queen was acted out in these dedications. First I will consider dedications directed to her while she was a princess. These dedications all have an agenda of education and are grounded in humanism. They show how, as a child and the sole heir of Henry and Catherine of Aragon, Mary was groomed to be the future Queen of England or at least a queen consort in an important continental court. The next chapter will consider the dedications that Mary received when she was queen. The majority of these dedications, as well as the books themselves, are religious in nature, specifically addressing a return to Catholicism. While I will not argue that dedications determined the religious ideas of Mary, I will suggest that the dedications created negotiated bonds by which expressions of religious preferences were made public. The next chapter will examine the dedicated manuscripts that Mary received, as well as all dedications to Philip while he was King of England. The fact that Mary received eighteen manuscript dedications and thirty-three printed

book dedications shows that even by the middle of the sixteenth century manuscripts and print competed for value and prestige among patrons. The final chapter will consider Mary's personal library, specifically the types of books Mary choose to own compared with the types of books that were given to her. This chapter will demonstrate that Mary used her books to reflect her role in returning England to the true religion and that she valued books as much as precious items as she did for the knowledge that they held. Altogether, this dissertation will span approximately seventy years of dedications to royal Tudor ladies in England, while focusing on the books associated with the first real English queen regnant.

Neither historians nor literary critics have undertaken a comprehensive study of the tradition or impact of dedications. Rather, the study of book dedications has been primarily left to amateur historians as compilers of anthologies of select dedications, with little or no explanation of the dedications. Approximately a century ago, authors such as Clara Gebert, Mary Elizabeth Brown, and Henry Benjamin Wheatley all offered such anthologies.⁶ Wheatley's anthology, though the smallest, does offer some history of book dedications. According to Wheatley, modern book dedications bear little resemblance to early modern book dedications. Rather, book dedications have existed in three phases: the first, as expressions of love of a friend or patron; the second, as praise sold to the highest bidder; and the third, as a small note to someone with whom the author

⁶ Clara Gebert, *An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933); Mary Elizabeth Brown, *Dedications: An Anthology of the Forms Used From the Earliest Days of Book-Making to the Present Time* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1913); Henry Benjamin Wheatley, *The Dedication of a Book to Patron and Friend* (A.C. Armstrong, 1887).

wished to associate his book.⁷ Early modern dedications fall mostly into this second category, consisting of long passages of praise written in the hopes of receiving some form of patronage, although there are examples of the other two types of dedications as well. As such, the dedications which this study will examine belong to the second category and were written with specific purposes in mind. These dedications are long, laudatory prefaces written to a specific queen.

The most important work that has been done with English book dedications is Franklin B. Williams, Jr.'s *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books Before 1641*.⁸ Meant to be a research aid to the English Short Title Catalogue, Williams's book created a key by which to search the intended recipient or recipients of nearly every book printed in England prior to 1641. He organized his study as a personal index, alphabetically listing every book dedicatee followed by the English Short Title Catalogue numbers of each book dedicated to that person. Also included are compilations of lists of books dedicated to specific geographical areas and anonymous dedications. Using Williams's work alongside the Electronic English Short Title Catalogue (STC) and Early English Books Online (EEBO), English book dedications are traceable, making the history of book dedications a topic that can easily be researched.

It is only very recently that book dedications have been treated in a scholarly fashion.⁹ John Buchtel's 2004 dissertation at the University of Virginia examines

⁷ Wheatley, *Dedication*, v-vi.

⁸ Franklin B. Williams, Jr. *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books Before 1641* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1962).

dedications associated with Henry Stuart, Prince of Wales, and two articles have been published out of his research.¹⁰ His treatment of dedications is quantitative in that he only discusses a few dedications specifically and treats the rest generally, as Henry, Prince of Wales, received over one hundred book dedications in ten years. Specifically, Buchtel quantifies the types of works that were dedicated to Prince Henry, as well as the size and status of the books dedicated. He is as interested in how dedications to Prince Henry fit in with patronage and court culture as with the format of the books in which they were printed. Buchtel also situates his study within the history of literary patronage by focusing on dedications by key literary figures of the seventeenth century, such as Francis Bacon and George Chapman.

Also taking a quantitative approach to book dedications is Tara Wood's dissertation at Arizona State University in 2008. In it, she examines the 183 books dedicated to Elizabeth I to situate them within the Tudor patronage system.¹¹ Wood concludes that with the accession of Elizabeth I, England had to grapple with the gender issues of having a female monarch. Using book dedications as a coping mechanism,

⁹ For a theoretical approach, see Kevin Dunn, *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

¹⁰ John Buchtel, "Book Dedications in Early Modern England: Francis Bacon, George Chapman, and the Literary Patronage of Henry, Prince of Wales" (PhD diss., University of Virginia, 2004).; "'To the Most High and Excellent Prince': Dedicating Books to Henry, Prince of Wales," in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. Timothy V. Wilks (London: Holberton, 2008), 104-133.; "Book Dedications and the Death of a Patron: The Memorial Engraving in Chapman's Homer," *Book History* 7 (2004), 1-29.

¹¹ Tara Wood, "'To the most godlye, virtuos, and myghtye Princess Elizabeth': Identity and Gender in the Dedications to Elizabeth I" (PhD diss., Arizona State University, 2008).

authors developed the beginnings of an English national identity. Her work largely underplays the importance of Elizabeth's involvement in print culture, in favor of detailed discussions on the English patronage system, an analysis of the men who made the dedications, images that these men applied to Elizabeth, and their discussion of politics and identity which led to a better understanding of England as a nation-state. My approach to dedications will be largely distinct from Wood's, as I am more interested in how dedications were used to negotiate power, favor, and religion and I also provide literary analysis of the dedications to Mary.

In his important revisionist study on Marian Catholicism, William Wizeman offers a chapter on Marian texts, authors, and dedicatees. In it, he identifies four categories which most Marian religious books would fall under: catechetical, polemical, devotional, and sermons. Catechetical books were those which analyzed Catholic doctrine, such as Richard Smyth's *Bouclier of the Catholike fayth*, John Angel's *Agrement of the fathers*, and John Proctor's *A waie home to Christ*. The printing of Catholic sermons, such as those of St. Augustine translated by Thomas Paynell, challenged the idea that Protestants could monopolize on using sermons for instruction. Polemics were popular in that they "engaged in controversy," hotly refuting what they viewed as heretical ideas.¹² Miles Hogarde's work on the sacraments, Thomas Martin's work against the marriage of priests, and John Christopherson's work against rebellion were all such books that refuted Protestantism. Wizeman's final category, devotion,

¹² William Wizeman SJ, *The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor's Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 32.

includes mainly works that inspired piety, particularly primers, such as Miles Hogarde's *Mirroure of love*.

But Wizeman's pertinence to my study is his brief discussion in his chapter on dedicatees and readership of Marian religious works. Wizeman, like many others, points out that evaluating the influence of book dedications on readership is incredibly difficult. However, Wizeman does briefly assess common dedicatees and reasons for dedicating to them. Keeping in mind that Wizeman does not consider all books dedicated to Mary, but only those which he regards as Marian religious texts, Wizeman concludes that authors dedicated to Mary for two reasons: one, because she was an example of Catholic steadfastness through the reforms of her father and brother, and two, to present her with texts that could aid in the restoration of Catholicism. Dedicators wished to inform both Mary and their readers that they were assisting in the revival which her accession began. Authors dedicated to Marian bishops for similar reasons, showing their desire to combat heresy. Wizeman concludes that most Marian writers saw themselves as contributing to the rehabilitation of the Catholic Church and dedicated books to Mary and high church officials "to encourage the revival of Catholicism chiefly among intelligent lay and clerical readers of the middling sort."¹³ Overall, Wizeman's chapter points to coherence among Marian Catholic writers who wrote to promote Catholic spirituality both to people who were already Catholics and to those who were not quite sure if they were Catholic or evangelical.

There has also been one very important article written on early modern book dedications, but it focuses on dedications directed to women in early modern Spain for

¹³ Wizeman, *Mary Tudor's Church*, 47.

the period of 1500 to 1700.¹⁴ Admittedly, Nieves Baranda Leturio does not include books dedicated to women of the royal family, as they had different duties and demands than did the rest of Spanish women, yet her argument is also pertinent to royal dedications. Baranda Leturio suggests that dedications are useful sources that provide information on women's reading habits, beyond telling of patronage and social relationships. They also illuminate correlations between subject matter and readership, with the majority of books covering topics of religion, while the rest consisted mainly of literature, etiquette, and education. Her work is valuable, in that no guide exists for dedications in Spanish books, such as Williams's companion book for the English Short Title Catalogue, and she is in the process of examining and quantifying dedications for the first time. She also refers to secondary Spanish studies, and indicates that dedications have been treated within the Spanish historiography of reading and print, but only in cursory fashion for superficial networking. This article is especially useful for its general discussion of identifiable patterns between women who received books, content, and their involvement in promoting printed books. Baranda Leturio also notes women were more involved in book production than has previously been thought.

Helen Smith has furthered this last idea in a recent full-length study.¹⁵ Smith examines the various roles of women in textual production, the process of making and consuming books, and how print and manuscript overlapped. She argues that women

¹⁴ Nieves Baranda Leturio, "Women's Reading Habits: Book Dedications to Female Patrons in Early Modern Spain," in *Women's Literacy in Early Modern Spain and the New World*, eds. Anne J. Cruz and Rosilie Hernández (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), 19- 39.

¹⁵ Helen Smith, "*Grossly Material Things*": *Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

contributed to book production, dissemination, and appropriation more than has previously been acknowledged. Specifically, Smith contributes to an understanding of books as collaborative and contingent. For her first two chapters, she uses book dedications as new evidence of women's participation in the process of book composition. While her time frame is 1557-1640, and therefore only one year overlaps with my study, her work is useful in showing that there was collaboration between the sexes in the early generations of print in England. The large number of dedications to women further reveals that women were considered important by printers and authors, even if the written relationship between dedicators and dedicatees did not always reflect actual relationships. Dedications give varying evidence of women involved in literary activities, such as commissioning and patronage, than has previously been acknowledged. Smith is particularly skeptical that dedications led to actual payment and rewards, which is an aspect of the dedications to Mary that I will explore to see if there is any truth in Smith's generalizations. The remainder of Smith's book examines women as stationers, print traders, and readers.

According to A.S.G. Edwards and Carol M. Meale, one of the biggest issues facing early printed books was marketing: how could a printer make a book at least as appealing as a manuscript while promoting his own printing press? If printed books were going to replace the manuscript market, printers had to find a way to market the new commodity. One such way was the use of colophons.¹⁶ Printers also used woodcuts and heraldic devices to associate themselves with important patrons. Another issue facing

¹⁶ See A.S.G. Edwards and Carol M. Meale, "The Marketing of Printed Books in Late Medieval England," *The Library*, Vol. VI (1993), 95-124. Edwards and Meale offer a discussion of marketing tactics used by early printers to establish the early book market.

early printed books was that manuscripts appealed to purchasers because of their potential for individualization, but print made books relatively uniform. As a result, change from manuscript to print initiated a change in client-patron relationships, as can be seen in dedications.

Though the debate between Elizabeth Eisenstein and Adrian Johns is not specifically about print in England, they, too, have contributed differing opinions on the shift from manuscript to print. In her full-length study, Eisenstein argues that the printing press created a print revolution which essentially created the Renaissance because information could now easily be disseminated in a way not possible with manuscripts.¹⁷ Johns challenges Eisenstein's thesis by arguing against a rapid change from manuscript to print, instead calling the print revolution a "historical construct."¹⁸ In 2002, Eisenstein and Johns continued their debate over the nature of print in an AHR forum.¹⁹ Eisenstein is very critical about Johns's use of sources to make his generalizations, claiming that Johns relies too heavily on the history of print in England. She notes that print in England lagged far behind continental printing, but one would not get that sense from reading Johns's work. Johns defends his English sources by noting that English print was very influential and that England had one of the earliest scientific journals to gain

¹⁷ Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

¹⁸ Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998).

¹⁹ Elizabeth Eisenstein and Adrian Johns, "AHR Forum: How Revolutionary Was the Print Revolution? 'An Unacknowledged Revolution Revisited' and 'How to Acknowledge a Revolution'," *American Historical Review* 107 (2002), 84-128.

international repute. So, Johns defends his partiality towards England based on the printing of scientific literature there, which actually took place much after much of the print revolution of which Eisenstein is concerned.

Julia Boffey, however, is specifically concerned with the intersections between manuscript and print in England in the five decades after Caxton opened up his shop in 1476 in Westminster.²⁰ She falls more in line with Johns's thesis, and argues that early sixteenth-century readers accommodated themselves to different kinds of textual production, thereby allowing manuscripts and print to co-exist. Book readers kept and used manuscript and print materials side by side. Manuscript and print overlapped with handwritten notes and corrections, decoration, and binding. The biggest change that London readers underwent with the shift from manuscript to print was simply the greater availability of books to be purchased and read.

Client-patron relationships cannot always be clearly delineated from book dedications. Just because an author or printer or translator dedicated a book to someone, does not mean that patronage ensued. Often dedications did not directly mention a monetary arrangement.²¹ Many scholars have treated book dedications as irrelevant because of this. If dedications are more of a literary convention than identification of a relationship, then they must not be that important. But one claim of my study is that even though patronage relationships through book dedications may not be easily discernible, that does not mean that dedications should be ignored. Dedications did more than just

²⁰ Julia Boffey, *Manuscript and Print in London, c. 1475-1530* (London: The British Library, 2012).

²¹ Edwards and Meale, "Marketing," 97.

tying a dedicator to a dedicatee, they acted as textual negotiations between authors, printers, and patrons.

The central sources for my study are the approximately 60 printed book dedications made to Margaret Beaufort, who received ten; the six queens consort, who received seventeen; and Mary I, who received thirty-three, with the most emphasis placed on the dedications made to Mary. Though the content of each dedication varies, each follows a similar prescriptive formula, of praise, prostration, and blessing. I also use the eighteen manuscript dedications to Mary and over thirty books known to have been in Mary's personal library. I have consciously chosen not to examine or include manuscripts dedicated to the wives of Henry VIII. Although plenty exist, the primary focus of my dissertation is books related to Mary, and I would like to limit the discussion of dedications to the six wives to serve as a brief introduction. Maria Dowling has mentioned some of these dedicated manuscripts, such as a manuscript version of Clément Marot's *Sermon du bon Pasteur et du mauvais*.²² This dissertation is the first time all of these sources have been utilized together to create a complete catalogue of books associated with Mary Tudor. This catalogue will contribute to the current revisionism happening within Marian scholarship by demonstrating that Mary was not only a pious queen, as expected, but also actively engaged in the negotiation of literary patronage, and to a great extent was an active participant in the public negotiation of religious reform.

Because my research spans four generations of royal ladies, a look at the historiography of relevant studies that have examined books in relation to each queen will

²² Maria Dowling, ed. "William Latymer's Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne," *Camden Miscellany*, xxx (4th series, vol. 39) (London, 1990), Introduction, 35.

more clearly show where my work fits in the larger scholarship. Suzannah Hull, a librarian at the Huntington Library, has written two very useful surveys of early modern English books for women.²³ While neither is particularly analytical, they both show how looking at books written by, read by, and directed to women illuminates the lives of early modern women as well as using any other existing source. She identifies 163 books in 500 editions that were aimed at a female audience between 1475-1640, with 85% of them printed after 1570.²⁴ With this number of books for women existing, clearly there was what was perceived as a growing audience of women reading them. While it is in some cases difficult to tell if a book was directed at women, Hull suggests that the most clear evidence was dedication to women.²⁵ But even this is not foolproof, as dedications could change over time, so a book that was addressed to a female audience in the last quarter of the sixteenth century may have originally been dedicated to a man decades earlier. For example, *Byrth of Mankynde* has no direct appeal to women in 1540, but by the printing of the second edition in 1545, a general preface to women was added.²⁶ Using Williams's book on dedications, Hull identifies 1,780 books dedicated to individual

²³ Suzanne Hull, *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475-1640* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1982) and *Women According to Men: The World of Tudor-Stuart Women* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1996).

²⁴ Hull, *Chaste*, 1.

²⁵ Hull, *Chaste*, 10.

²⁶ Eucharius Roeslin. *The byrth of mankynde, newly translated out of Laten into Englysshe. In the which is entreated of all suche thynges the which chaunce to women in theyr labor, and all suche infyrmitees whiche happen vnto the infantes after they be delyuered. And also at the latter ende or in the thyrde or last boke is entreated of the conception of mankynde, and howe manye wayes it may be letted or furtheryd, with diuers other fruytefull thynges, as doth appere in the table before the booke* (London: Thomas Raynald, 1540). STC 21153.

females, with about 23% to queens.²⁷ This number of dedications to women seems to contradict Hull's earlier statement of 163 books aimed at female readers, but Hull makes a distinction between books whose subject matter was meant for women (163) and books that sought patronage from women (1,780). Hull also notes how women were not expected to read other languages, but were considered literate in English, as 20% of these early books were translations.

She divides women's books into four categories: practical guides, recreational literature, devotional works, and books relating to the controversy over the female sex. More than half of books for women were practical guides.²⁸ It is these practical guides which are the most revealing about women's daily lives because their topics are on everyday subjects, such as recipe books, needlework, marriage guides, educational guides, midwifery, and herbals. For recreational literature, Hull identifies these as books that would have been read for fun. Almost all were printed after 1570, also showing an increased literacy and expectation that women were reading.²⁹ Only 18 of her 163 identified books were devotional in nature, as she does not include Bibles, but does include prayer books, religious treatises, polemics, sermons, and eulogies. Books on the controversy of women examined the innate goodness or badness of women. The strength of Hull's book is that she did the leg work to identify and categorize books for women, leaving room for studies like mine. Many of the books I will be examining are not found

²⁷ Hull, *Chaste*, 20.

²⁸ Hull, *Chaste*, 31. She identifies this as 85%.

²⁹ Hull, *Chaste*, 71. She identifies this as one quarter of all books for women.

in her lists because she did not consider a dedication to a single female a clear indication of a targeted female audience.

Continuing this idea, Hull's other study examines books that were written for and about women, as she is interested in how men's views molded society and expectations of women. Specifically, Hull explores the instructions that men gave to women in print and what these reveal about the relationships between women and men. Again offering little analysis, Hull helpfully exposes readers to the types of prescriptive literature that were available in sixteenth century England. These included guide books which directed women to be meek and obedient and health treatises which were written by professionals so as to instruct women how to cure ailments, as they were still the day-to-day healers in many households. No matter if on childbirth, education, food preparation or fashion, descriptions of ideal women poured from the presses.

Studies on women as readers will also be useful to contextualize why authors and dedicators chose their subject matter and these queens, based on expected levels of literacy and readership. David Cressy has written the most important study on literacy in early modern England. In *Literacy and the Social Order*, he argues that at the time of the English Civil War, more than two-thirds of men and nine-tenths of women could not even write their own names, although he found literacy rates to be higher in or around London.³⁰ Cressy's estimation of seventy percent illiteracy at the time of the English Civil War still remains the accepted calculation. Heidi Braymen Hackel offers another

³⁰ David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 176.

final important study on women as readers.³¹ Hackel centers her study on recreational reading, that undertaken by merchants, gentlewomen, and servants. Her discussion of female reading practices suggests that reading was a highly individualistic process that can be better understood by examining women's libraries and the ways in which they read and inscribed their books.

William Sherman has convincingly argued that books in Renaissance England were not only read, but used, and the marks left in by users can offer vast information about the users as well as the lives of the books.³² While Sherman is most concerned with marginalia, his point is also illustrated with book dedications. Through dedications, one can see how a book was used, not necessarily by readers, but by printers, authors, and patrons. Manuscripts could also have dedications, but there was a difference in intentionality between a printed book that was distributed in large quantities to the public and most manuscripts. One particular chapter, "Reading the Matriarchive," explores the role of women in gathering information and using it in the household. In this chapter, Sherman notes that while it is difficult to determine works written and used by women, there are two types of texts that would have been typically utilized by women: printed works that celebrated historical women and offered lessons to women and manuscripts written by women for the sake of keeping records. Sherman suggests that exploring materials that would have been in a "matriarchive" is good starting ground for examining early modern women within modern archives.

³¹ Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

³² William Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

Andrew Pettegree's *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, while broadly concerned with the culture of persuading early modern people to convert from Catholicism to Protestantism, also contributes to the historiography of the use of books.³³ For Pettegree, books and print material were not the primary mode of spreading the Reformation, as previously thought, because books could be used for a host of reasons beyond reading them for the information that they contained. Book and printed material ownership, including pamphlets, did not constitute sympathy with reforming ideas. Book owners may have bought reforming texts because of the status associated with book ownership, simply to have books on their bookshelves, or because reforming ideas were sponsored by their rulers. Pettegree's newer study moves from how books were used within the Reformation to the transformation from the scholarly, medieval book world to the development of the sixteenth-century reading public.³⁴ He traces the existence of books before print, to the invention of printing, to the crisis of the first era of print, in which it was realized that material and ideas within printed books could not be controlled. Both Pettegree and Sherman make clear that print was quickly accepted as the new means of spreading ideas and arguments, but not every reader or user of print gleaned the same information from a printed work because books were used in many different ways.

More specifically, Margaret Beaufort has had the most written on her as a patroness of books. There have been two important articles relevant to Margaret

³³ Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

³⁴ Andrew Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

Beaufort and her involvement with Caxton and print culture. First is Susan Powell's "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books."³⁵ Powell investigates the relationship between Margaret Beaufort's piety and her books. Powell argues that Margaret Beaufort was active in the book trade to benefit herself, as well as others, spiritually. Powell traces books attributable to Margaret Beaufort through her will and household inventory, her relationship with Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde through book commissions, and her active translation of French devotional works into English so as to spread the circulation of devotional works to a wider audience. For all of the brilliant detail Powell incorporates of books owned by, commissioned by, and translated by Margaret Beaufort, there is no mention of any books dedicated to her. Yet this study will be a good starting point to look for dedications in all of the books connected with her.

The second article is Anne Clark Bartlett's "Translation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* (1489)."³⁶ Bartlett's article argues that courtly women readers had greater connection to works on secular governance than previously recognized, with Margaret Beaufort being an ultimate example. Margaret Beaufort commissioned Caxton to translate *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* from French into English in 1489. Though this text was a romance, it contained a thinly-veiled account of governance and was essentially a political manual for its aristocratic women readers. Again, this study has no real connection to works

³⁵ Susan Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," *The Library* 6 (1998), 197-240.

³⁶ Anne Clark Bartlett, "Translation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* (1489)," *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22 (Feb. 2006), 53-66.

dedicated to Margaret Beaufort, but it provides a foundation for my argument that through print culture and dedications women wielded power.

Moving to the six wives of Henry VIII, there is actually only one modern study which is concerned with books related to them, and that is James Carley's *The Books of King Henry VIII and His Wives*.³⁷ Carley examines the contents of the libraries held by King Henry VIII as well as books that belonged to his six wives. He argues that in studying these books, one can identify how Henry's collection of books reflected the king's changing views of religion and politics in his lifetime. Equally, his wives' books show a correlation between Henry's intellectual life and his views on marriage. Carley does not engage with each individual book owned by Henry VIII, as he has already accomplished that in his larger study, *The Libraries of Henry VIII*.³⁸ Rather, this companion work delves into generalities about the purpose of collecting books, the general content matter of his books, and how Henry VIII came to own his books. For Henry's wives, Carley only examines the first two and the last two, as Jane Seymour died before she could really establish a book collection, and Anne of Cleves was only queen for six months. Mainly, these women were collectors of religious texts, and according to Carley, most of the generally held conceptions of these women, such as Anne Boleyn and Katherine Parr being committed reformers, can be confirmed through an examination of these texts. Following the example of Tom Birrell's seminal Panizzi lecture "English Monarchs and Their Books," Carley offers no footnotes, but simply suggestions for

³⁷ James Carley, *The Books of King Henry VIII and His Wives* (London: The British Library, 2004).

³⁸ James Carley, *The Libraries of King Henry VIII* (London: The British Library, 2000).

further reading at the end of his study, leaving the reader wanting exact references and sources.³⁹

Maria Dowling mentions the importance of English Renaissance learning, but does so specifically in relation to humanism. In *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, she examines Henrician humanists, both scholars and amateurs, and their impact upon the court and especially religion.⁴⁰ She argues that it is important not to overestimate the importance of humanism in England, both Catholic and evangelical. For, though many humanists existed in England, they could, and often did, face open hostility, as did Thomas More. To construct her argument, Dowling defines humanism as the “reappraisal of religious and secular thinking through examination of the literary bases of theology and philosophy.”⁴¹ As such, an authoritative body of acceptable, classical texts needed to be established against which to measure current writings. This in turn required

³⁹ T.A. Birrell, *English Monarchs and their Books: from Henry VII to Charles II*. The second Panizzi Lecture, 1986 (London: The British Library, 1987).

⁴⁰ Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (Kent: Croom Helm, Ltd., 1986). Dowling’s work clearly is an interaction with and answer to James McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics Under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965). McConica explores the humanist community in early sixteenth-century England and how humanism affected politics. He identifies all English humanists as influenced by Erasmus, therefore having a blend of continental humanism and reform. McConica argues that humanism did have a great effect on court politics, which is the main argument that Dowling refutes. Dowling also refutes McConica’s other claim that Katherine Parr instituted and supported a scholastic nursery, which gave the younger two Tudor children their Protestant bent. Even under these two future rulers, when conservative humanism went underground, McConica argues that Erasmian humanism still flourished in England, just outside of doctrine and politics, and instead in universities, where it had always flourished. Every study on Tudor humanism has grappled with McConica’s work, as it was the first modern study on early English humanism. Though Dowling refutes most of McConica’s findings, McConica’s research is still relevant as the starting point for humanist studies.

⁴¹ Dowling, *Humanism*, 1.

knowledge of classical and biblical tongues. Yet, Dowling points out that humanism was not one coherent movement, so what was necessary and important to one humanist might not necessarily be so for the next. Thus, her study is limited to the reign of Henry VIII, for she considers the humanists of Elizabeth's time to be products of the English Renaissance, although they built upon Henrician humanist studies. She concludes that for the most part, these Henrician humanist scholars were men of very little personal importance, often receiving poor treatment and experiencing bad living conditions. This insignificant existence, however, allowed most of them to survive the tumultuous reign of Henry VIII. Yet, their personal insignificance also forced them to rely mainly on the patronage system for sponsorship and survival.

Of course Dowling mentions well-known humanists who lived and wrote in England, such as Erasmus, Roger Ascham, and Richard Croke. But of particular interest is her chapter "Women and the New Learning," in which she describes the types of humanist education available to Tudor women. Prior to the sixteenth century, learning of any type was just about off limits to females, as it was feared that knowledge would provoke sin in women. The first woman to receive the most traditional humanist education in England was Mary Tudor, daughter of Henry VIII, for, her education was actually meant to prepare her for a life of public service. Other women, however, also received schooling in the new learning. Anne Boleyn, for example, did not have formal Latin and Greek education, but studied scripture in at least French and English, and encouraged her ladies-in-waiting to do the same. Not surprisingly, humanist education was not universal for Henrician women, but in even allowing for women to be educated,

humanism marked a fundamental change in the attitude towards women's studies. The relatively small scale of female learning at the beginning of the sixteenth century laid the foundation for women's education by the end of the sixteenth century.

Dowling also wrote two short, important articles on Humanism and the Tudor queens. In "Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon," she argued that it was foolish to cross Henry VIII, but many English scholars did choose to support Katherine, with words and deeds.⁴² Those who were defenders of Katherine of Aragon were just as devoted to humanism as those who defended the king. Overall, this article is very generally about her supporters, typically mentioning Richard Fox and Bishop Fisher. The shorter article, "A Woman's Place? Learning and the Wives of Henry VIII," offers a short explanation on the contributions of Henry VIII's wives in promoting the new learning at court.⁴³ She argues that Henry VIII's wives should not all be treated with equal importance in relation to the new learning, as two stand out for their commitments to patronage in religious and cultural life, Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. Katherine Parr demonstrated that by the end of Henry's reign humanistic learning was desirable in women, and the other three queens had no real place in the new learning. In this, Dowling mentions many works dedicated to the queens and how they fit in with the new learning and religion. Being so brief, her article provides a good jumping off point for future studies of the Tudor queens and their role in humanism.

⁴² Maria Dowling, "Humanist Support for Catherine of Aragon," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984), 46-55.

⁴³ Maria Dowling, "A Woman's Place? Learning and the Wives of Henry VIII," *History Today* 41 (June 1991), 41-42.

There have been even fewer scholarly works concerned with Mary I, book dedications, and print culture. Any study that addresses Marian print does so from the point of view of examining whether or not English print flourished during her reign and whether or not Catholic or Protestant print did better.⁴⁴ John King has also contributed to the study of Marian print but from the standpoint of the book trade and readership.⁴⁵ Thus, this dissertation will be forging new ground in examining books associated with Mary, and will be situated within the new revisionist histories of Marian religion. Two specific studies come from Eamon Duffy.⁴⁶ In *Fires of Faith*, Duffy reassesses Catholicism under Mary, setting out to argue against outdated approaches of Reformation historiography which view Mary's church as backward-looking. Rather, Duffy argues that the Marian church had a reforming agenda and while it lasted, was effective. He does not look at the entirety of religious belief and behavior in England while Mary was queen, but focuses specifically on the Marian regime and its role in mid-Tudor Catholicism. Also unlike earlier historiography, Duffy identifies Cardinal Pole, not Mary

⁴⁴ See J.W. Martin, "The Marian Regime's Failure to Understand the Importance of Printing," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 44 (Autumn 1981), 231-247.; Jennifer Loach, "The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press," *The English Historical Review* 101 (January 1986), 135-148.; D.M. Loades, "The Press Under the Early Tudors: A Study in Censorship and Sedition," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society* 4 (1964), 29-50.

⁴⁵ See John N. King, "The Account of a Marian Bookseller, 1553-4," *British Library Journal* 13 (Spring 1987), 33-57.; "The Book Trade Under Edward VI and Mary I," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume III, 1400-1557*, eds. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 164-178.; *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁴⁶ Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).; Eamon Duffy and David Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

herself, as the driving force behind Marian reform, although the queen was active. My dissertation will be similar to Duffy's assessment, in that it will not examine book dedications to Mary in the context of all religion in England, but their relationship with and impact on Marian reforms.

Duffy and David Loades's edited collection is also a revisionist study of Marian religion, addressing many aspects of religion under Mary, not just the reform that she oversaw. Their study provides much of the context that cannot be found in Duffy's solo study. Specifically, in an introductory chapter on Mary's personal religion, David Loades offers a few sentences on Marian dedications, against which I intend to argue. He claims, "she received innumerable dedications of works of Catholic devotion or polemic; but they tell us nothing beyond the fact that she was famously orthodox, and reputed to be remarkably learned for a woman."⁴⁷ While dedications may not reflect Mary's personal convictions, as just because a person owned or supported a book did not mean that they read it, dedications to Mary offer much more than the facts that Mary was Catholic and educated. I am not so interested in whether or not her reform was effective or well-implemented, but how dedicators, and by extension authors, theologians, and humanists, wrote about it.

As scholars are currently in the process of rehabilitating Mary's reign and character, the newest biographies as well as studies of Marian England will be most

⁴⁷ David Loades, "The Personal Religion of Mary," in Eamon Duffy and David Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 19-20.

useful.⁴⁸ This dissertation will fit in with these new revisionist discussions. While my main goal is not to write a rehabilitation of Mary or her religion, I will show that Mary was an active participant in the religious affairs of England and that she did have support, particularly from humanists and clergy. Through my examination of books associated with Mary Tudor (and to a lesser extent those associated with Lady Margaret Beaufort and the six wives of Henry VIII), I will argue that book dedications were a space where men and women negotiated ideas of education, politics, and religion.

⁴⁸ John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).; Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2010).

CHAPTER II

LADY MARGARET BEAUFORT AND THE WIVES OF HENRY VIII

This chapter is meant to serve as background to the printed book dedications directed to Queen Mary I. It will first examine the printed dedications given to Lady Margaret Beaufort. Next, I will explicate the printed dedications given to the six consorts of Henry VIII, the subject matter of those dedicated books, and the influence of royal printers on book dedications. The late-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (the period in which these royal ladies lived) saw a transition from manuscripts to printed books, and with this change in media came change in book dedications and their uses. The dedications discussed in this chapter demonstrate the commercial potential of printed book dedications, particularly in the new market of print. Yet, this chapter also suggests that once commercial success was determined, dedicators were able to use printed dedications to appeal for patronage.

The printed book dedications directed at Lady Margaret were more often than not given from a commercial perspective; men dedicated books to Lady Margaret to have her name endorse the new practice of print. Her name was also invoked in colophons because she gave authority to texts and enhanced their commercial potential. Nevertheless, Lady Margaret actively involved herself in the printing process, perhaps even making suggestions to printers. The model of attaching Lady Margaret's name to a

book was so successful that dedicators attached the names of the six consorts of Henry VIII to enhance their importance and saleability. But printed dedications to the six wives of Henry VIII were more clearly done as an attempt to gain or maintain patronage relationships, knowingly appealing to the consorts so that they in turn would entreat Henry VIII on the behalf of the dedicators.

Granted, these women had different roles and responsibilities than Mary. Consorts might have had great influence, but they often had to work through others to effect change or give rewards. However, in tracing the dedications of Lady Margaret as a royal lady, the six wives who, as royal ladies, received printed book dedications, and Queen Mary I as the most powerful lady to receive book dedications, one can discern a pattern among dedications to royal women. In sum, this chapter will reveal how dedications to Tudor queens were first written and formulated and the impact that these early dedications had on the manuscript and print dedications given to Mary Tudor.

Lady Margaret Beaufort

This chapter begins with a cursory look at the dedications to Lady Margaret, as straddling the new type of client-patron relationship that developed with the early book trade.⁴⁹ One may wonder why Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby, is the launching point for this chapter, and not Elizabeth of York, queen to Henry VII. Mainly, this is because Elizabeth of York only received one printed book dedication, and it was

⁴⁹ “At the centre of these networks stands the figure of Lady Margaret Beaufort who, it would seem, through her own developed literary and devotional preoccupations became a means of stimulating new publishing initiatives, and hence new markets for early printed books.” Edwards and Meale, “Marketing,” 115.

shared jointly with Lady Margaret Beaufort. So while she might have more in common, in terms of roles and responsibilities, with the six consorts, she simply did not receive enough dedications to warrant beginning this study. The dedication that she and Lady Margaret share will be described below. Moreover, Lady Margaret's literary patronage has been well-documented, making her fit better in a study on dedications to royal ladies. Of all of the women mentioned in this dissertation, Lady Margaret has been the subject of the most modern scholarship of her relationship to books and literary culture.⁵⁰ Finally, Lady Margaret also is a model example of how a "female audience for early English printing had been developed in the fifteenth century," mainly via religious houses and aristocratic women.⁵¹ She was closely tied to both communities. Lady Margaret was the first English royal lady to see the real use of print, and printers found real use of her.

Franklin B. Williams identified ten printed books dedicated to Lady Margaret Beaufort. I concur with his number, but I will also mention one dedicated manuscript.⁵²

⁵⁰ See M.J.C. Lowry, "Caxton, St Winifred, and the Lady Margaret Beaufort," *The Library*, 6th Series 5 (1983), 101-117; William E.A. Axon, "The Lady Margaret Beaufort as a Lover of Literature," *The Library*, 2nd Series 9 (1907), 34-41; A.S. Bailey, "A Royal Patroness of Learning: Margaret Beaufort, Mother of Henry VII, of England," *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 19 (1917), 612-645.; Susan Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," *The Library* 6 (1998), 197-240. Catherine Nall, "Margaret Beaufort's Books: a New Discovery," *Journal of the Early Book Society* 16 (2013), 213-220.

⁵¹ Mary C. Erler, *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 133.

⁵² Of course Lady Margaret also had other manuscripts associated with her that were not dedicated to her. Westminster Abbey holds a prayer book with illuminations of the badges of both her and her third husband, Thomas Stanley. Both Michael K. Jones and Malcolm G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), and Janet Backhouse, "Illuminated Manuscripts associated with Henry VII and Members of his Immediate Family," In *The Reign of Henry VII: Proceedings of the 1993 Harlaxton*

A cursory look at these ten books reveals that seven did not really contain dedications to her, but simply mention her in the colophon as commanding or funding their printing. A colophon is a production note giving information pertinent to the publication of a book. In early modern books, this information tended to be on the last page in a brief paragraph, and made a book look more like a manuscript, in that the author, location of creation, and date all tapered to signify the end of the manuscript. Colophons could also be incorporated into the frontispiece (title page), but that became more common as the sixteenth century progressed. Those that mention Lady Margaret tend to follow a generic formula of listing the printer, the location of the printer's house, and Lady Margaret as a funder or commissioner of the book, as well as the date of publication. For example, the title page of *Imitatio Christi* features a woodcut of a pieta, Mary cradling a deceased Christ. Beneath that reads:

A full deuout and gostly treatyse of the Imytacion and folowyng the
blessed Lyfe of oure moste mercyfull Sauyoure criste: compyled in Laten
by the right worshypfull Doctor Mayster John Gerson: and translate into
Englysshe: The yere of oure lorde. M.D. ii. By mayster wyllyan Atkynson
Doctor of diuinite: at the specyall request and cōmaundement of the full

Symposium. Benjamin Thompson, ed. (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995), identify this manuscript as Westminster Abbey MS 39. This manuscript is more commonly known as the Beaufort Hours, as it was passed down in Lady Margaret's family and contains handwritten inscriptions of important family dates, such as birthdays. Backhouse also mentions illuminated manuscripts that were most-likely owned by Elizabeth of York and Margaret Beaufort, as they show evidence of being family heirlooms with incorporations of the Tudor rose. Some of these manuscripts also have additions of family names and births that suggest ownership by Lady Margaret and Elizabeth of York, such as the Beaufort Hours. St Johns College, Cambridge has a manuscript with an inscription indicating that it was given to Lady Margaret by Lady Shirley, wife of Richard Shirley, who was one of Lady Margaret's baliffs. College Classmark N.24. Referred to as MS 264 in Montague Rhodes James's *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), 311-313.

excellent Pryncesse Margarete moder to our Souerayne lorde kynge henry the. vii. and Countesse of Rychemount and Derby.⁵³

Only three of the ten dedications mention Lady Margaret beyond the colophon: *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*, the *Hereford Breviary*, and Bishop John Fisher's sermons entitled the *Fruytful Saynges of King Davyd*.⁵⁴ Since Williams included the seven colophons in his compendium, I will also treat them as dedications, while differentiating between colophons and actual dedicatory verses in my discussion below. As is usual for the types of works that these colophons accompany, they show that Lady Margaret not only read works in English and French, but that she was integral in getting foreign language books printed in English for the benefit of other English readers and hearers.⁵⁵ But printers would not have included Lady Margaret's name just to inform their readers that she liked the book, but rather to use her name and approval of the book as a marketing strategy to bolster the importance of a book. I suggest that colophons and dedications to Lady Margaret were given generally for commercial purposes, to promote the sales of books made with the new printing technology, while the dedications to the six wives, which will be discussed later, were given for different purposes.

⁵³ John Gerson, *Imitatio Christi*. Trans. by William Atkinson (London: Richard Pynson, 1504). STC 23995.

⁵⁴ *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* (Westminster: William Caxton, 1490).; *Hereford Breviary* (Rouen: Inghelbert Hague, 1505). STC 3124.; John Fisher, *Treatise concernynge the fruytfull saynges of Dauyd the kynge* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1508). STC 10902.

⁵⁵ John Fisher, *The English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester*, ed. by John E.B. Mayor (London: Early English Text Society, 1876), 292. In his "Mornyng remembraunce" sermon for Lady Margaret, Fisher note that "right ftudyos fhe was in bokes whiche fhe hadde in grete nombre bothe in Englysshe & in Frensshe, & for her exercyfe & for the prouffyte of other fhe dyde translate dyvers maters of deuocyon out of Frensshe into Englysshe."

Born on 31 May 1443, Margaret Beaufort was the daughter of John Beaufort, duke of Somerset, and Margaret Beauchamp of Bletsoe.⁵⁶ Her paternal great-grandfather was John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, through his later marriage with Katherine Swynford, making the Beaufort line arguably illegitimate. Four days after her father's death, Margaret was made ward of William de la Pole, Marquess of Suffolk, and she was subsequently betrothed to his son John de la Pole. The betrothal was broken off in 1453, and Margaret never considered herself to be married to Pole. Thereafter, Margaret was made ward of Jasper and Owen Tudor, half-brothers of King Henry VI. Edmund Tudor married Margaret in 1455, the couple moved to Wales, and she quickly conceived. On 1 November 1456, Edmund died from the plague, leaving his thirteen-year-old wife six months pregnant. Margaret gave birth to the future Henry VII on 28 January 1457.

⁵⁶ Early biographies of Margaret Beaufort tend to be hagiographical, treating her as an example for all women of the fifteenth century. See Caroline A. Halsted, *Life of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, Mother of Henry VII* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1839), 94-95. "In the performance of her conjugal and maternal duties, she has been justly held up as a bright example to her sex. Nevertheless every earthly feeling was chastened by the higher claims due to her Maker. It was her habit to rise at five, and she invariably passed the time till ten – the dinner-time of that period – in deep meditation and prayer. The remainder of the day was given to the exercise of every virtue that could adorn with Christian grace her exalted rank. Wherever was her abiding place, blessings followed the steps of the illustrious Margaret." See also E.M.G. Routh, *A Memoir of Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond & Derby, Mother of Henry VII* (London: Oxford University Press, 1924). Newer treatments of Margaret Beaufort, while still reverent, portray her as an active woman who was the power behind her son winning his crown. For a full biography of Lady Margaret, see Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, now considered the most authoritative biography. Jones and Underwood confirm Margaret's birthday as the earliest date written in the Beaufort Book of Hours, 34.

Margaret was wed to Henry Stafford, second son of Humphrey Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, in 1458 in what was technically her third marriage.⁵⁷ Her son, Henry Tudor, was taken from Margaret in 1462 and made ward of William, Lord Herbert. After Edward IV's confinement in 1469, Margaret took a keen political interest in her son's future.⁵⁸ In 1471, Henry Tudor became a possible Lancastrian claimant to the throne. He then sought sanctuary in France to protect this possibility. Stafford died on 4 October that same year. On 12 June 1472, Margaret entered her fourth marriage, this time to Thomas Stanley, second Baron Stanley. Politically astute, Margaret arranged for her son to share in her estates and wealth, arranged for the return of her son, and negotiated his marriage to Elizabeth of York, which eventually took place after the Battle of Bosworth.⁵⁹ On 9 April 1483, Edward IV died, and his brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester, was made protector of Edward's sons. But Richard had them declared illegitimate and accepted the crown for himself on 26 June 1483.⁶⁰ Upon Henry's return to England from sanctuary in France, he defeated Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth and became king. On 7 November 1485, Margaret was declared *femme sole*, and was legally made an independent woman within marriage. This has given rise to questions of

⁵⁷ Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 41.

⁵⁸ Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 49.

⁵⁹ Fisher, *English Works*, 291. In her month's mind sermon, Fisher notes that "Fyrst she was of singuler wysedome ferre passynge the comyn rate of women."

⁶⁰ Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 61.

her signature of “Margaret R,” and whether or not she meant it to mean *regina* or Richmond.⁶¹

As the king’s mother, Margaret worked tirelessly for the benefit of her son, her ladies, and her country. She consolidated lands, set up a royal council, and became a famous patron of the arts and education. She became a benefactor of Cambridge University, and upon her death her executors, especially Bishop Fisher, endowed professorships of divinity, as well as re-founded Christ’s College and established St. John’s College with her monetary support, albeit with much difficulty. Her work as a literary patron will be explicated below. Lady Margaret must have shared her enthusiasm for education and reading with her son. In 1492, he hired Quintin Poulet of Lille to be royal librarian, who remained in his service until approximately 1506. Poulet, a Flemish illuminator and scribe, was the first man recorded to hold this post.⁶² Henry VII died just two months before his mother, letting her to see the marriage and coronation of her grandson Henry VIII to Katherine of Aragon. Upon Margaret’s death in 1509, her month’s mind sermon, or mass celebrated one month after a person’s death, was delivered by Bishop John Fisher, one of her closest friends and collaborators behind her Cambridge foundations.⁶³ She was interred in Westminster Abbey, in the same chapel as

⁶¹ Jones and Underwood, *The King’s Mother*, 86. From the 1460s to 1499, Margaret signed “M. Richmond.” In 1499, Lady Margaret adopted the new form “Margaret R,” mirroring the royal style of placing an “R” after one’s name to represent rex or regina. Yet, for Lady Margaret, this “R” most likely stood for “Richmond,” her highest title. See also Bartlett, “Translation,” 57.

⁶² Backhouse, “Illuminated Manuscripts,” 175.

⁶³ Fisher, *English Works*, 289-310. Reprinted here. In this sermon, Fisher compares Lady Margaret to the biblical Martha.

her son and daughter-in-law, with an effigy by Pietro Torrigiano, a Florentine sculptor, and an inscription written by Erasmus.

During her lifetime, and ever since, Lady Margaret was regarded as a literary patroness. In Bishop Fisher's "Mornyng remembraunce" sermon for Lady Margaret's month's mind, Fisher mentions that she was a mother to universities and a patroness to learned men for the benefit of England.⁶⁴ According to Susan Powell, foremost authority on Lady Margaret and her association with books, Lady Margaret frequently purchased and read manuscripts and books, and she even had a library at her house at Collyweston. She was not that unusual for her time, as other royal ladies, including her own grandmother, Margaret Holland, Duchess of Clarence, read, were pious, and had close connections with religious foundations.⁶⁵ But Powell does convincingly argue that Lady Margaret's involvement in the book trade was largely for the religious benefit of herself and others, using Lady Margaret's household accounts to trace when she purchased books, how often, and how much she paid for them.⁶⁶ In doing so, Powell shows that

⁶⁴ Fisher, *English Works*, 301.

⁶⁵ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 198-199. The importance of Powell's article is that it makes great use of Lady Margaret's household accounts to reconfigure her reading habits and relationships with books. Powell is also in the process of editing all of Lady Margaret's household accounts at St John's, Cambridge in order to publish them.

⁶⁶ Susan Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort: 'Of singuler wysedome ferre passynge the comyn rate of women,'" in *The Brown Book: A Commemorative Edition for the 500th Anniversary of the Death of Lady Margaret Beaufort* (Oxford: Lady Margaret Hall, 2009), 7 and 10. Rebecca Krug suggests that Lady Margaret read because reading and writing was part of her familial and social relationships. Krug, *Reading Families: Women's Literate Practice in Late Medieval England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 122. Krug argues that Lady Margaret's "literate practice" was influenced by her social, cultural, and intellectual surroundings.

Lady Margaret purchased books that were often translations of French and Latin, as she was not able to read Latin herself.⁶⁷

Building from Powell's study, I contend that Lady Margaret did command many works to be translated and printed for their religious benefit, but that printers were quick to mention Lady Margaret's commandment in their colophons to associate their books with her as a marketing tool. Noting that a book was good enough to be recommended by the queen mother for print must have shown ordinary readers that the book was worth purchasing and recommending to others to purchase.⁶⁸ Printers profited by including her name within their colophons. Works related to Margaret show that she had a unique relationship with print and that she understood its potential to distribute texts. For royal women in the generations after Lady Margaret (particularly the six consorts of Henry VIII and Mary I), book dedications took on different forms and meanings.

Besides being actively engaged in commissioning books to be translated and printed, Lady Margaret actively translated as well, and her desire to translate texts was appreciated in her own lifetime. In his "Mornyng remembraunce" sermon, Fisher noted that "As for medytacyon she had dyvers bokes in Frensshe wherewith she wolde occupy herselfe whan she was wery of prayer. Whefore dyvers she dyde translate oute of Frensshe into Englysshe."⁶⁹ Powell notes that in 1503 Pynson printed the first three

⁶⁷ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 201.

⁶⁸ See Yu-Chiao Wang, "Caxton's Romances and Their Early Tudor Readers," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (2004), 173-188. Wang argues that Caxton marketed his romances with "celebrity endorsement," but meant them to have wider readership, 173.

⁶⁹ Fisher, *English Works*, 295.

books of *Imitatio Christi*, as were translated by William Atkinson, a fellow at Cambridge, in 1502. Lady Margaret commissioned the printing of Atkinson's translation in 1503, as the colophon of book three states. Once she became aware of a fourth book, she herself translated it from a French-language edition, and Pynson added it to Atkinson's translation in a 1504 edition.⁷⁰ Lady Margaret also commissioned the 1504 edition.⁷¹ It was reprinted in 1517, 1519, and 1528 with the original title page that mentions Lady Margaret's commission. Powell also suggests that Lady Margaret later purchased and distributed many copies of *Imitatio*, specifically to Syon Abbey.⁷² This colophon, like many others, not only shows Lady Margaret's interest in the use of print translating work into English for the benefit of England by providing it with accessible religious texts, but also the commercial possibilities of adding a specific patron's name to the title page.

Interestingly, the ten dedications were printed by only four different printers, and these four printers wrote all of the dedications except for one. Bishop John Fisher, long-time friend and confessor of Lady Margaret, actually wrote a dedication to her of his *Fruytful Saynges of King Davyd*. The printers affiliated with Lady Margaret were William Caxton, who printed the two earliest books at her command, one with a dedication and one with only a colophon; Richard Pynson, who included her in the colophon of two printed books; Inghelbert Hague, who dedicated one book to her that was printed in Rouen; and Wynkyn de Worde, who included her in five colophons, only

⁷⁰ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 217.

⁷¹ Gerson, *Imitatio Christi*. See Brenda M. Hosington, "Lady Margaret Beaufort's Translations as Mirrors of Practical Piety," in Micheline, White, ed., *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2011), 185-203.

⁷² Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 223-224.

printing the actual dedication by Fisher.⁷³ Also interesting is that all dedications to Lady Margaret were made after the late 1480s, when she would have been in her late fifties and sixties. This is probably because of the late arrival of the printing press to England and because of her elevated importance as mother to the king after 1485.⁷⁴ Caxton was actually the man who introduced print to England. He printed the first English-language book, *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, in 1473 from Bruges, and set up the first print shop in Westminster in 1476, where he first printed Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*.

Lady Margaret also received the dedication of a handwritten Italian manuscript by Giovanni de Gigli on the office of the mass of the feast of the Holy name of Jesus.⁷⁵ Giovanni de Gigli was Bishop of Worcester, a papal official, and a diplomat for the English crown. On 1 July 1490 he was made the resident ambassador of England in Rome, where he remained until his death in 1498. Susan Powell argues that Lady Margaret was responsible for initiating the feast of the Holy Name in England, as she was fond of using the prayers associated with the feast. Richard Pynson printed the office and proper (the part of the Catholic liturgy that varies according to date or feast day) of the mass in 1493, probably at the instigation of Lady Margaret, and again printed it in 1497,

⁷³ Joseph Ames, *Typographical Antiquities or The History of Printing in England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Edited by Thomas Frognall Dibdin (1810-1819). First published 1749. In three volumes. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagbuchhandlung, 1969), reprints all of Caxton's, Wynkyn De Worde's, Richard Pynson's titles, along with titles of other, less prolific printers.

⁷⁴ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 208. Powell makes a similar point.

⁷⁵ British Library, Additional MS 33772. The dedication page of the manuscript is reprinted in Jones and Underwood, plate 14, and discussed on pp. 176-177.

but without the dedication.⁷⁶ De Gigli's scant twelve lines appear to be those of a humanist attempting to recreate classical Latin.

All of the books associated with Lady Margaret seem to sincerely attest to her piety except for *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*, the earliest book dedicated to her.

Blanchardyn and Eglantine is a medieval courtly romance with French origins. It is the story of a prince named Blanchardyn who learns chivalry and embarks on tournaments until he finds himself in Tournaday, the realm of Eglantine. He is told that to win Eglantine's heart he must surprise her with a kiss. When Blanchardyn unexpectedly kisses Eglantine she falls from her horse. An embarrassed Eglantine then swears war on Blanchardyn, but during the course of the battles, Eglantine sees the courage and trustworthiness of Blanchardyn and slowly falls in love with him.

Lady Margaret Beaufort first came across this romance when she purchased a French manuscript copy from William Caxton.⁷⁷ In his appendix on the versions of *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*, Kellner identifies six manuscript versions of the romance all in French verse, and five prose versions, with two in French manuscripts and three in print in English.⁷⁸ On EEBO, three editions of *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* exist: 1490, 1595, and 1597. Lady Margaret was only associated with the first English edition. As

⁷⁶ For a fuller explanation, see Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 208-210.

⁷⁷ *Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine, c. 1489, From Lord Spencer's Unique Imperfect Copy, Completed by the Original French and the Second English Version of 1595*. Leon Kellner, ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1890), cxxiii. Kellner identifies Caxton's French manuscript as having only one extant edition.

the dedication explains, Lady Margaret quickly asked Caxton to translate this work into English, and he dedicated his translation to her. As this is the first dedication received by Lady Margaret, and an example of how Lady Margaret solidified relationships with important printers in England, the dedication is presented below in its entirety:

Unto the right noble puyssaunt & excellent pryncesse, my redoubted lady, my lady Margarete, duchesse of Somercete / Moder vnto our naturel & souerayn lord and most Crysten Kyng henry the seuenth, by the grace of god, Kyng of englonde & of ffranunce, lord of yrelonde, & cetera, I, wyllyam caxton, his most Indygne humble subgette and lytil seruaunt, presente this lytyl booke vnto the noble grace of my sayd lady. Whiche booke I late receyued in frenshe from her good grace, and her commaundement wyth alle / for to reduce and translate it in to our maternal & englysh tonge / whiche booke I had longe to fore solde to my sayd lady, and knewe wel that the storye of hit was honeste & loyefull to all vertuose yong noble gentylnen & wymmen for to rede therin, as for their passé tyme; for vnder correction, in my Iudgement / it is as requesyte other whyle to role in Auncyent hystories of noble fayttes & valiaunt actes of armes & warre, whiche haue ben achyued in olde tyme of many noble prynces, lordes, & knyghtes / as wel for to see & knowe their walyauntes for to stande in the specyal grace & loue of their ladyes, And in lykewyse for gentyl yonge ladyes & damoysellys, for to lerne to be stedfaste & constaunt in their parte to theym that they onse haue promised and agreed to such as haue putte their lyues ofte in leoparde for to playse theym to stande in grace, As it is to occupye theym and studye ouer moche in bokes of contemplacion; wherefore, at thynstaunce and requeste of my sayd lady, whiche I repute as for a commaundement, I haue reduced this sayd booke out of frenshe in to our englyshe: whiche booke specyfyeth of the noble actes and fayttes of warre, ashyued by a noble and victorious prynce named Blanchardin, sone vnto the kyng of Fryse / for the loue of a noble pryncesse callyd Eglantyne, other wyse named in frensche 'Iorguylleuse damours,' whiche is as moche to saye in englyshe, as the proud lady of loue, quene of tramaday: And of the grete aduentures, labours, anguysshes / and many other grete dyseases of theym both, tofore they mughte atteyne for to come to the fynall conclusion of their desired loue / as alonge by the grace of god it shall be shewed in thistorye of thys presente booke / Besechyng my sayd ladyes bountyuous grace to

⁷⁸ Kellner, *Caxton's*, cxvi. The three English print versions that he identifies correlate with the three English versions on EEBO. However, EEBO identifies the earliest version as from 1490, while Kellner identifies it as circa 1489.

receyue this lityll boke in gree of me, her humble seruaunt / and to
pardoune me of the rude and comyn englyshe, where as shall be found
fauhte; For I confesse me not lerned, ne knowynge the arte of rethoryk / ne
of suche gaye termes as know be sayd in these dayes and vsed: But I hope
that it shall be vnderstoden of the reders and herers: And that shall suffice.

Besechyng allmyghty god to graunte to her moste noble goode grace,
longe lyffe / and thacomplesshement of hir hihe, noble, and loyes desires
in thys present lyff,

And after this short and transytorye lyff, euer lastyng lyff in heuen.
Amen.⁷⁹

Apart from Lady Margaret being an excellent princess, her most important asset was that she was mother to the king, which Caxton acknowledged at the beginning of his dedication. However, Caxton called her Duchess of Somerset, which was her mother's title. As was typical of dedications, Caxton continued with modesty, but immediately coupled his modesty with a statement of how Lady Margaret had previously made a purchase from him of the French version of *Blanchardyn and Eglantine*. Lady Margaret was literate in English and French, but not Latin, which she lamented. She then commanded Caxton to translate this book into English, as he was known for being a printer and a translator. When he mentioned that he had previously sold this book to Lady Margaret, he also mentioned that he knew it was "honeste" for decent young nobles to read to pass the time. It was appropriate for young gentlemen because it was a story of ancient knights who took up arms, which was something young men should aspire to. Moreover, it offered a model for young men of how to receive the love of a lady. This book was appropriate for young noble women because it would teach them how to be

⁷⁹ Reprinted in Kellner, *Caxton's*, 1-2, and W.J.B. Crotch, *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* (London: Early English Text Society, 1928), 104-105. The dedication is not included on EEBO.

steadfast in both love and promises, which, for Caxton, was just as important a lesson for women to learn as were those offered in books of contemplation. Here, Caxton was traditional in his views that women should not spend too much time thinking or studying because it was a more fruitful endeavor of men. So, perhaps Caxton suggested this text to her early in their relationship as something that was appropriate for a noble woman, which could explain her interest in this romance. After his brief explanation and justification for printing this romance, Caxton concluded his dedication typically by taking responsibility for any problems with the translation, praising his patroness one last time, and finishing with a prayer.

Perhaps this book interested Lady Margaret because it told of the “noble actes and fayttes of warre.” Only five years earlier her son, Henry VII, won the throne of England through an act of war. Lady Margaret may have read the French version of *Blanchardyn* and saw a suitable justification or legitimation of her son’s acts of war. While being entertaining, this book could have confirmed a prince’s right to engage in war for the benefit of love, which would have been a sound allegory for Henry’s love of England and even Elizabeth of York. Jones and Underwood also note that culture dictated the nobility be interested not only in learning, but also in chivalry and history.⁸⁰ So, Lady Margaret’s interest in *Blanchardyn* may have just been a product of her culture, but Lady Margaret may have been brought together with Caxton because of politics.⁸¹

A few scholars have actually grappled with why Lady Margaret would have been interested in a romance when every other work that she commissioned was religious in

⁸⁰ Jones and Underwood, *The King’s Mother*, 171.

⁸¹ Jones and Underwood, *The King’s Mother*, 181-182.

nature. Anne Clark Bartlett sees *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* as a romance meant for instructing females in governance and statecraft. For Bartlett, Eglantine is not a passive victim of courtly literature, but an example of how men and women could work together politically, which is why it appealed to Lady Margaret. Eglantine was a heroine because in the battle scenes she observed the fighting and ran her fortification.⁸² As such, this romance is a mirror for princesses as much as Machiavelli's *The Prince* was a mirror for princes, in that it offers advice on seeking wise council, yet also provides guidance for women not found in traditional manuals, such as how to handle marriage negotiation.⁸³ So for Bartlett, while it might not seem logical for this text to appeal to Lady Margaret, it did so because it validated women in governance, even if only within the family and estates.

Jennifer Summit offers a more gendered and post-modern analysis of Caxton's use of Lady Margaret as a patron for a romance text when she was known to be a lover of religious texts.⁸⁴ For Summit, Lady Margaret was not really involved in the printing of this book, but was only mentioned to serve Caxton's commercial needs.⁸⁵ Summit sees Caxton's prologue as an instance of courtly love, in which Lady Margaret was idealized and became a romantic figure while the actual power of the relationship was left to men.

⁸² Bartlett, "Translation," 58.

⁸³ Bartlett, "Translation," 57.

⁸⁴ Jennifer Summit, "William Caxton, Margaret Beaufort, and the Romance of Female Patronage," in *Women, the Book and the Worldly: Selected Proceedings of the St Hilda's Conference, 1993*. Volume II. Ed. by Lesley Smith and Jane H.M. Taylor (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1995), 151-165.

⁸⁵ Summit, "William Caxton," 155-156.

However, there is one major flaw in Summit's deductions: they deny Lady Margaret any agency in the printing of this book. Summit acknowledges that Lady Margaret was known to be active in the accumulation and print of religious books, yet doubts that she had an interest in *Blanchardyn* because it was a romance. As already noted, Lady Margaret was connected with having commanded ten books, so it cannot be believable that nine commandments to print were legitimate, while one was simply flattery and an effort to attach a woman's name to a book. Lady Margaret probably did commission *Blanchardyn* out of genuine interest, and Caxton then used that relationship to his commercial advantage. This attachment of Lady Margaret with a piece of romance literature also does not strike Susan Powell as odd either; it simply was the earliest known book that Lady Margaret was interested in, and that it appears as though it was the only romance that she ever promoted. By this time Lady Margaret was in her forties and may just have become more interested in religious works once she realized the patronage power that she actually exerted as the king's mother.⁸⁶

But, as Edwards and Meale note, it is very difficult to determine the exact role of Lady Margaret in the printing of *Blanchardyn*, even though she was mentioned as having commanded its translation.⁸⁷ While Edwards and Meale are very skeptical of the ability of scholars to determine client-patron relationships between printers and patrons, I

⁸⁶ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 206. Powell dates *Blanchardyn* to 1488, using the dating provided by George Painter, *William Caxton: A Quincentenary Biography of England's First Printer* (London: Chatto and Wyndus, 1976). The STC dates it at 1490.

⁸⁷ Edwards and Meale, "Marketing," 97. They note that Caxton's dedications and prologues were vague, making it difficult to determine the actual relationship between patron and client. Moreover, Caxton hardly ever mentions actual money exchanging hands as concrete evidence of patronage.

suggest that dedications and colophons that mention commandments by patrons can be understood as having actually happened. This should be the case with *Blanchardyn*, as Caxton later printed another work at Lady Margaret's commandment, and she most likely would not have allowed Caxton to attach her name to a work if he had earlier mentioned her without her permission or approval. Besides, in Lady Margaret's household accounts payment to printers is frequently mentioned, even if the names of the books purchased or commissioned were not recorded, as it was more important to account for the fees of the books than their titles.⁸⁸ Therefore, even if the exact relationship is difficult to ascertain, Lady Margaret was certainly involved in the printing and distribution of books.

While *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* seems to be exceptional compared to all of the religious texts associated with Lady Margaret, its dedication to her really may not be that unusual. It was the first dedication that Lady Margaret received. Perhaps she was just establishing a relationship with Caxton and was not yet sure of his ability to translate texts. As a reader of French and English, Lady Margaret may have been able to use *Blanchardyn* to measure his ability as a translator and printer to the royal family. This book was the first dedicated to Lady Margaret, but it was not the first dedication of an English-language book by Caxton. He printed the first English book in 1473 in Bruges, and dedicated it to Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy, who was an Englishwoman.

Importantly, *Blanchardyn and Eglantine* serves an example of a text that straddles the transition from the medieval to the early modern period. It follows in the tradition of French and English love literature directed at a courtly audience, particularly as it was bought by one of the most important women of the court. Lady Margaret may have even

⁸⁸ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 207.

purchased it and ordered its translation so that the young members of the court could read a piece of love literature of which she approved. Lady Margaret was very much concerned with having books printed for the benefit of English readers, as evidenced by the number of colophons which stated that she commissioned or funded the books to which they were attached.

The *Hereford Breviary* is the second book which bears an actual dedication to Lady Margaret, and also attests to her desire to see books printed for the benefit of English readers. Printed in only one edition in 1505, the breviary also exists in approximately five manuscript editions, with the earliest dated to the thirteenth century.⁸⁹ It also exists in one modern edition in which the title page and the dedicatory preface are included via photocopy, while the remainder of the breviary has been retyped, noting the changes among the five manuscript and one printed editions.⁹⁰ Lady Margaret's household accounts indicate that she purchased two vellum copies of the breviary by Inghelbert Hague on 20 August 1505.⁹¹ The title page of the printed edition features the title *Breviarium secundum usum herford*. Beneath the title is a woodcut of the device of Lady Margaret, and beneath the device are four lines that praise her. They read,

No(n) opis est clero que digna repe(n)dere possit
Pro tantis meritis alma virago tuis
Ecclesie sacris que margareta ministris
Consulis /ethereo vive beata polo.

⁸⁹ *The Hereford Breviary Edited From the Rouen Edition of 1505 with Collation of Manuscripts*. Walter Howard Frere. ed. Vol. 1. (London: 1904), ix. STC 15793.

⁹⁰ *Hereford Breviary*, Frere, ix.

⁹¹ Powell, "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books," 226.

“No work of a cleric can be considered worthy of the great merits of your ladyship, and of the sacred ministers of the church whom you advise. I wish that you may live eternally blessedly.”⁹² These words seem typical of book dedications, as straight-forward praise for the dedicatee while the author assumes a position of modesty. The actual paragraph dedication which follows these four lines, however, is not so typical.⁹³

The dedication is in Latin as well and begins by praising Lady Margaret for being mother to King Henry VII, and continues on to hope that this breviary is worthy of her, which is quite traditional. Hague mentioned how he had first purchased this breviary at a marketplace in Rouen and asked Lady Margaret to take account of “impensas nostras.” Asking a patron for reimbursement was not unusual. Many dedicators wanted payment for their work of translating or even recovering texts from foreign markets. Lady Margaret often paid for foreign texts, as was even mentioned in the colophon for the Sarum Breviary of 1507.⁹⁴ Pynson noted that it was “Impensis Margarete comitisse Richemondie et derbie.”⁹⁵

⁹² I would like to thank Dr. Constance Bouchard for her assistance with the Latin translations associated with Lady Margaret. For these four lines, we agree that “polo” is a misprint and really should have been “volo.”

⁹³ Refer to Appendix I for the entire dedication.

⁹⁴ British Library, Royal 2 A XVIII. The Beaufort Book of Hours, includes Sarum, which is why MB probably wanted it printed for benefit of English readers. Powell notes that in her will, Lady Margaret bequeathed to Bourne Abbey in Lincolnshire a Sarum mass book. Perhaps this was one of the Sarum mass books that she previously commissioned. Powell, “Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books,” 201.

⁹⁵ *Sarum Breviary* (London: Richard Pynson, 1507). STC 15806a.

It is “margaritarum decore,” decorated with daisies. While this was obviously a play on Lady Margaret’s name, it had other significance. The margarite, or daisy, was the device of Lady Margaret, as it had been of her namesake, Margaret of Anjou.⁹⁶ Examples of Lady Margaret’s daisy badge can be found over the gates of Christ’s and St John’s Colleges in Cambridge, as well as in some of her plate.⁹⁷

What is unusual about this dedication is that in three places Hague refers to Lady Margaret using masculine Latin words. In the second line, Hague calls her “comitis Richmontii et derbii,” or *count* of Richmond and Derby. Later, when asking her to recognize and do something about the expense of the book he asked her for her “paternitates,” or paternity. And lastly, Hague called her “excellentissime domine et patrone nostre,” or most excellent lady and our *patron*. Why would Hague three times refer to Lady Margaret in the masculine? One simple explanation is that his Latin skills were poor; he may have just used the incorrect endings. Another explanation is that Hague thought he was actually sending the book to the Count of Richmond and Derby and his masculine endings were intentional. In the places where Hague called Lady Margaret “mother” and he uses the word “parentis.” This was a word that could be used for either gender and would be understood in the context in which it was written. However, the fourth word of the dedication is “viraginis,” meaning ladyship, and thus undercutting all of the remaining masculine words. So, Hague must have engaged in bending the gender of his words to apply to Lady Margaret to imply that a woman so

⁹⁶ C.H. Cooper, *Memoir of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1874), 122, n. 3.

⁹⁷ Underwood and Jones, *The King’s Mother*, 291-292.

powerful must have had some masculine qualities. Moreover, in using these masculine words to describe her, he must have been complimenting her and her activities.⁹⁸ What is also interesting is that “paternitates” and “patrone” are both in sentences which kindly ask Lady Margaret to remember the expense that he endured to get this book. Perhaps Hague used masculine words here to remind her of her duty to take ownership of this book, and he saw patronesses as having less power than patrons.

Bishop John Fisher was a frequent recipient of patronage from Lady Margaret. His 1508 treatise, *The fruytfull saynges of Dauyd the Kyng*, was the third and final book which had an actual dedication to Lady Margaret, and its full title explains that it is a compilation of seven sermons at the “exortacion and sterynge of the moost excellent pryncesse Margarete countesse of Rychmount & Derby & moder to our souerayne lorde kyng henry the vii.”⁹⁹ In the short prologue that follows, Fisher began by mentioning that it had been traditional for learned doctors to translate and put into writing scriptures so that readers and hearers would benefit from them. He continued that he had recently preached these sermons before Lady Margaret, and that she “delyted” in them, thus commanding him to write them down so that they could be printed. Once read and heard, they would aid in the pursuit of eternal salvation. Fisher ended the prologue wishing that

⁹⁸ Powell, “Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books,” 238-239. “In the case of the Lady Margaret, the term ‘patroness’ may require some semantic adjustment, since it is usually assumed that the patron’s involvement will consist of money and encouragement but will otherwise be somewhat removed from the activities of the patronised. Lady Margaret Beaufort was an active patron of learning. She was in close personal contact with the printers, who were keen to publish in the areas of her special interests; she supported the book trade and disseminated learning through purchasing books... both within the cloister and in the wider world.”

⁹⁹ John Fisher, *Treatise concernynge the fruytfull saynges of Dauyd the kyng* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1508), aa.i.r. Ames, II, 427-428, reprints prologue.

the holy Trinity “preserue ghostly & bodily my foresayd lady” and “that the intellygentes of the sayd sermons may be gladder in the path of ryghtwysnes dayly to persuer.”¹⁰⁰

Fisher’s remarks are those of a compassionate friend, as well as a spiritual leader. He was a respected theologian, which is why Lady Margaret wanted to print his interpretations of scripture. Fisher was so influential, that this collection of sermons was printed five more times, in 1509, 1510, 1525, 1529, and 1555. This final printing occurred after the Fisher’s 1535 execution, during Mary Tudor’s reign. But again, the prologue is not really a dedication to Lady Margaret, claiming to be written for her or to glorify her, rather it explains that the book was printed at her request. The prologue, as well as the title, show that rather than being a passive receiver of written works, she was an active participant in the printing of written works. The 1509 edition gives evidence of this as it includes a colophon by Wynkyn de Worde in which he states that he was “printer vnto the moost excellent pryncesse my lady the kynges graundame.”¹⁰¹

Fisher’s book of sermons was not the only book printed by Wynkyn de Worde in which de Worde refers to himself as Lady Margaret’s printer. *The Shyppe of Fooles* is an allegory in which the ship of fools is really a ship of sinners to serve as a lesson for believers, and Henry VII’s funeral sermon by Bishop Fisher also contain colophons in which de Worde mentions that he is printer to the king’s grandmother.¹⁰² There are four

¹⁰⁰ Fisher, *Treatise*, aa.i.v.

¹⁰¹ The 1509 edition does not contain page letters or numbers. The colophon is located on the last page of printed text.

¹⁰² Brant Sebastian, *The Shyppe of Fooles* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509) (STC 3547) and John Fisher, *This Sermon folowyng was compyled [and] sayd in the cathedral chyrche of saynt Poule within ye cyte of London by the right reuerende fader in god*

other books from 1509 in which de Worde refers to himself as “Prynter unto the moost excellent Prynmesse my Lady the Kynges Moder” and later “graundame to the kynge.”¹⁰³ It appears as though he only took that title during 1509. This title has also been useful in determining the chronology of some of the last books dedicated to Lady Margaret. Susan Powell has argued that the chronology of Lady Margaret’s last commissions must be Fisher’s *Fruytyfull Saynges of Dauyd*, *The Lyf of Saynt Ursula*, and then Fisher’s funeral sermon for Henry VII.¹⁰⁴ This is because *Fruytfull Saynges* is dated 16 June 1508, *Saynt Ursula* has a colophon in which she is called the king’s mother, meaning that it must have been printed before his death in April 1509, and *Shyppe* appeared in July 1509, after her death in June.¹⁰⁵ *Saynt Ursula* may have been printed as early as 1508, since there is no mention of de Worde as Lady Margaret’s royal printer, as was the case with the rest of his 1509 books.¹⁰⁶ Its colophon reads: “Vite sancte ursule sodaliumque suarum translate e sermone latino in anglicum/ rostatu fratris Edmūdi hatfeld monachi Roffensis a iussi illustrissime domine dñe Margarete matris excellentissime principis Henrici septimi.

John bysshop of Rochester, the body beyinge present of the most famouse prynce kynge Henry the. vij (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509) (STC 10900). Both of Fisher’s works dedicated to Lady Margaret have been reprinted in their entirety in Fisher, *English Works*.

¹⁰³ *The p[ar]lyament of deuylles* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509). STC 19305.; *Nychodemus gospel* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509). STC 18566.; Stephen Hawes, *The conuersyon of swearers* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509). STC 12943.; *Longe paruula* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509). STC 23164.

¹⁰⁴ Powell, “Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books,” 229. Powell notes that Lady Margaret’s household accounts record that she sent a transcript of Fisher’s funeral sermon for her son to Wynkyn de Worde to be printed twelve days after Henry’s funeral.

¹⁰⁵ Powell, “Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books,” 227 and fn 191.

¹⁰⁶ Powell, “Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books,” 227-228.

Impressa finit feliciter per me Wynaudum de Worde Londoniis cōmorantem in vico vulgariter dicto the fletestrete in signo solis et lune.”¹⁰⁷ Here, Henry VII is invoked to remind the readers that Lady Margaret was a powerful woman because her son was king (never mind that she was also the wealthiest woman in England because of her land holdings).

As previously mentioned, however, the other most powerful woman in England, Elizabeth of York, was only given one printed book dedication. This book, *O Jhesu endless swetnes of louying soules*, is also dedicated to Margaret Beaufort.¹⁰⁸ Like so many of the other dedications to Lady Margaret, there are no actual dedicatory verses, only a colophon. The colophon states “These prayers tofore wreton ben enprinted by the commaundmentes of the moste hye & vertuous pryncesse our liege ladi Elizabeth by the grace of god Quene of Englonde & of Fraunce. & also of the right hye & most noble pryncesse Margarete Moder unto our souerayn lorde the kynge.”¹⁰⁹ Elizabeth of York must have been at least interested in reading and print, but not nearly to the extent of her mother-in-law.¹¹⁰ Most likely, Lady Margaret was behind the printing of this book and

¹⁰⁷ *Here begyneth ye lyf of Saynt Ursula after ye cronycles of englonde* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509), B iv.r. STC 24541.3. Also, Ames, II, 346. My translation: Life of Saint Ursula and her family and friends translated from Latin into English, by brother Edmund Hatfeld a monk of Rochester ordered by the most illustrious lady Margaret mother of the most excellent prince Henry VII. Newly imprinted happily by me Wynkyn de Word of London abiding in the street commonly called Fletestreet at the sign of the sun and moon.

¹⁰⁸ *O Jhesu endless swetnes of louying soules* (Westminster: William Caxton, 1491). STC and 20195.

¹⁰⁹ This book does not contain page letters or numbers, but the colophon can be found on the last page of printed text.

asked Elizabeth to also take some interest. It is interesting, however, that Elizabeth is not mentioned in any other dedications or colophons. *O Jhesu* was printed in 1491, and was only the second book dedicated to Lady Margaret. Elizabeth lived another twelve years, passing away in 1503. She would have had many more occasions to be involved in print culture, but perhaps left that endeavor to a more interested Lady Margaret. Elizabeth of York and Lady Margaret did have a special bond as it was Lady Margaret who negotiated Elizabeth's marriage to Henry, the two women were barely separated on the day in which Elizabeth was crowned, and in 1488 the two women were given liveries of the Order of the Garter together, but this bond does not appear to have been shared over a love of books.¹¹¹

Elizabeth of York and Lady Margaret share one other book in common: Walter Hilton's *Scala perfectionis* of 1494.¹¹² This is a piece of devotional literature which has been connected to the mystical tradition of the late Middle Ages, and was reprinted three more times in 1507, 1525, and 1533.¹¹³ *Scala* does not appear to be related to *Imitatio Christi*, but both books were incredibly influential devotionals, with *Imitatio* being the most read Christian devotional book next to the Bible. Of the seventeen extant copies of

¹¹⁰ Lady Margaret and Elizabeth of York each owned numerous Books of Hours. See Kathleen L. Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts 1390-1490*, 2 vols (London: Harvey Miller, 1996). See also Janet Backhouse, "Illuminated Manuscripts."

¹¹¹ Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 69.

¹¹² Walter Hilton, *Scala perfectionis* (Westminster: Wynkyn de Worde, 1494). STC and 14042.

¹¹³ George R Keiser, "The Mystics and the Early Printers: The Economics of Devotionalism," In *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England*, Exeter Symposium IV, Papers Read at Dartington Hall, July 1987. Ed. by Marion Glasscoe (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987, 9-26), pp. 9.

the 1494 edition, three belonged to laywomen and three belonged to nuns, showing the interest of women who were able to read in devotional works.¹¹⁴ According to Jones and Underwood, the fifteenth century saw an increased concern for lay piety, daily rituals, and cult worship that mimicked that of monasteries, but was not as stringent. As such, there was increased interest in devotional works that aided in this ordered lifestyle. Hence, Lady Margaret's interest in Hilton and *Scala*. Hilton had written an ordinance for private worship in the late fourteenth century, which must have appealed to Lady Margaret, as she then asked Wynkyn de Worde to print *Scala* in 1494. In 1507, Lady Margaret bought another edition of *Scala*, which also included Hilton's earlier work.¹¹⁵ The colophon of *Scala Perfectionis* is a rhyme by de Worde:

Infynite laude wyth thankynge many folde
 I yelde to god me socouryng wyth his grace
 This boke to finyssh whiche that ye beholde
 Scale of perfeccion calde in euery place
 Wherof thauctor Walter Hilton was
 And Wynkyn de Worde this hath sett in prynt
 In Willyam Caxstons hows so fyll the case
 God rest his soule. In Joy ther mot it stynt

This heuenly boke more precyous than golde
 Was late direct wyth great humylyte
 For godly plesur. theron to beholde
 Unto the right noble Margaret as ye see
 The kyngis moder of excellent bounte
 Henry the seuenth that Jhu hym preserue
 This mighty pryncesse hath cōmaunded me
 Temprynt this boke her grace for to deserue¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Erler, *Women*, 121-122.

¹¹⁵ Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 173-174.

¹¹⁶ Reprinted in Routh, *Memoir*, 109. She notes that these stanzas were printed at the end of the first edition and that the 1533 edition had an epilogue which recommends this book

This colophon only mentions that it was commanded by Lady Margaret.¹¹⁷ According to Keiser, de Worde's printing of *Scala* was probably a beneficial professional move, as this was the first book that de Worde printed for her, and he probably did so without much worry over payment.¹¹⁸ Caxton had printed the only other two books dedicated to her, but had recently died in 1492, and by 1494 de Worde had taken over his shop. This book was probably the beginning of a professional relationship between Lady Margaret and de Worde. However, there is a copy of *Scala perfectionis* which is now in the Yale University Library that has an inscription which was actually written by both Lady Margaret and Elizabeth of York.

I pray you pray for me
Elysabeth ye quene

mastres rosse y trust yn your prayers
the whyche y pray you y may be partener
of Margaret R the kynges
modyr¹¹⁹

This handwritten inscription was included in a presentation copy to Mary Roos.

Roos was a lady of the queen and between 1497 and 1503 she married Hugh Deny, a

for the health of the soul. The colophon leaf is reprinted in P.J. Croft, *Lady Margaret, Elizabeth of York, and Wynkyn de Worde* (London: Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., 1958).

¹¹⁷ The stanza to Lady Margaret is reprinted in Routh, *Memoir*, 109.

¹¹⁸ Keiser, "Mystics," 11-12.

¹¹⁹ Yale University Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, BV4831 .H5 1494+. The inscription is located on a4v. A photocopy of this inscription is reprinted in P.J. Croft, *Lady Margaret*. This is a slim explanation of a few books linked with Lady Margaret. It includes some photocopies of colophons and inscriptions by her as well.

servant of Henry VII.¹²⁰ This transaction of presenting books to close friends or other courtiers was not unusual, and was the type of patronage work that a queen would naturally be engaged in. But it is odd that after 1494 Elizabeth of York is not associated with any other books.¹²¹ And, if she commissioned any other books, they have been lost since their printing, which is always a viable possibility.

These ten dedications to Lady Margaret Beaufort show not only her commitment to using the printing press for the spread of education and lay piety, but also how printers were eager to use their affiliations with Lady Margaret for their commercial benefit. Not all books dedicated to Lady Margaret had actual laudatory words for her, but in just mentioning her commission of or relationship to the book, the printers benefitted their presses. Jones and Underwood note that “she was not simply a pious laywoman lending the London printers her name to grace the devotional works which left their presses.”¹²² This assessment seems correct. Lady Margaret was a politically astute woman who knew that as much as her name benefitted the printers with whom she was mentioned, that her name would also ensure purchases of books with proper liturgies and religious ideas. That her name meant popular success for devotional literature reflected her important

¹²⁰ Croft, *Lady Margaret*, 4. See also Michael G. Sargent, “Walter Hilton’s “Scale of Perfection”: The London Manuscript Group Reconsidered, *Medium Aevum* 52 (1983), 189-216, pp. 207-208.

¹²¹ Other inscriptions by Elizabeth of York have been identified. See Eamon Duffy, *Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers 1240-1570* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 51-52 and 144.

¹²² Jones and Underwood, *The King’s Mother*, 181.

status as both the king's mother and an independent female.¹²³ While the full story of Elizabeth of York is only now being explored, the six consorts of Henry VIII have received the opposite treatment¹²⁴

The Six Wives of Henry VIII

The dedications to the six consorts of Henry VIII vary greatly, as does the subject matter of the books to which they are attached, ranging from devotional literature to needlework patterns. Taking after Hull, these books can be organized for better understanding into three categories: instructions for women, devotional works, and general instructions and philosophies.¹²⁵ Devotional texts provide the bulk of these works and it is easy to understand why. Henry VIII of England was no stranger to marriage, as he celebrated his first of six with Katherine of Aragon on 11 June 1509.¹²⁶

However, he was no stranger to dissolving marriages either, as he celebrated his first of

¹²³ Jones and Underwood, *The King's Mother*, 187.

¹²⁴ Arlene Naylor Okerlund, *Elizabeth of York* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Amy Licence, *Elizabeth of York: The Forgotten Tudor Queen* (Gloucestershire: Amberly, 2013); Alison Weir, *Elizabeth of York: A Tudor Queen and Her World* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2013).

¹²⁵ Suzannah Hull, a librarian at the Huntington Library, has written two very useful surveys of early modern English books for women. While neither is particularly analytical, they both show how looking at books written by, read by, and directed to women illuminate the lives of early modern women as well as any other existing source. She divides women's books into four categories: practical guides, recreational literature, devotional works, and books relating to the controversy over the female sex. As she does not include many of these dedicated works in her studies, and those that she does almost all fall under practical guides, I have chosen not to use her categories.

¹²⁶ For more details of what follows, see David Starkey, *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003) and John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

four annulments (this one with Katherine) on 23 May 1533, just eight days before Anne Boleyn, Henry's second wife, was crowned Queen of England. In the process of dissolving his marriage to his first wife and marrying his second, Henry VIII split England from the Catholic Church. During his last four marriages, Henry, as well as his religious advisors, solidified the new (and in many cases old and traditional) doctrine of the Church of England, making religion the most important issue of his reign.

A large repercussion of Henry's annulments and subsequent marriages was the ushering in of possibilities for evangelical theology. With Henry proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church of England in 1534, and the preferment of evangelical sympathizers, such as Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, came greater acceptance of evangelical religious ideas. Even though Henry's and his wives' religious commitments have never been clearly determined, the men who dedicated books to these wives clearly had ideas of the religion they thought the queens adhered to or that the men wanted them to adhere to, which is why with each succeeding queen the dedicated works, and the dedications themselves, became more evangelical in nature.¹²⁷ Thus, the majority of books dedicated to Henry's six consorts are devotional in nature.

Humanism, like religious reform, also had a great impact upon the books dedicated to the six wives. Maria Dowling notes that as humanism developed in the early sixteenth century, learning and reading for women became more acceptable. As such, the six wives made it fashionable for women to read, and dedicators to these women also furthered this idea. Dowling goes so far as to claim that Katherine of Aragon

¹²⁷ For a couple of opinions, see G.W. Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005); G.W. Bernard, "Anne Boleyn's Religion," *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 1-20.

championed humanism to prepare Mary for the throne.¹²⁸ Yet, Dowling is critical of the use of dedications in determining female interest in humanism, as the dedications may have been rhetorical and with so many books lost to posterity, for her it is impossible to make generalizations.¹²⁹

Not surprisingly, politics forced many printed book dedications to change over time or to be left out of later printed editions. The most basic reason for these changes was that Henry VIII was married six times. Dedicators attempted to use dedications to change politics, by first interceding with different consorts with different interests to get to the king. For example, in 1535 William Marshall dedicated his translation of *The forme and maner of subvention or helping for pore people, deuysed and practived in the city of Hypres in Flanders*, a treatise on the poor relief that had been done in Ypres, to Anne Boleyn.¹³⁰ Interestingly a poor relief program was put in place in England the next

¹²⁸ Dowling, *Humanism*, 219, 223-235. Dowling refutes earlier claims that Katherine Parr made a scholarly nursery which stimulated the learning and educations of her three stepchildren. Dowling directly challenges James McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics Under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965). McConica argues that the circle of Katherine Parr revived the traditions of Margaret Beaufort and Katherine of Aragon in Erasmian humanism, but did so better and more influentially than the earlier women, pp. 201. McConica uses the dedication to Katherine Parr in Erasmus's *Paraphrases* to show her domestic success, pp. 231-232. Overall, McConica credits much more of a role in humanism and learning than does Dowling.

¹²⁹ Dowling, *Humanism*, 237-238.

¹³⁰ William Marshall, *The forme and maner of subue[n]tion or helping for pore people deuysed and practysed i[n] the cytie of Hypres in Flaunders, whiche forme is auctorised by the Emperour, [and] approued by the facultie of diuinitie in Paris* (London: Thomas Godfray, 1535). STC 26119.

year, which historian Eric Ives suspects was because Anne Boleyn passed the information to Henry VIII.¹³¹

Dedicators even replaced the name of one queen with the name of another, much in the same way that initials of one queen were replaced with the initials of the next in royal emblems. It was possible that a book dedicated to one consort was printed many times through the sixteenth century, so with each new edition, the dedication reflected the current wife. For example, Coverdale's translation of the Bible in 1535 contained a dedication to Anne Boleyn.

Unto the most victorious Prince
and our most gracious sovereign Lord, king Henry the eighth,
king of England and of France, lord of Ireland.
Defender of the Faith, and under God
the chief and supreme
head of the
Church of England.

The right and just administration of the laws that God gave unto
Moses and unto Joshua: the testimony of faithfulness that God
gave of David: the plenteous abundance of wisdom that God gave
unto Solomon: the lucky and prosperous age with the
multiplication of seed which God gave unto Abraham and Sara his
wife, be given unto you most gracious Prince, with your dearest
just wife, and most virtuous Princess, Queen Anne, Amen.¹³²

In the 1537 edition of the Coverdale Bible, "Queen Anne" was replaced with "Queen Jane," with the rest of the dedication remaining the same. Yet in appealing to the king and his wife, Miles Coverdale was attempting to get his English Bible sanctioned and

¹³¹ E.W Ives, *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: 'the most happy'* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004), 284.

¹³² *Bible*. Trans. by Miles Coverdale (Cologne: E. Cervicornus and J. Soter, 1535), ii.r. STC 2063.

widely circulated in England. It did not work; Coverdale's Bible was never royally approved, but the Great Bible (also prepared by Coverdale, but largely based upon William Tyndale's English translation) was approved only a few years later, in 1539.

Some dedicators chose not to change the name of the queen, so dedications were left out of concurrent print editions, with the possibility of being added back to even later printed editions. Shifting dedications may have happened because of print house difficulties or differing printers simply leaving the dedication out to save paper, but primarily reflected the shifting political and religious situation of sixteenth-century England.

Juan Luis Vives's dedication to Katherine Aragon underwent many such changes in the nine English editions of *The Instruction of a Christen Woman*.¹³³ Vives's *Instruction* was written in Latin, as *De institutione Foeminae Christianae*, and first printed in Antwerp in 1524, with a dedicatory preface to Katherine of Aragon, a countrywoman of Vives's.¹³⁴ *Instruction* was translated into English by Richard Hyrde, a member of the household of Thomas More, and first published in England in 1529, including Vives's original dedication and a new dedication by Hyrde. Vives's dedication notes, "The preface of the moste famous clerke maister Lodovic Vives upon his boke called the Instruction of a Christen woman unto the moste gracious princes Katharine quene of Englande... And this worke most excellent and gracious quene, I offer unto you

¹³³ Juan Luis Vives, *The Instruction of a Christen Woman* (London: Thmas Berthelet, 1529). STC 24857. See Appendix II.

¹³⁴ Juan Luis Vives, *The Instruction of a Christen Woman*, Virginia Walcott Beauchamp, Elizabeth H. Hageman, and Margaret Mikesell, eds. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), vi.

in lyke maner...because that you have ben both mayde, wife, wydowe, and wife agayne.”¹³⁵ Katherine was qualified to take the advice prescribed by Vives in his book because in it he offered guidance specifically for maids, wives, and widows, and Katherine had experience being all three.

According to Virginia Walcott Beauchamp, editor of a complete edition of *Instruction*, these nine English editions can be categorized into three groups which are reflective of cultural concerns.¹³⁶ Group one, both editions from 1529 and the 1531 edition, are identical quartos with both dedications to Katherine of Aragon. While this dating of editions is not exact, it has been inferred based upon when Thomas Berthelet was made the king’s printer in 1530, as he is known to have printed all three, yet his title as the king’s printer is only mentioned on the 1531 edition.¹³⁷ Group two, the editions of 1541, 1547, 1557, and 1567, were edited to omit the ties to Katherine and make the text more appealing to general, aristocratic readers. Group three, those from 1585 and 1592, were octavos edited again to conform with ideologies of Tudor Puritanism.¹³⁸ Vives’s and Hyrde’s names appear on all editions, yet Hyrde’s preface is omitted from all editions after 1531, and all mention of Katherine as queen was removed, to reflect her

¹³⁵ Vives’s dedication appears on Bir – Biiiv of the 1529 edition. For this dedication, I use both the 1529 English edition and the printed edition in Beauchamp. Like Beauchamp, I have left the spelling as original as possible.

¹³⁶ Compiled by a group of scholars out of a colloquium held at the Folger Shakespeare Library, this offers a complete English translation of the *Instruction*, based on the original English printing in 1529, but compared with each of the eight later English editions.

¹³⁷ Vives, Beauchamp, lxxix.

¹³⁸ Vives, Beauchamp, lxxviii.

demoted status after her annulment from Henry. In 1541, the word “queen” was reinserted in place of “princess” in Vives’s preface.

By 1541, Hyrde’s preface would have been dangerous to print. Not only did it praise a woman who had since been removed from the throne and denied to have ever been queen, it also praised Thomas More. Thomas More was an avid supporter of Katherine of Aragon and the Catholic Church. He was executed for treason in 1535 for refusing to sign the Oath of Supremacy and acknowledge King Henry VIII as head of the Church of England. So the preface praised two people who by 1541 had dramatically fallen from favor, and were both dead. By 1541, Henry was married to his fifth wife; he would not have supported a book that said such good things about two people who caused him so much trouble.

Interestingly, Vives’s dedicatory preface in the 1592 edition returned to calling Katherine “queen.” This is unusual in that Elizabeth I was the current queen, and daughter of Anne Boleyn, the woman who replaced Katherine. Forty years after the death of Henry VIII it was probably safe to refer to Katherine as queen again, as the hostility towards her would be long forgotten. But such an explanation seems unusual, as around this time, the controversy between Mary, Queen of Scots, and Elizabeth was taking place. Mary, executed in 1587, was considered the Catholic heir to the throne of England. It would seem that supporting a former Catholic queen would be dangerous. Catholic support, however, must not be why Katherine was restored as “queen”, because the printer of the 1585 edition was Robert Waldegrave, a well-known Puritan. Rather, Waldegrave chose to adhere to the first few editions of *Instruction*, in which Katherine

was called queen, though there are a few places where traces of the 1567 edition can be seen and Katherine remains a princess.¹³⁹ It was just Waldegrave's decision to use original translations of the text to make his own edition that restored Katherine as queen. However, Hyrde's dedication was not included. John Danter, printer of the 1592 edition, kept most of Waldegrave's inclusions and exclusions, so that his treatment of Katherine is the same as Waldegrave's.

When Hyrde translated and printed the *Instruction* in English in 1529, the court scene was drastically different than when Vives printed his original edition in 1524. Katherine was still queen, but really only in name. Anne Boleyn was increasingly at Henry VIII's side as a replacement to Katherine. While Katherine's patronage would still have been welcome, it was clear that she did not have nearly the power that she once wielded with Henry VIII. In 1530, Katherine was retired to Richmond Palace, in Surrey, and was never to see her husband or her daughter again. Yet, the 1531 edition of the *Instruction* still carried both dedicatory prefaces. It seems odd that the 1531 edition included both dedications, particularly as Thomas Berthelet, the king's printer, printed the first five quarto editions. But this could be explained several ways. First, Katherine was still queen and could be treated as such. Second, this book was written and translated out of respect for Katherine, so that respect could have driven Berthelet to keep the dedications until the annulment was finalized. Third, Henry needed it to appear publicly that he really wanted Katherine to remain his wife and that the only reason he was concerned about the status of their marriage was because of his conscience (not

¹³⁹ Beauchamp notices these changes in dedication and edition patterns in depth in her introduction.

because he wanted to marry Anne), so both dedications could have been kept to show that until the marriage was found to be unlawful or unholy that Katherine was still queen. Fourth, and most interesting, is that as a staunch supporter of Katherine and the royal marriage, More could have had *Instruction* printed with both dedications as support for Katherine, while veiled as an effort to promote humanistic texts.¹⁴⁰ Thomas More was made Chancellor in summer of 1529. Since Hyrde was a member of More's household, More could have encouraged Hyrde to translate the text so when it was printed it did not appear as though More himself was translating tracts to support Katherine while he was Chancellor.

Hyrde's dedication, "Unto the moste excellent prynces quene Catharine, the moste gracious Wyfe un to the moste noble and mighty prince kynge Henry .viii...For what is more frutefull than the good education and ordre ofwomen...I thought at the lease wyse for my parte hit wolde do well to be translate this boke into our englishe tonge, for the commodite and profit of our owne countre," was meant to do several things.¹⁴¹ Mainly, he wanted to offer a Latin text in translation to those who were unable to read Latin because it contained ideas, particularly humanist ideas that had to be made available to a population that was unable to read Latin: women. Katherine was able to read Latin, but she was exceptionally educated. Hyrde presented his translation as a duty to the state; these ideas of Vives's are so important that he must translate them and dedicate them to the queen because she is the most important woman in the state.

¹⁴⁰ McConica, *English Humanists*, 106-124.

¹⁴¹ Hyrde's dedication appears on Aiiir – Aiiiv.

Although Vives's dedicatory preface was left in every edition, it was changed slightly, as mentioned above, to reflect Katherine's demoted status to princess. For instance, the word "quene" was replaced with "princess." Why would this dedication be allowed to stay, even in an altered form? The two dedications are very different in tone and subject matter. Vives's dedication is not nearly as dangerous as Hyrde's. Vives praises Katherine, but he praises her for her knowledge and her mothering. Even when Katherine was demoted from queen to princess, she was still educated and a mother, two things that even Henry VIII could not deny. She, therefore, could still serve as a role model for other women in her virtue and duties as a woman. Hyrde's dedication much more explicitly repeatedly praises Katherine because she is queen. Unlike with Vives's dedication, it would not be possible to simply change the word "queen" with that of "princess" and still keep Hyrde's dedication, which is why Hyrde's is removed while Vives's dedication is left in all editions.

One can see how Vives's *Instruction*, with its dedications and dedication changes, reflected the current political and social scene of England. *Instruction* superficially was part of the popular humanism of the day, in that it offered an instruction manual based on ancient and early church sources. It was part of the evolving popular literature that came to dominate the types of works that were written for women in the seventeenth century. Politically, *Instruction* reflects the fact that England was facing having a queen regnant because the king and his wife had no male heir. *Instruction*, then, offered instructions written specifically for a female (Mary) based upon the deeds and behaviors of her mother, even though Vives aimed for a much larger readership. Its dedication changes,

particularly those of the 1540s, when Henry VIII was still king, reflect how Katherine had been removed as queen and that praise of her as a queen would not be tolerated.

Instruction also demonstrates the then-current idea that as the only living child from the union of Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon, Mary, was the most likely successor to the throne of England and had to be educated as such. Although dedicated to Katherine of Aragon, it clearly presented an educational tract for her daughter, of whom Katherine was in charge. However, the education it offered was really more concerned with teaching women how to be chaste, not education in the more traditional sense of schooling.

Practically every time that *Instruction* is mentioned in modern scholarship, it is followed with the assertion that this was commissioned by Katherine of Aragon as an educational treatise for her daughter, Mary, as Mary needed to be prepared if she was to be queen of England.¹⁴² Educational treatises already existed for princes, such as Erasmus's *Instruction for a Christian Prince* (1516), but princesses were just not thought of as needing an education, and certainly not as future heads of state.¹⁴³ Foster Watson is the first scholar to assert this, yet he offers no source for this information.¹⁴⁴ This idea has been treated as fact ever since, and can easily skew the perception of the purpose of his work. There is no real evidence that this was a commissioned work. Rather this

¹⁴² For example, see Garrett Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon* (New York: Book-of-the-Month-Club, 1941), 184.

¹⁴³ For a perspective of the education of Spanish royal children, see Martha K. Hoffman, *Raised to Rule: Educating Royalty at the Court of the Spanish Hapsburgs, 1601-1634* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011).

¹⁴⁴ Foster Watson, ed., *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912), 1. [Excerpts from the *Instruction*, 29-136.] [Excerpts from *Defence*, 211-239] See Beauchamp, who points out this mistake, xxiii.

mistaken claim of commission seems the result of sloppy work by Watson. Vives was commissioned by Katherine to make a plan of study for Mary so that he could work alongside her tutor. As the study plan, *Epistolae duae de Ratione Studii Puerilis*, was written at approximately the same time as the *Instruction* and is similar in subject matter, it would make no sense for Vives to mention his commission in one dedicatory preface, but not the other.¹⁴⁵ What is most likely is that Watson simply assumed that since the educational treatise was commissioned by Katherine, then *Instruction* must have been also.

Epistolae duae was written in two parts, one for a girl, dedicated to Katherine of Aragon, for the education of Mary, and one for a boy, dedicated to William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, for the education of his son, Charles Mountjoy. In some secondary works, *Epistolae duae* is cited as dedicated to Mary.¹⁴⁶ This is because *Epistolae duae* was printed as part of a collection of Vives's work, alongside *Introductio ad Sapientiam* and *Satellitium sive Symbola*. As a whole this book was dedicated to Mary, but *Epistolae duae* had a specific letter to Katherine of Aragon.¹⁴⁷

This dedicatory epistle to Katherine of Aragon is:

To the Lady Katherine (Queen of England), his unique (unica) protectress. You have ordered me to write a brief plan of study according to which thy daughter Mary may be educated by her tutor. Gladly have I obeyed thee, as I would in far greater matters,

¹⁴⁵ Juan Luis Vives, *Introductio ad Sapientiam, Satellitium sive Symbola, Epistolae duae de Ratione Studii Puerilis* (Louvain: Peter Martens 1524).

¹⁴⁶ David Starkey, *Six Wives*, 177 and Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen* (New York: Random House, 2009), 23.

¹⁴⁷ The dedication to *Satellitium* can be found in Watson, *Renascence*, 151-154.

were I able. And since thou hast chosen her teacher, a man above all learned and honest, as was fit, I was content to point out details, as with a finger. He will explain the rest of the matters. Those questions which I thought either obscurely treated or omitted by writers on the art of grammar I have noted somewhat copiously. I pray Christ that this plan of teaching my effectively help thy daughter to her erudition and virtue. Farewell, and know my mind most devoted to your Majesty.¹⁴⁸

This dedication clearly asserts that this educational treatise was commissioned by Katherine of Aragon and written for the education of Mary. Watson's misunderstanding has led to every subsequent scholar assuming this and *Instruction* were commissioned, and even basing entire arguments on this point.¹⁴⁹ *Instruction* was not made at the behest of Katherine, but because of respect for Katherine. As the subsequent editions reflect, that respect can shift in later printing, or at least printers can make it seem so.

Like Vives's dedication of *Instruction*, the *Epistolae duae* dedication also began with praise of Katherine of Aragon. Yet, this praise of her is not nearly as laudatory or detailed. Rather, Vives proclaimed his honor to obey his command of commission. The *Epistolae duae* dedication to Katherine of Aragon is also much shorter than that of Vives's *Instruction*. In *Epistolae duae*, Vives does not praise Katherine for her own learning or education or for the foresight to give her daughter a humanist education. The bulk of this very short dedication refers to the tutor who had been chosen for Princess Mary as the one who would actually provide the day-to-day education of Mary, not

¹⁴⁸ Watson, *Renascence*, 137. Watson took the liberty of modernizing the spelling and printing this dedication in modern English, which I have chosen to keep.

¹⁴⁹ Constance Jordan's study bases part of her argument on this. Jordan, "Feminism and the Humanists: The Case for Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defense of Good Women*," In *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Margaret Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy Vickers, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 242-258.

Vives. Vives almost sounds angry that he has put this plan together but has not been rewarded with the actual position of royal tutor. Vives may have been disappointed that he was not chosen to be the tutor of Mary, but was only chosen to write some instructions of how she should be taught. Perhaps he thought that he should have been her tutor if he was the one writing her textbooks. Vives even states that his instructions are short because someone else will be directing her day-to-day study. These words, then, are the words of a man being commanded to write a book, but not receiving any additional patronage from it. Most likely, this is because with *Instruction* Vives was seeking patronage, but *Epistolae duae* was commissioned and Vives already had Katherine's patronage. For this instance with Vives, once patronage had been acquired, he was not as generous with his praise. This illuminates how distant the relationship between printer, patron, and author could be.

In 1523, when *Epistolae duae* and *Instruction* were first written, Katherine of Aragon was at the height of her power. Therefore, *Instruction* is often seen as commissioned by Katherine for the education of Mary because she wanted to prepare Mary to become Queen of England. Yet this text is really about behaviors of women, and does not really speak to the power or potential of women for things outside of the home. Nowhere does Vives advocate for Mary to get the same training as a prince. Again, this identification of *Instruction* as a preparatory text for Mary as queen probably stems from the educational treatise that was actually commissioned by Katherine, but when it is compared to that written for Lord Mountjoy, again, the education of a girl is slight in comparison. Katherine may have wanted to prepare her daughter to be queen, but

humanists were not ready to condone or support equal education for women, let alone queenship. Katherine herself saw nothing unusual about a queen regnant, as her mother was queen of Castile in her own right.

Juan Luis Vives's *Instruction of a Christen Woman* is the most famous of the books that falls into the category of instructions for women, along with other such books as Erasmus's *Institution of Christian Marriage* and Roselin Eucharius's *Byrth of Mankynde*.¹⁵⁰ Each of these works targets a female audience and provides guidance specifically for females in areas in which men felt that women needed men's advice, such as midwifery, marriage, and education. Though these works form the smallest category, next to general instructions and devotional works, they speak not only to the *querelle des femmes* that was taking place in Europe generally, but also to three very specific events in England: the possible succession of Mary as queen, the queen's primary duty to produce heirs, and the place and ideology of matrimony.

The second category, devotional works, includes the majority of books dedicated to the wives of Henry VIII. Yet within this devotional literature, the topics vary greatly. As expected, when Katherine of Aragon was queen, the devotional works were orthodox and argued directly against Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon. Alphonsus de Villa Sancta, a Spanish Observant and Katherine's confessor, wrote two tracts defending against reform that were dedicated to Katherine.¹⁵¹ Both printed in 1523 by Pynson, the

¹⁵⁰ Erasmus. *Institution of Christian Marriage*, trans. by Michael Heath, in Josh O'Malley and Louis Perraud, eds., *Collected Works of Erasmus: Spiritualia and Pastoralia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 203- 438. Eucharius Roselin, *The byrth of mankynde, newly translated out of Laten into Englysshe* (London: Thomas Raynald, 1540). STC 21153.

first was *Problema indulgentiarum, quo Lutheri errata dissoluuntur, et theologorum de eisdem opinionibus hactenus apud eruditos uulgata astruitur*, followed by *De libero arbitrio aduersus Melanctonem*.¹⁵² Similar in nature to Henry's publication against Luther, *Assertio septem sacramentorum*, these identify Katherine as an active participant against heresy and reform. In the dedications, Villa Sancta names Katherine, *fidei Defensatrici*, Defendrix of the Faith, mimicking the title that Henry was given by the pope, Defender of the Faith, after writing *Assertio*.

The devotional works dedicated to the five wives after Katherine of Aragon took on a much more evangelical flair. In 1535, Anne Boleyn was the joint recipient of Miles Coverdale's English translation of the Bible, as mentioned above. In 1536 she also received Tristram Revel's translation of Frances Lambert's *The summe of christianitie gathered out almoste of al placis of scripture*.¹⁵³ In his dedication Revel called upon Anne to have Henry direct the bishops to teach grace and to lead Henry to become a true champion of the true church and to act against "the church of the Antychryste, the men of synne, the Pope, and his sects."¹⁵⁴ However, Revel's translation proved to be too

¹⁵¹ Dowling, *Humanism*, 39. Dowling notes that Villa Sancta may have written more, but only two survive.

¹⁵² Alphonsus de Villa Sancta, *Problema indulgentiarum quo Lutheri errata dissoluuntur, et theologoru[m] de eisdem opinio hactenus apud eruditos uulgata astruitur* (London: Richard Pynson, 1523) (STC 24729) and *De libero arbitrio aduersus Melanctonem auctore fratre Alphonso a Villa sancte minorita regularis obseruationi* (London: Richard Pynson, 1523) (STC 24728), respectively.

¹⁵³ Franz Lambert, *The summe of christianitie gathered out almoste of al placis of scripture, by that noble and famouse clerke Francis Lambert of Auynyon. And translatyd, and put in to prynte in Englyshe, by Tristram Reuel* (London: Robert Redman, 1536). STC 15179.

evangelical, as Anne Boleyn refused to sponsor it.¹⁵⁵ In a deposition, Revel admitted to giving his translation to William Latimer, the queen's chaplain, to show Anne, as well as to the Archbishop of Canterbury's brother, who gave it to the Archbishop, who then gave it to Hugh Latimer, bishop of Worcester to read and examine. Worcester noted that in two or three points it was extremely evangelical. Later, Anne Boleyn denied its sponsorship.¹⁵⁶

Following Anne Boleyn, Anne of Cleves received a dedication in *The Pomaunder of Prayer*, written by Thomas Becon in 1553 but not published until 1558, the year after Anne died.¹⁵⁷ Addressed to "the moste honorable and vertuous Lady Anne of Cleve," it exhorts Anne to remember to pray and give thanks to God, while in the body of the text were many prayers in English.¹⁵⁸ *Pomaunder* was printed in at least six editions, 1558, 1560, 1561, 1563, 1565, and 1578, but the dedication was not present in the 1560 and 1578 editions. In the case of the 1560 edition held by the British Library,¹⁵⁹ the

¹⁵⁴ Lambert, *The summe of christianitie*, iv.v.

¹⁵⁵ In his 2004 biography of Anne Boleyn, Eric Ives argues that Anne Boleyn denied the dedication because of its denial of the Mass (Ives, *Anne Boleyn*, 409). Yet in Maria Dowling's article "Anne Boleyn as Patron," In *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*, edited by David Starkey (London: Collins and Brown Limited, 1991), 111, Dowling argues that Anne denied the dedication because her situation was precarious at the beginning of 1536.

¹⁵⁶ *Letters and Papers*, Volume 10, 371.

¹⁵⁷ Seymour Baker House, "Thomas Becon," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Hereafter abbreviated *ODNB*.

¹⁵⁸ Thomas Becon, *The pomaunder of prayer* (London: John Day, 1561), A.iir. STC 1746. Only the 1561 and 1563 editions are available on EEBO.

¹⁵⁹ British Library, C.66 d.6.

dedication pages are most likely missing, while for the 1578 edition, there is only an exhortation to the Christian reader, as Anne had passed away in 1557 and Becon in 1567. As an evangelical, Becon did dedicate his prayers to Mary I, since when she came to the throne she divested him of his offices and placed him in the Tower. From the Tower, Becon exiled himself in Strasbourg and Marburg, until he returned to England upon the accession of Elizabeth I to take up a clerical position.¹⁶⁰

Two devotional books dedicated to Henry's final wife, Katherine Parr, were also evangelical in nature, even though Mary Tudor was involved in the translation of one of them. One devotional work dedicated to Katherine Parr was Anthony Cope's *A godly meditacion vpon. xx. select and chosen Psalmes of the prophet Dauid as wel necessary to al them that are desirous to haue ye darke wordes of the prophet declared and made playn: as also fruitfull to suche as delyte in the contemplatio[n] of the spiritual meanyng of them*¹⁶¹. Printed in 1547, yet after the death of Henry VIII, this collection of prayers is evangelical in nature, as Cope was a devout Protestant and one of Katherine's chamberlains. The other, *The first tome or volume of the paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testament*, translated in part by Nicholas Udall, was dedicated to both Edward VI and Katherine Parr, as it was printed in 1548, when Katherine was no longer queen.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ House, "Thomas Becon," *ODNB*.

¹⁶¹ Anthony Cope, *A godly meditacion vpon. xx. select and chosen Psalmes of the prophet Dauid as wel necessary to al them that are desirous to haue ye darke wordes of the prophet declared and made playn: as also fruitfull to suche as delyte in the contemplatio[n] of the spiritual meanyng of them* (London: For John Daye, 1547). STC 5717.

¹⁶² Erasmus, *The first tome or volume of the paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testament* (London: Edward Whitechurch, 1548). STC 2854.

Katherine Parr received a dedication before the gospel of Saint John, which is fitting, as Mary Tudor was the translator of this gospel, at Katherine's request.¹⁶³ Mary Tudor was unable to complete the entire translation, but she did complete a majority of the work.¹⁶⁴ Katherine Parr also received the dedication of the manuscript translation of Marguerite of Navarre's *Mirror of the Sinful Soul* from her other stepdaughter, Elizabeth, as a New Year's gift in 1545, when Elizabeth was only eleven years old.¹⁶⁵ In the dedication, Elizabeth acknowledged women have sinful souls and only through the grace of God can be saved.

The final category of books, general instructions and philosophies, encompass the remainder of the books dedicated to Henry's wives. Ranging from a French textbook dedicated to both Anne Boleyn and Mary Tudor, to William Marshall's plan for poor relief, to a needlework pattern book, to a general defense of women, these books were not necessarily geared for a female audience. Giles Duwes's French textbook was written specifically for Princess Mary, but had a wider circulation than Mary, since it was printed.¹⁶⁶ It will be discussed in detail in chapter three. John Taylor's work, *The needles excellency a new booke wherein are diuerse admirable works wrought with the*

¹⁶³ James McConica saw Udall's dedication to Katherine Parr as the best comment on her domestic success as a patroness of humanism. McConica, *English Humanists*, 231.

¹⁶⁴ James Carley, *The Books of King Henry VIII and his Wives* (London: The British Library, 2004), 140. Carley notes that she was too sick to finish the translation.

¹⁶⁵ Bodleian Library, MS Cherry 36.

¹⁶⁶ Giles Duwes, *An introductory for to lerne to rede, to pronounce, and to speake Frenche trewly, compyled for the right high, excellent, and the most vertuous lady, the lady Mary of Englande, doughter to our most gracious souerayn lorde kyng Henry the eight* (London: Thomas Godfray, 1533). STC 7377.

needle, was not contemporary to the queens and was printed in many editions in the seventeenth century.¹⁶⁷ Not exactly dedicated to Katherine of Aragon, his work examined many pieces of embroidery by famous English women, about each of whom, Katherine of Aragon, Mary Tudor, and Elizabeth, he wrote a small poem.¹⁶⁸ Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defence of Good Women* was dedicated to Anne of Cleves in 1540, and was written for a male audience on the merits of women and the benefit of teaching women. Elyot will be discussed further below. William Marshall's translation on a treatise on poor relief was already mentioned above.

Though the subject matter of the books dedicated to the wives of Henry VIII varies greatly, they illuminate some of the most important political changes and concerns of the Henrician period. In line with the *querelle des femmes*, some of these books were directed at women and their place in learning. Reflecting the great religious changes taking place in England, many of the dedicated books were devotional in nature and keyed into the religious leaning of each queen, being traditional for Katherine of Aragon and evangelical for Anne Boleyn and Katherine Parr. More specifically, Katherine of Aragon understood English and French rudimentarily, but was well-versed in Latin, so any books dedicated to her in Latin about religion she would have understood.¹⁶⁹ Anne

¹⁶⁷ John Taylor, *The needles excellency a new booke wherin are diuers admirable works wrought with the needle. Newly inuented and cut in copper for the pleasure and profit of the industrious* (London: Printed for James Boler and sold at the sign of the Marigold in Paul's Churchyard, 1634). STC 23776.

¹⁶⁸ John Constable's *Epigrammata* of 1520 is similar, in that it contains a verse that mentions Katherine of Aragon, c.i. John Constable, *Ioannis Constablii Londinensis et artium professoris epigrammata* (London: Richard Pynson, 1520). STC 5639.

¹⁶⁹ Carley, *Books*, 109.

Boleyn was fluent in both English and French and her books highlight her preference for France and religious reform.¹⁷⁰ Even Henry's own book collection transformed over time, reflecting his changing views.¹⁷¹ A few books dedicated to his wives were meant for a general audience, and these typically praised the virtue and learning of women, as able creatures to receive education and even influence the men around them. Now it is time to turn to a discussion of the printers of these works to see how they fit into the political scene, where their sympathies were, and what other types of works they were printing.

The printers of the books dedicated to the wives of Henry VIII vary just as much as the subject matter of the books. Yet, the intersection of these printers and the dedications is very revealing of what was sanctioned by the King and what was done simply for patronage. The books dedicated to the wives of Henry VIII were printed by both royally sanctioned printers, the King's Printer, and independent printers. Of the seventeen books dedicated to the six queens, six were printed by the king's printers. All of these save one were books dedicated to Katherine of Aragon, meaning that five of the eight books dedicated to Katherine of Aragon were printed by royal printers.

Richard Pynson, the second printer to hold the title of King's Printer, was responsible for four books dedicated to Katherine of Aragon, three related to traditional religion and one that was a translation of Plutarch. The three religious works most likely

¹⁷⁰ Carley, *Books*, 124 and 129.

¹⁷¹ James Carley notes that when juxtaposing Henry's books with those of his wives, one can see "how closely his intellectual life converged with his marital adventures...especially in the case of his first two marriages, the battle of the wives is reflected in the battle of the books." Carley, *Books*, 18.

were part of Henry VIII and Thomas Wolsey's press campaign to advance Catholic interests against Martin Luther and promote a holy war against France.¹⁷² Katherine's confessor, Aphonsus de Villa Sancta, wrote two of the religious works in 1523, one against Luther and the other against Melanchthon, as mentioned above. The other religious book printed by Pynson, circa 1515, was written by Franciscan Gilbert Nicolai. *Tractatus de tribus ordinibus beatissime virginis dei genitricis Marie* only exists in one copy in La Biblioteca Columbina, Seville.¹⁷³ This work is not very well-known because of its rarity. Gilbert Nicolai is more well-known for having written "The Rule of the Ten Virtues of the Beatissime Virginis Mariae," the rule under which Joan de Valois, Queen of France and Duchess of Berry, established a nunnery dedicated to the contemplation of the Virgin Mary. The work Nicolai dedicated to Katherine of Aragon coincided with the approval of the second edition of Nicolai's rule, which he wrote in the hopes of uniting the Order of the Annunciade with the Conceptionalist Sisters, an effort which ultimately failed. But this does not explain why this was published in London, as the rest of his works were printed on the continent, or why he even chose to dedicate it to Katherine. Most likely, Nicolai was either trying to spread the order to England or have one of England's nunneries join with it. As the Annunciade is based out of Poland now, there

¹⁷² Pamela Neville-Sington, "Richard Pynson," *ODNB*.

¹⁷³ Gilbert Nicolai, *Tractatus de tribus ordinibus beatissime virginis dei genitricis Marie* (London: Richard Pynson?, 1515). La Biblioteca Columbina was endowed by Fernando Colon, son of Christopher Columbus, and contains many of Columbus's own written manuscripts. See Dennis E. Rhodes, "Don Fernando Colon and His London Book Purchaes, June 1522," in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 52 (1958), 240.

are few western European sources which even mention Gilbert Nicolai apart from noting that he was Joan's confessor.

The non-religious book printed by Pynson and dedicated to Katherine of Aragon was Thomas Wyatt's translation of Plutarch's *Quyete of Mynde*. According to James Carley, Katherine originally asked Wyatt to translate Petrarch's *De remediis utrusque fortunae* out of Castilian into English. But, due to the changing political scene, Wyatt instead presented her, on New Years' Day 1528, with Plutarch's *De tranquillitate et securitate animi*, as this book encouraged "passive acceptance," and it was hoped that Katherine would quietly accept an annulment. But she did not and Katherine disapproved of the book.¹⁷⁴ In his dedication, Wyatt himself claimed that Petrarch's work was "tedious," which is why he changed subjects.¹⁷⁵ But, as one scholar has noted, both works emphasized that Fate cannot be avoided and that his translation of Plutarch helped to solidify Wyatt's reputation as an English humanist.¹⁷⁶ Pynson, then, printed works that supported religion and queenly obedience within England. Though early in his career he printed some evangelical humanist works, such as a sermon by Savanarola, Pynson for the most part printed texts that supported and solidified traditional religion and Henry's authority.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Carley, *Books*, 121.

¹⁷⁵ Plutarch, *Quyete of Mynde*, Trans. by Thomas Wyatt (London: Richard Pynson, 1528), a.iir. STC 20058.5.

¹⁷⁶ Patricia Thompson, "Sir Thomas Wyatt: Classical Philosophy and English Humanism," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (February 1962), 79-96, 85.

¹⁷⁷ Pamela Neville-Sington, "Richard Pynson," *ODNB*.

Thomas Berthelet was the other King's Printer responsible for books dedicated to the queens. He printed Juan Luis Vives's *Institution of a Christen Woman* and Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Defense of Good Women*. Berthelet was appointed King's Printer in 1530, approximately one year after Richard Pynson's death, and kept the post until Henry's death in 1547.¹⁷⁸ According to EEBO, approximately two hundred titles can be attributed to Berthelet, albeit some are editions that were reprinted after his death and many were royal proclamations. As many of the books dedicated to Henry's latter five wives were more radical in nature, it is not surprising that Berthelet did not print them; he was generally conservative. Before he became King's Printer he had been reprimanded for printing unsanctioned books, but he eventually obtained the proper license to print them.¹⁷⁹

Anne of Cleves was the dedicatee of Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defence of Good Women*. Elyot was a clerk of the Privy Chamber who in September 1531 was named ambassador to Charles V, so that he could explore Charles's feelings regarding Henry and Katherine's marriage. Elyot was a known sympathizer of Katherine's, and as such he was recalled to England in January 1532 to be replaced as ambassador by Thomas Cranmer, a man more sympathetic to the annulment and who it was thought would attempt to push Charles in the same direction.¹⁸⁰ Upon his return to England to 1532,

¹⁷⁸ K. F. Pantzer, "Thomas Berthelet," *ODNB*. Upon Henry's death, Berthelet did not renew his license to print for King Edward, which was then given to protestant Richard Grafton.

¹⁷⁹ Pantzer, "Thomas Berthlet."

¹⁸⁰ Greg Walker, *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 124.

Elyot had a frank conversation with the king in which he cited his position of the annulment not being good for England, and was soon relieved of his post. Being distressed by the annulment and no longer in favor with Henry, Elyot lost his public office and retired to his home in Cambridgeshire to work on scholarly activities. He went so far as to feed imperial ambassador Eustache Chapuys information to send to the Emperor about the unhappy state of England without Katherine as queen in 1533 and 1534.¹⁸¹ Greg Walker claims that it was not so much Elyot's dislike of the treatment of Katherine as it was his dislike of the consequences of the annulment that caused Elyot to speak out against it for over a decade. Elyot's concern was that Henry VIII was placing himself above the good of the commonweal in divorcing Katherine and marrying Anne Boleyn, thereby acting like a tyrant.¹⁸² Both Anne and Katherine's deaths in 1536, however, allowed Elyot to write more freely against Henry's actions towards Katherine, as works supporting Katherine would not have been as directly subversive.

Elyot wrote *Defence of Good Women* sometime between 1531 and 1538, with the first printing done in 1540 by Berthelet.¹⁸³ The only extant copy of the 1540 edition is held in the Huntington Library, and was often missed by scholars of Elyot, such as Foster Watson, who cite the 1545 edition as its only early modern printing.¹⁸⁴ When Watson published excerpts of Elyot's *Defence* for the first time since 1545, he identified it as the

¹⁸¹ Walker, *Tyranny*, 125.

¹⁸² Walker, *Tyranny*, 125 and 135.

¹⁸³ William St. Clair and Irmgard Maassen, eds., *Conduct Literature for Women, 1500-1640*. Vol. 2 (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000), 201.

¹⁸⁴ Huntington Library, Rare Books, call number 88302.

first English attempt at a Platonic dialogue, which has since been refuted, and as a reference to the discarded Queen Katherine of Aragon.¹⁸⁵ It does resemble a Platonic dialogue in that it takes the format of a debate between Caninius and Candidus over the goodness of women. Caninius views women as inferior creatures, while Candidus views womankind as prudent and reasonable.¹⁸⁶ To support this view, Candidus extols the virtues of many wise women from antiquity, most notably, Queen Zenobia. Zenobia was a Syrian queen in the third century A.D., who led a revolt against the Roman Empire. She was Queen of Egypt until 274, at which time she was captured and taken to Rome as a hostage, where she lost her title of queen and died as a prisoner of the Emperor. By the end of the dialogue, Caninius shares the view of Candidus.

Watson's second claim, of the similarities between Queen Zenobia and Katherine of Aragon, was echoed by Stanford Lehmborg.¹⁸⁷ Though Lehmborg does not agree with most of Watson's findings, he finds even more similarities between the queens than does Watson. First, Elyot identifies Queen Zenobia's home as Surry, rather than Syria, which could be reference to Surrey, where Katherine of Aragon was removed to Richmond Palace in 1530 by Henry VIII.¹⁸⁸ Second, like Katherine, Zenobia was educated and gave her children the opportunity for education. Third, both queens were not married to their

¹⁸⁵ Watson, *Renascence*, 211-212.

¹⁸⁶ Sir Thomas Elyot, *Defence of Good Women*, In Edwin Johnston Howard, ed. *Sir Thomas Elyot's The Defence of Good Women* (Oxford, OH: The Anchor Press, 1940), 3.

¹⁸⁷ Lehmborg, Stanford Lehmborg, *Sir Thomas Elyot: Tudor Humanist* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1960).

¹⁸⁸ Watson, *Renascence*, 212.

respective kings until the age of twenty-three. And finally, during the times of their captivities, both Zenobia and Katherine found solace in their learning, Zenobia in moral philosophy and Katherine in religion.¹⁸⁹ Greg Walker concurs that Elyot deliberately enhanced the character of Queen Zenobia to align with Katherine of Aragon, more so than the historical queen already did.¹⁹⁰

As many similarities between Katherine of Aragon and Queen Zenobia have been drawn, there is also a similarity between Anne of Cleves and Zenobia, which warrants Anne's comparison to her. Like Zenobia, Anne of Cleves was an anti-imperial queen, married as part of Thomas Cromwell's attempted alliance with the Lutheran princes of the Holy Roman Empire. Even though this is minor in comparison to all of the similarities between Katherine and Zenobia, it shows how one book could be adapted and dedicated to support many causes at different times.

Constance Jordan furthers Watson's findings in her 1986 article, "Feminism and the Humanists: The Case for Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defence of Good Women*."¹⁹¹ In it, she offers a hypothesis as to why Elyot would have written a disguised defense of Katherine of Aragon nearly four years after her death. She speculates that the *Defence* was really written for an audience of those disaffected with Henry VIII and his new queen, Anne Boleyn, in approximately 1533, because it reads stylistically like some of his other work

¹⁸⁹ Lehmborg. *Sir Thomas Elyot*, 176-177.

¹⁹⁰ Greg Walker, *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), 181.

¹⁹¹ Jordan, "Feminism," 242-258.

around 1533.¹⁹² The frontispiece of both the 1540 and 1545 editions has the date 1534 within the wood cut, which could serve as further evidence for an earlier, now missing, edition. For Jordan, *Defence* was really an apology for Katherine as regent and could have been written for her eyes.¹⁹³

Yet, Jordan has missed one piece of evidence that nullifies the possibility of an earlier printed edition, although Elyot's text may have been written as early as 1533. In the Privy Purse expenses of Princess Mary, there is a payment to Thomas Elyot of five shillings in January of 1540.¹⁹⁴ This is the only time that he is mentioned in her expense accounts. This payment most likely is related to the *Defence of Good Women* because Elyot probably gave Mary a copy as a New Years' gift. Mary could have given Elyot this payment because she was aware that *Defence* was meant to contain veiled illusions to her mother. There is no reason for Mary to have rewarded Elyot for his book if it was initially printed six or seven years earlier. Besides, the 1540 edition contains a dedication to Anne of Cleves, diverting any attention from Katherine of Aragon to Anne. According

¹⁹² Walker's *Fictions* also engages with dating *Defence* and with Jordan's findings. For him, *Zenobia* also seems to reflect badly upon the characteristics of Anne Boleyn. But, he suggests that some of its veiled criticism reflects events of 1539, so a date of 1540 must be correct. He bases this on two claims. First, that it did condemn Anne Boleyn, it probably only did so after her trial and execution, when so many character flaws were revealed. Second, there is a passage in which *Zenobia* identifies Palmyra's enemies, which Walker identifies as the Holy Roman Empire, Scotland, and France. These conclusions seem to be far reaching, as Anne's character had been attacked for years leading up to her and Henry's marriage. As for the passage which may reference England's enemies, this allusion would apply to England's political situation, but it, too, is far reaching compared with the allusions to Katherine of Aragon's character. See Walker, *Fictions*, 184-192.

¹⁹³ Jordan, "Feminism," 257.

¹⁹⁴ *Privy Purse Expenses of the Princess Mary, daughter of King Henry VIII, afterwards Queen Mary*, Ed. Frederic Madden (London: W. Pickering: 1831), 82.

to Watson, in Elyot's preface to his *Image of Governance* he says "My little book called the Defense of Good Women, not only confoundeth villainous report, but also teacheth good wives to know well their duties." In the same preface he says that his *Dictionary* is not yet ready, which he completed in 1538, which means that *Defence* was written before 1538, but there is no evidence explaining exactly when.¹⁹⁵

Thomas Berthelet was the King's Printer at the time of the printings of all of Elyot's editions. It seems odd that Berthelet would print a work so obviously meant to be support for Katherine of Aragon, particularly if its first edition really was 1533 or 1534. J. Christopher Warner provides an explanation for this. He argues that books published by Berthelet represented Henry VIII as a philosopher-king, a learned ruler who listened to wise council, thus allowing philosophical inquiry into the king's actions.¹⁹⁶ However, Warner's argument seems somewhat improbable as Henry was not usually a king who accepted criticism graciously.

The dedicatory preface by Sir Thomas Elyot mainly describes his dialogue, but also praises Anne of Cleves's grace and virtue.

I doo dedycate unto your hyghnes mooste noble prycesse, humbly
desyryng your highnesse in suche wyse to accepte my good wyll
and service and this littell warke as your owne, that under your
gracis protection and favour it may safely passe through the
daungerouse rase of dysdayne and envy, and be receyved
thankfully and joyously of al good women in this your noble

¹⁹⁵ Watson, *Renascence*, 211.

¹⁹⁶ J. Christopher Warner, *Henry VIII's Divorce: Literature and the Politics of the Printing Press* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998), 3. In chapter 3, Warner mentions that Elyot's works were known for holding rulers to high moral standards and conveying Elyot's thinly-veiled criticism of Henry VIII's actions, but since he abided by discursive rules, it meant that his warning were meant for the king to get good counsel.

realme, who by the onely example of your excellent majestie,
maye be alway desyrouse to imbrace vertue and gentylnesse,
wherin consisteth verye nobilitie.¹⁹⁷

This dedicatory preface only exists in the 1540 printing. It is dedicated to Anne of Cleves, as she was the current queen in 1540, though not for long. Her marriage to Henry VIII lasted from only 6 January 1540 to 9 July 1540, at which time their marriage was annulled and Anne of Cleves became the “King’s Sister.” Elyot was one of the gentlemen appointed to receive Anne of Cleves in 1540, which is probably why he dedicated this work to her. It was probably a present of some sort that he gave to her on her entrance into England or as a wedding gift.

The 1545 edition has no dedicatory preface, which is odd, as Katherine Parr was the current wife of Henry VIII. She herself was educated and regarded as virtuous, but the dedication was not made. Katherine Parr’s exclusion from a dedication may have reflected her weakening power at court, as her zealous evangelical position worried many conservatives, who in early 1546 plotted to remove her as queen. The plot was unsuccessful, and Henry forgave Katherine once she promised to be more obedient, but with Henry’s temper growing short, Berthelet could have simply not included a dedication to any queen so as not to anger Henry.

Elyot’s dedication appears very similar in content to that of Vives and Hyrde for *Instruction*. Like Vives, Elyot chose to write a book like this about women so as to promote virtue among women, for there were texts (unmentioned) like this in other languages, but English women needed to be able to read about virtue in their own tongue. Like Hyrde, Elyot noticed that men often rebuke women for their shortcomings, but do

¹⁹⁷ Elyot, *Defence* (1540), A.iiiiv. STC 7657.5.

not teach them any differently. But unlike Vives and Hyrde, Elyot wrote his treatise to defend women against bad words. His dedication goes beyond just saying that women need to be taught, but defended why they need to be taught. Elyot pleaded for Anne to accept his treatise and allow it to be printed so that other women can read it as well, for they need to know that they are worthy of education and defense. Elyot concluded with more praise for Anne, to reinforce that he is writing this because of Anne's great example (and so as to ask covertly for patronage).

Besides the questionable date of when Elyot's text was written, this dedication leaves an unanswered question. Was this dedication made and printed in the first six months of 1540, perhaps as a wedding present to Anne of Cleves? Or, was it dedicated and printed in the last six months of 1540, perhaps as a message defending Anne of Cleves, who was Henry VIII's second wife whom he annulled and simply put in a different palace in England so that he did not have to face her anymore? Since it refers to "Queen Anne," rather than "Lady Anne," change evident in another book dedicated to her, the former is probably true. Again, this dedication is reflective of the political situation in which it was written. It was most likely written in a brief window in which Anne of Cleves was queen, but not included in the subsequent 1545 edition. So, as wives changed, so did dedications.

No matter when it was first dedicated or printed, one cannot escape the political message being delivered by *Defence of Good Women*. Elyot did not like when a man rebuked a woman for no reason, other than because he thought that as a man he is her superior. Elyot set out to write a treatise that defended virtuous women and taught

gentlemen not to rebuke women for no reason, but to listen to them and respect them. Clearly this was a commentary on the marital situation of Henry VIII, supporting one, if not both, of Henry VIII's deposed queens. Henry rebuked one virtuous queen, Katherine of Aragon, for not producing a son, and another virtuous queen for not being attractive enough. For Elyot, neither of these reasons was sufficient to annul a marriage. Thomas Berthelet must have held similar opinions, as he printed all of Elyot's books between 1530 and 1545.

Of the eleven books not printed by the King's Printers, these can be attributed to ten different printers. Robert Redman printed Tristram Revel's translation of the *The summe christianitie gatheryd out almoste of al placis of scripture*, a reformist text. Redman himself was most likely reformist in nature, and was a major print competitor to both Pynson and Berthelet. Redman used the same sign as Pynson and upon Pynson's death, moved into his print shop.¹⁹⁸ John Day, another reformer, printed Thomas Becon's *A pomaunder of prayer* and Sir Anthony Cope's *A godly meditation on select and chosen psalms*. Thomas Godfray printed one book sanctioned by King Henry VIII, Giles Duwes's *An introductory to learn to rede, to pronounce, and to speak French*, Mary's French textbook, and the one book rejected by Anne Boleyn, William Marshall's text on poor relief in Ypres. Richard Faques was a near relation of William Faques, King's Printer from 1503 to 1508, the first man to hold the title, and succeeded William's shop upon his death.¹⁹⁹ Faques printed the first book dedicated to Katherine of Aragon,

¹⁹⁸ "Robert Redman," *ODNB*.

¹⁹⁹ E. Gordon Duff, *A Century of the English Book Trade* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1905), 44.

Salute Corporis, which contained William of Saliceto's *Salute Corporis* as well as excerpts from other texts.²⁰⁰ It was dedicated jointly to Henry and Katherine in 1509, and is generally considered to be a wedding present for the couple, as its printing was financed by Petrus de Champagne, Squire to the Body to the king.²⁰¹ Edwards and Meale note that this commission paid dividends for Champagne, as he was later rewarded by the king.²⁰²

As there is not much known about any of these printers or the others who printed the remaining books dedicated to the wives, it is difficult to deduce common patterns linking print culture and dedications. Generally, the books dedicated to the later five wives were more evangelical in nature, which probably explains why they were not printed by the King's Printers. For men trying to get reformist texts to the queens, it would have been much easier to have them printed by anyone on Fleet Street than first get the text approved by the king. This way, the evangelical books did not have to agree with the image of the king, yet could still be allowed to be printed and distributed. It just would have been too difficult to try to have the King's Printer print something that Henry may not have agreed with, but there would have been many other printers who would have happily printed books meant for the eyes of the king and queens, just to compete with the King's Printer.

Yet, during Henry's reign, there were strict regulations regarding the printing of religious material. As early as 1407, statutes were put in place that allowed the Bishop of

²⁰⁰ Edwards and Meale, "Marketing," 112-113.

²⁰¹ Edwards and Meale, "Marketing," 112-113.

²⁰² See Edwards and Meale, "Marketing," 112-113. Also note 34.

London to prosecute heretical books.²⁰³ Later, in 1524, Bishop Tunstall issued a warning against importing books that supported Lutheran heresies and declared that they must first be shown to either “the Lord Cardinal, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, or the Bishop of Rochester.”²⁰⁴ Other statutes were passed in the 1530s and 1540s that allowed confiscation of texts that did not conform to the Henrician religious settlement.²⁰⁵ While Mary was queen she also made three proclamations which ordered punishments for seditious and unlicensed bills and books.²⁰⁶ For example, in 1554, Mary made provision “that none evil books shall either be printed bought or sold without just punishment.”²⁰⁷

One such regulated book was Erasmus’s *Institution of Christian Matrimony*. First printed in Latin in Basel in 1526 as *Christiani matrimonii institution*, it was dedicated to Katherine of Aragon and praised her marriage to Henry as a model marriage. It also mentioned Mary as a girl who was following in her mother’s footsteps of virtue, learning, and someday, queenship. This work fit into the large debate over the sacramental status of marriage taking place all over Europe. As I have argued elsewhere, it was never

²⁰³ Arthur W. Reed, “The Regulation of the Book Trade Before the Proclamation of 1538,” *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, vol. XV (1920), 158-159.

²⁰⁴ Reed, “Regulation,” 162-163.

²⁰⁵ Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26-27.

²⁰⁶ Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. 11 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 4, 5, 41.

²⁰⁷ British Library, Cotton MS Titus C VII, fol. 120. Quotation taken from David Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 243.

printed in England or in English because it was too dangerous to print for Henry VIII.²⁰⁸ By the time an English translation or printing could have been undertaken, it would have been too controversial, as Henry was just beginning his quest for annulment from Katherine. It was even placed on the Catholic Church's Index of Forbidden Books in 1559 because of its evangelical overtones. *Institution* was not quite as evangelical as many of the books dedicated to Henry's latter five wives, but nonetheless, it is an example of a text that did not concur with royal approval.

Conclusion

Dedications to the six consorts of Henry VIII were much different than those to Lady Margaret Beaufort. Those to Lady Margaret were done generally for commercial purposes, just briefly noting their connection to her in a colophon. Those to the six queens consort were all actual dedications that praised their patron and pleaded for patronage. They were more concerned with praising the virtues of the queens and appealing to their interests in hopes that the queens would then make appeals on their behalf to the king. Also unlike those to Lady Margaret, these dedications more explicitly show the patronage and power of the Tudor queens at court, as they reflect specific changing religious and political ideas that were influencing the Tudor court. Yet, the dedications to the six consorts still added authority and commercial appeal to books. The dedications to Lady Margaret and the six wives laid the groundwork for how to dedicate

²⁰⁸ See Valerie Schutte, "To the Illustrious Queen': Katherine of Aragon and Early Modern Book Dedications," in *Women during the English Reformations: Renegotiating Gender and Religious Identity*, Julie A. Chappell and Kaley A. Kramer, eds. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, Forthcoming 2014).

printed works to queens. They were not quite the same types of books and subject matter as were those to Mary, but they certainly influenced Mary, particularly with their emphasis on humanism and religious devotion. Many of them even mention Mary or focus on political situations involving Mary. The next chapter will explore the dedications that Mary received at this same time, while she was both princess and lady.

CHAPTER III

DEDICATIONS TO A PRINCESS

The previous chapter examined the printed book dedications given to Lady Margaret Beaufort and the six consorts of Henry VIII as dedications to royal ladies that set the tone for how to dedicate to a queen regnant. This chapter shifts focus to the printed book dedications that Mary received before she became queen. As a princess (and Lady), Mary was the recipient of eight printed book dedications. These eight dedications had two specific agendas: education and virtue. While the hope for patronage was ever-present in dedications, there was an evident shift from dedicators using royal dedicatees for patronage to dedicators seeing themselves as educators. Dedicators saw it as their duty to instruct the princess not only in foreign languages, classics, and religion, but also to prepare her with humanism to be queen or queen consort one day.

This chapter will examine the eight printed books dedicated to Princess Mary. I will discuss, in near chronological order, the three textbooks to Mary, followed by an examination of two generic appeals to Mary, moving to the final three dedications to Mary which were more personal in nature, and conclude with a comparison of books dedicated to Prince Edward and Princess Elizabeth. By the end of the chapter it will be clear that even though Mary was highly educated and unusual for her time, dedicators seemed to value her virtue more than her education. This chapter suggests that as a

princess Mary had very little influence over the networks of patronage relating to printed books. Only once she became queen was Mary able to negotiate with patrons in a public way.

Of the eight princess-era dedications, three accompanied textbooks given to Mary in the 1520s and 1530s, exploring education in French, Latin, and principles of virtue. She also received a small treatise about honoring God in the 1520s. Two books were dedicated to her in the 1540s while her father was still alive: a type of travel narrative and a treatise on virtue. From 1547 to 1553, the reign of Mary's brother, Edward, she was given two books that were religious in nature. Like those mentioned in the previous chapter, these printed books dedicated to Princess Mary covered a variety of subjects and were dedicated by a variety of men. Unlike the the printed books dedicated to Lady Margaret and the six consorts, every book dedicated to Mary while she was a princess was dedicated either by the author or translator; none was dedicated by the printer. Unlike her grandmother, Mary's name was not invoked to legitimize the importance of printed books. This suggests that print was firmly established in London by the 1520s, having only arrived in the 1470s. Yet, there was still much overlap between manuscript and print, and chapter four of this study will elaborate on that overlap and all of the dedicated manuscripts that Mary received during her lifetime.

Importantly, but again unsurprising, is that like the books dedicated to the six wives of Henry VIII, the books dedicated to Mary while she was a princess, and later demoted to Lady, closely followed the politics of the time. While in favor and only heir apparent, Mary received textbooks to be taught from, preparing her to be queen, either

regnant over England or consort over another country. Mary received no dedications after 1526 until 1533, as this was the period in which her father became involved with Anne Boleyn, politics became factional, and a male heir was expected to usurp Mary's place in line to the throne. She received one dedication in 1533. Then, from 1534 to 1542, there is a gap of nine years before another book is dedicated to her. Most likely, this is because during these nine years Mary fell in and out of favor depending upon her relationship with her current step-mother and her willingness to accept the religious changes of her father. Mary also had a rocky relationship with her brother, particularly in terms of his more evangelical settlement. But as a potential heir and because of the very generous land settlement that Edward's regency council gave her upon his accession, she had a tremendous number of clients, and it became acceptable to dedicate to Mary again. Yet dedications to Mary again stopped after 1550 until her accession because she disagreed with her brother over the current religious settlement. All of these stoppages in dedications reflect the sycophantic nature of literary patronage in the Tudor court.

The first printed book dedicated to Princess Mary was Juan Luis Vives's *Satellitium sive Symbola* (Guards or symbols). It was printed for the first time in 1524 and appears to always have been bound with two other books, *Introductio ad Sapientiam* (Introduction to wisdom), and *Epistolae duae de Ratione Studii Puerilis* (Two letters of the method of children's study).²⁰⁹ *Epistolae duae* contained the letter to Catherine of Aragon mentioned in the previous chapter. *Satellitium* was never printed in England, but was printed many times on continental Europe, and often with the other two books. The

²⁰⁹ Juan Luis Vives, *Introductio ad sapientiam; Satellitium sive Symbola; Epistolae duae de Ratione Studii Puerilis* (Louvain: Peter Martens, 1524).

last time *Satellitium* was printed was in 1599, and the dedication to Princess Mary appears to have been kept in all editions.²¹⁰ The fact that *Satellitium* and *Epistolae duae* were bound together in most editions is probably why scholars have often been mistaken about which dedication belongs to which book.

The entirety of *Satellitium* was written in Latin, both the dedication and the body of the text. In *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*, Foster Watson translated the dedication, as well as a few of the *symbola*, or mottos which were meant to both guard and instruct the young princess's morals, which he found most interesting.²¹¹ In total, Vives's book contained 213 *symbola*, a few more than the "Satellites ducentos," or two hundred, which Vives promised. Vives wrote that "it has been customary that a satellitium (escort, guard) should be attached to princes, to keep constant watch over the safety of their life and body...but I...will set around thy soul a guard, which will preserve thee more securely and safely than any spearmen or bowmen whatever." These morals, "Ego uero a matre tua inclyta & sanctissima foemina rogatus," Vives undertook to write at the request of Mary's "holy mother," just like *Epistolae duae* of the year before.

In the dedication, Vives continued that a guard of the body may desert or even kill a prince, but that the soul always faces greater dangers from threats of vice. He warned that the soul should be dearer to a person than the body, so Mary must protect her soul because the Devil is everywhere. He called the mottos *symbola* "as if there were sure signs, by which Princes of old were ordinarily distinguished, as indeed they are to-day."

²¹⁰ The last printed edition that I had access to was from 1577, and it contained the dedication.

²¹¹ Watson, *Renaissance*, 151-158. All quotations regarding *Satellitium*, including translations, come from Watson.

His *symbola* would make her more worthy than kings who have “greater faith in their own power than they have in that of God,” and who take on symbols of lions, dragons, and bears. Vives’s *symbola* were brief so that they are powerful and meaningful, but were not so allegorical that they could be interpreted in ways that obscure Vives’s meaning. He also included a few lines of explanation with most of the *symbola* because he did not want them to be ambiguous. Some of Vives’s *symbola* included “Bonis omnia in bonum” (5), “Nobilitatem non dat usus dies” (52), and “Cogitatus liber” (190), followed by the explanation “nemo prohibere potest quenquam cogitare,” nobody can forbid anyone to think. Vives’s dedication continued, “Mihi pro hoc Satellitio nolo ftipendium aliud numerari,” he did not desire payment for *Satellitium* because he could not receive a better payment than her taking his advice and living according to his *symbola*. Again, Vives invoked Mary’s mother, Catherine, noting that Mary will be a good princess just by imitating her mother. Vives concluded the dedication, traditionally, by asking Jesus Christ to give Mary a long life and good fortune. Most importantly Vives meant for his *symbola* to ensure that she kept and practiced virtue.

Mary favored one *symbola* in particular, “Veritas temporis filia” (90), as she chose to adopt it as her motto. This particular *symbola* was followed by the explanation: “Verum, quod diu latuit, procedente tempore existit & apparet, ne quis fidat mendacio, vel putet in occulto veritatem semper fore: Cicero: Opinionem commenta delet dies, naturae iudicia confirmat.” Truth may lay hidden for a long time, but it always exists and appears. There is no doubt that Mary felt many truths were hidden but upon her accession were revealed: the validity of her parents’ marriage, her divine calling to be

queen, and her conviction that the religion of England should be Catholic. Ironically, the same motto was used on the frontispiece of John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrvovs regiment of women*, targeted at Mary and her cousin, Mary, Queen of Scots, as queens.²¹²

Not as concerned with virtue, but equally important as a textbook for Mary is Thomas Linacre's *Rudimenta grammatices*.²¹³ Linacre composed three grammars, *Rudimenta grammatices*, *Progymnasmata grammatices vulgaria*, and *De emendate structura Latini sermonis*, but *Rudimenta* was designed for the use of Princess Mary and was probably written between 1519 and 1524, but not printed by Richard Pynson until approximately 1525, as "diligenter castigat denuo" on the frontispiece identifies.²¹⁴ According to Garrett Mattingly, prior to 1509 Thomas Linacre was relatively unknown to the royal family, as he had only published one book. He had been appointed as tutor/physician to Prince Arthur in 1501, but after Arthur's death was dropped from royal service. Mattingly suggests that Catherine may have remembered Linacre from his appointment to Arthur at Ludlow, as Linacre was quickly reappointed right after the accession of Henry VIII.²¹⁵

²¹² John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrvovs regiment of women* (Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul, 1558). STC 15070.

²¹³ Thomas Linacre. *Rudimenta grammatices Thomae Linacri diligenter castigat denuo* (London: Richard Pynson, 1525?). STC 15636.

²¹⁴ D.F.S. Thomson, "Linacre's Latin Grammars" in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460-1524*. Eds. Francis Maddison, Margaret Pelling, and Charles Webster (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 26.

²¹⁵ Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, 182-183.

Linacre appears to have been Mary's first Latin tutor and had to make a Latin grammar instruction for her because there was none suitable for his royal female student, so when he printed *Rudimenta* he dedicated it to her.²¹⁶ The dedication is one full page and is in Latin, while the rest of the body of the book is in English with the Latin grammar.²¹⁷ I surmise that the dedication is in Latin so that Mary would have to translate it herself as a reward for doing well in her studies. Linacre was also a royal physician, so it is unsurprising that in the dedication he calls himself the guardian of her health, "nec id ministerium obire per valetudinem licuerit." Linacre also notes that her father arranged this agreement, that Mary is excellent in birth, prominent among women, and has a great quality to study letters.

However, even though this book was written for a royal pupil, it did not have much success in England. The Scottish humanist George Buchanan translated *Rudimenta* into Latin for the use of his Scottish pupil, Gilbert Kennedy, third Earl of Cassillis. This Latin version was published by Robert Estienne in 1533 and was reprinted several times in France, and kept the dedication to Princess Mary, as well as the one by Buchanan to his pupil.²¹⁸ Buchanan's version, consequently, was widely used on the continent, while Linacre's English edition "fell out of use in England."²¹⁹ This disuse was most likely

²¹⁶ John Noble Johnson, *The Life of Thomas Linacre* (London: Edward Lumley, 1835), 232.

²¹⁷ The dedication is on A1v.

²¹⁸ Thomson, "Linacre's Latin Grammars," 26. For a list of French versions, see *George Buchanan: Glasgow Quartercentenary Studies 1906* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907), 399-400.

²¹⁹ Thomson, "Linacre's Latin Grammars," 27.

caused by Linacre's death in 1524. Linacre's death was not unexpected, because as early as 24 August 1521 Erasmus wrote to him sorry to hear of his declining health and encouraged him to publish his works so as not to deprive the world of his many years of labor.²²⁰ If not for that letter, *Rudimenta* may never have been printed after Mary's use. Juan Luis Vives wrote to Linacre in November 1524 telling him that he had not heard from him for a long period, that he feared that Linacre had a problem with his health which would explain the absence of a letter, and plead with him to send him a letter. Vives also asked about his grammar, "quid agas de Grammatica tua."²²¹ However, Linacre had died at the end of October of that year, so he was unable to respond to Vives.

From the time of Linacre's death in 1524 and Mary being sent the Welsh marches in 1525 she had two more Latin tutors. The first of these was Catherine of Aragon, herself, as evidenced in a letter that Catherine wrote her daughter.

As for your writing in Lattine I am glad that ye shall change frome me to Maister Federston, for that shall doo you moche good, to lerne by him to write right. But yet some tymes I wold be glad when ye doo write to Maister Federston of your owne enditing when he hathe rede it that I may se it. For it shalbe a grete comfort to me to see You kepe your Latten and fayer writing and all.²²²

The second, also evidenced by the letter, was Richard Fetherston. *Epistolae duae* and *Satelitium* by Vives also seem to have been written around the time of Linacre's death as

²²⁰ *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, III, 1505.

²²¹ Juan Luis Vives, *Opera Omnia*, Vol. VII, 1788, Reprinted (London: The Gregg Press Limited, 1964), 207-208. Letter and Papers Henry VIII, IV, 829.

²²² Henry Ellis, *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*. Vol. II. First Series (London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard. 1825), 19-20. British Library, Ms. Cotton Vesp. F xiii. Fol. 72. Reprinted in Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, 230-231.

Vives wrote them to be supplements to Mary's studies now that she was able to read the classics in Latin. The dedication of *Epistolae duae* to Catherine mentions an unnamed tutor, who must be Fetherston. Fetherston was sent to Wales with Princess Mary as part of her elaborate household. Even after the Welsh expedition, Fetherston was kept on as Mary's tutor, as was Giles Duwes who will be mentioned later, and both men were given New Year's gifts by Henry VIII in 1528 of 20 $\frac{3}{4}$ ounces in plate each.²²³ As late as 1 October 1533 Fetherston was named as Mary's schoolmaster in the list of her household expenses.²²⁴ Fetherston was then appointed to Catherine of Aragon's defense in the divorce proceedings but was quickly in trouble himself for not swearing the Oath of Supremacy.²²⁵ He was imprisoned in the Tower for six years and was hanged, drawn, and quartered with two others on 30 July 1540.²²⁶

Mary's other childhood tutor, Giles Duwes, dedicated a French textbook to his royal pupil. *An Introductory for to lerne to rede, to pronounce, and to speake Frenche trewly* was first printed in approximately 1533 by Thomas Godfray.²²⁷ Two later editions are extant, those of 1540 and 1546. Duwes served Henry VII as French tutor to

²²³ *Letters and Papers Henry VIII*, IV, entry 3748.

²²⁴ *Letters and Papers Henry VIII*, VI, entry 1199.

²²⁵ Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, 48.

²²⁶ *Letters and Papers Henry VIII*, XVI, entry 578. Very little is known about Fetherston. I can find no evidence of any textbook that he may have penned or even used for Mary's tutoring.

²²⁷ Giles Duwes, *An introductory for to lerne to rede, to pronounce, and to speake Frenche trewly, compiled for the right high, excellent, and most vertuous lady, the lady Mary of Englande, doughter to our most gracious souerayn lorde kyng Henry the eight* (London: Thomas Godfray, 1533?). STC 7377.

his children, was a gentleman of Princess Mary's chamber, and succeeded Quentin Poulet as royal librarian in the late 1520s.²²⁸ Duwes even participated in the coronation of Catherine of Aragon.²²⁹ Duwes and his wife then joined Mary's household when it was combined with that of Elizabeth in 1533.²³⁰

His book is in two parts. Book I, dedicated to Princess Mary, was the grammar portion of his textbook and explains everything from conjugation to pronouns. The dedication to Mary is brief, but it notes that this book is for her honor, that Duwes wrote these verses for her, and asks that she be forever blessed. After the brief dedication, there is a prologue that also refers to Mary. In that prologue, Duwes mentioned that Mary "hath me commanded and encharged" to write of how he taught her lessons, which implies some reluctance.²³¹ This refers to how he previously gave her these lessons, probably when he was sent to live with her in the Welsh Marches in 1525, and that she later asked him to print his lessons. In 1533 Mary had a new little half-sister, so perhaps Mary wanted Elizabeth to learn French from the same lessons.

Book II is dedicated to the King, Queen Anne Boleyn, and Princess Elizabeth. The dedication is written in French, but has an English translation above the French text.

²²⁸ David R. Carlson, "Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII" *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 22 (1991), 276-278; John Weever, *Ancient funeral monuments* (London: Printed by Thomas Harper, 1631); David Loades, *Mary Tudor*, Revised 1992, 43.

²²⁹ *Letters and Papers Henry VIII*, I, 82. Giles Duwes is listed in a warrant to be given materials for a coat to participate in the coronation.

²³⁰ *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, VI, 1199.

²³¹ Duwes, *An introductory*, Aiv r.

A laude and prayse
to the Kynge / the quene / and to the princesse
noble grace / for a preamble or
prologue to the sayd
boke.

To the right hye / right christen / and most redouted
imperiall myght and souerayne
maiesty of you / Henry by the grace of
god / lyueng kyng victorious / and monarcion of all
Englande the .viii. of that name: Be laude euerlastyng
honour without ende: Always lastyng lyfe
prosperous and good felicite.

And to you most illustre / right excellent / and right
magnanime / lady and princesse / my lady Anne by the
grace of god Quene of Englande / and of France
with right noble and most vertuose / your right dere and
well beloued doughter Elizabeth Princesse of Englande
and of Wales: be lyfe euerlastyng / and ioie with
out ende. Amen Amen.²³²

Interestingly, the 1540 edition contains both the dedication to Mary and the dedication to her family, while the 1546 edition was altered. One possible explanation for the 1540 edition leaving the dedication to Mary's father the same is that Henry was married to Anne of Cleves at the time, so it was convenient that dedication already said "Anne by the grace of god Quene of England." In the 1546 edition, the dedication of Book II, to the King, Queen, and Princess, was changed to only mention the king's new imperial status and his new title of Supreme Head of the Church of England. No wives or children are mentioned, which is also interesting because by this time Henry had a legitimate son. Nicholas Hill, an evangelical, printed the 1546 edition which may explain his choice to alter the dedication to reflect Henry being head of the church. Also, by mentioning that

²³² Duwes, *An introductory*, Siv r.

Henry was Supreme Head, Hill may also have been attempting to minimize Mary's Catholicism which was probably associated with this particular grammar.

Book II is a series of dialogues, and as with the entire book, the French text is large and above each line is an English translation. The first dialogue is a conversation between Mary and a messenger sent by the king and is interesting because it has Mary asking about her father and mother. This text must have been written before 1533 or her father and mother would not be together and a messenger from the king probably would not have included a message from her mother as well. The second dialogue is a monition to Lady Mary from a lady of Maltrauers about hearsay from the town. The fact that she is called "lady" is again evidence that Duwes must have written this book even as early as the 1520s during their stay in Wales as a text for her and then adapted its language for the printed version of the early 1530s. The third dialogue is a sample message from the Emperor, the French king, or any other princes and seems to be a generic letter that a prince/king would send to her to teach her the type of language that she might receive. Other dialogues include an example of a letter that might accompany a present given to her, an epitaph, a death notice, a letter from a squire, a conversation on perpetual peace between England and France, verses sent to Mary by her school master in an instance that he is sick, communications between Mary and her almoner and her treasurer, and discussions about the soul, Mass, and the division of time.

As for the discussion about the nature of the Mass, Mary (as Duwes writes her) questions whether the Mass should be heard or said, clearly a reflection of the new evangelical ideas circulating in England. Her almoner responds that the Mass should be

heard. Mary wants to know what a person would do at Mass if they did not pray along. The almoner responds that people should just listen and think on what the priest is saying. Mary then asks what people who do not understand it (i.e. Latin) should do. The almoner responds that if they hear and think they shall understand. Judith Richards has argued that this passage shows Mary's concern "that all the congregation should have a better understanding of the central religious ceremonies might be seen to foreshadow her concern as queen to promote a broad education of the laity in the Catholic religion."²³³ But it seems to me that Mary is objecting to reformed idea of service in which laity does not participate. For Mary, participating, such as taking the Eucharist and audibly reciting prayers, is understanding.

It is somewhat surprising that Duwes dedicated this textbook in two parts, one to Mary and the other to her father and his new family. Duwes easily could have just dedicated this book to Mary. Jeri McIntosh has argued that Duwes dedicated the second book to Anne Boleyn to tone down the overt political nature of his textbook.²³⁴ But, to me, the printing of this textbook does not seem to be a political action by Duwes, as these

²³³ Judith Richards, *Mary Tudor* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), 47

²³⁴ Jeri McIntosh argues that Duwes's book was printed in 1534 with political intent to represent Mary as de facto Prince(ss) of Wales. Yet, McIntosh also infers that Duwes wrote the text in the 1530s, when it seems much more likely that Duwes wrote the text in 1525 in Wales. Jeri McIntosh, "Princess Mary as the de facto Prince(ss) of Wales, 1525" *Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange*, University of Tennessee Knoxville (2010). Greg Walker makes a similar point as McIntosh, arguing that old texts could be reproduced in the 1530s and 1540s to seem accommodating even though they were critical of the new political and religious changes. *Introductorie* was written between 1524-1527, was not printed until 1533, and then was reprinted in 1539, 1540, and 1545. Greg Walker, "Dialogue, resistance and accommodation: conservative literary responses to the Henrician Reformation," In *The Education of a Christian Society: Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands*, Eds. N. Scott Amos, Andrew Pettegree, and Henk van Nierop (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 105.

lessons were written years before Anne Boleyn was even an influence, but more so an act of defiance by Mary. Duwes makes it clear that he only printed this textbook because Mary had asked him to do so. Duwes had been working for the royal family perhaps as early as the 1490s. He knew that publishing a text in which Mary, her mother, and her father were all peaceful and one family was a poor political decision if he wanted to keep in favor with the royal family and remain in service. So, Duwes had to dedicate the second book to Anne Boleyn and Princess Elizabeth so as to stay in the good graces of the royal family. Duwes had to make clear in the prologue that he only did this at Mary's bidding and he even changed the salutations to Mary to match her newly demoted status. At the very least Duwes may have been hoping to teach Elizabeth French one day as well. I suggest that Mary wanted him to print this text book as a reminder to her father that she was still a royal daughter and not a bastard. Mary would have taken comfort in the thought that Elizabeth would learn French lessons that were originally meant for Mary and which showed the court respecting Mary. This dedication seems to be the first dedication in which Mary actually negotiated with the dedicator over political power.

One other book has been linked to Mary's education, but it was neither written for her nor dedicated to her. The Bodleian Library possesses a 1519 edition of Sallust which has a binding stamped with the arms of Henry and Katherine of Aragon on the upper cover.²³⁵ MacRay has suggested that this may have been a textbook of Mary's based on its printing in 1519, the royal binding, and that many of the words in the text are underlined with marginalia of three different hands, one of which may belong to Henry

²³⁵ Bodleian Library, DD 68 Art.

VIII.²³⁶ Apart from the royal binding and the handwriting, there is no way to confirm if this text was actually used by Henry and his daughter, as it contains no library inventory number. Moreover, a comparison of known handwriting of Henry VIII and the handwriting in the Sallust shows that the most frequent writing does not belong to Henry.²³⁷ Yet, if one of the minor hands belongs to Henry, it is reasonable to conclude that Henry may have let his daughter use this book for her early humanist studies.

It seems that while Mary was the only princess she had little to do with the negotiation of her education or her dedications. Those dedications of her childhood and teenage years were mainly concerned with her education and were rather straightforward with their goals and intentions. The textbooks by Vives and Linacre were requested by her parents to encourage Mary into a humanistic education, as not many textbooks were available for young girls. The dedications reveal that these books were negotiated *for* Mary, not by her. Duwes's book was also written for the education of Mary, but its dedication some years later shows Mary's first attempt at negotiation in a printed dedication at the age of eighteen.

Mary also received some rather generic dedications. When she was only ten, Mary received a dedication, this time negotiated neither by her nor her parents. *The Extripacion of ignorancy* by Paul Bush is a short treatise which encourages its readers to fear God, love God, and honor their prince, and it contains a rather straightforward

²³⁶ William Forrest, *The History of Grisild the Second: A Narrative, In verse, of the Divorce of Queen Katharine of Aragon*, Ed. by W.D. MacRay (London: Chiswick Press, 1875), xx.

²³⁷ I would like to thank Dr. Francesca Galligan, rare books librarian at the Bodleian, for examining this book and comparing the handwriting.

dedication as an appeal for patronage.²³⁸ Bush's dedication to Mary is general and he seems to have had no connection to the crown much before 1542 when he was made Bishop of Bristol, a newly founded bishopric by Henry VIII.²³⁹ The entire book is written with a seven line rhyming scheme, in which each paragraph is comprised of seven lines that rhyme in the pattern ABABBCC. The dedication is written in this same pattern and is comprised of three such rhyming paragraphs.²⁴⁰ Bush noted that Mary was a "gracious lady" who was naturally virtuous. He told her that his book is brief and includes some of both the Old and New Testaments, and that it is meant to be written against evil detractors. He acknowledged that he is not as gifted as the laureate Chaucer, the "fountayne of oratours," and that he (Bush) is bound to Mary with "hert and feryce." He extolled her magnificence and testified his fidelity to her and her parents and ended with asking God to preserve her honor. Bush appealed to Chaucer to link himself with a great poet of England to better place himself to receive patronage from both king and princess.²⁴¹ This dedication really can just be understood as an appeal for some type of courtly position, the kind of which Mary was in no position to give in 1526. Upon her

²³⁸ Paule Bush, *Here begynneth a lytell treatyse in Englysshe, called the extripacion of ignorancy: and it treateth and speketh of the ignorance of people, shewyng them howe they are bounde to feare god, to loue god, and to honour their prince* (London: Richarde Pynson, 1526?). STC 4186.

²³⁹ J.H. Bettey, "Paul Bush, the first bishop of Bristol" *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 106 (1988), 170.

²⁴⁰ Bush, *Ignorancy*, A.ii.v.

²⁴¹ Seth Lerer has argued that Bush's *Ignorancy* fits within the medieval Chaucerian tradition with its language and style, particularly in three dedicatory verses to Princess Mary, and sees the dedication as an "application for laureateship." Seth Lerer, "Paul Bush and the Chaucer Tradition," *Medium Aevum*, Vol. 73 (2004), 103-109.

accession, Mary did have to decide Bush's fate, as he took advantage of the ability for priests to marry. Bush was removed from his bishopric, but because his wife had died in the fall of 1533, he was allowed to be rector of the parish in Winterbourne.²⁴²

Another rather generic dedication, simply written for patronage, was Andrew Borde's *Introduction of knowledge*.²⁴³ Similar to the printed dedication of Duwes, Borde's dedication was first written in 1542 but the book was only first printed in 1555 by William Copeland. *Knowledge* had a second printed edition in 1562, which kept the dedication to Mary. Cathy Shrank has argued that *Knowledge* was meant to do two things: give practical knowledge of other countries, but at the same time promote Englishness as culturally superior to these other countries.²⁴⁴ The dedication is just a small paragraph so as to remember the "bountiful goodness" of Mary.²⁴⁵ In it Borde told Mary that he has lived in Scotland, has travelled all over the realm of Christianity, and has lived in Montpellier. While very informal, the bulk of the dedication just repeats the contents of the book as laid out in the title: knowledge of other regions, languages, and coins. He concluded the dedication "trusting that your grace will accept my good wyll and dylygent labour in Chryste, who kepe your grace in health and honour."²⁴⁶ The language of Borde indicates no personal knowledge of Mary. Trusting her goodwill

²⁴² Bettye, "Paul Bush," 171.

²⁴³ Andrew Borde, *The first booke of the introduction of knowledge* (London: William Copeland, 1555. STC 3383.

²⁴⁴ Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 35.

²⁴⁵ Borde, *Knowledge*, Aiv.

²⁴⁶ Borde, *Knowledge*, Aiv.

seems to be a call for some kind of patronage. Moreover, Borde did not seem to have any reason for specifically dedicating this to Mary. Borde had been out of the country, so he probably did not know the situation of Mary that well, or if he did, he was just hoping for any chance of succeeding in gaining patronage.

According to F.J. Furnivall, Borde was an Englishman and a Carthusian monk who was discharged after being accused of breaking his vows of celibacy. He then travelled overseas and studied medicine, returning to England to take the Oath of Supremacy, eventually ended up imprisoned and then was freed by Thomas Cromwell. Borde travelled overseas at least four times, and returned to England shortly after writing *Knowledge*, all the while acting as a practicing physician. He was again imprisoned and his will is dated 1549.²⁴⁷ Furnivall identifies Borde's *Introduction of knowledge, A Dyetary of Helth*, and *Breyary of Health* as all written in 1542. Both *Dyetary* and *Knowledge* have dedications dated to May 1542, to the Duke of Norfolk and Princess Mary, respectively, neither of whom supported religious reform. As Borde was freed from prison once by Cromwell, it seemed that he had affection for him. In dedicating to Mary, but also mentioning Thomas Cromwell in the body of his book, Borde positioned himself as accommodating both old and new religions, or rather championing the new identity of England being comprised of both.²⁴⁸ Perhaps that was also the stance of William Copeland, the printer of the 1555 edition. He printed a book that contained a dedication to Mary, but on 12 March 1557 he was ordered by the Privy Council to turn in

²⁴⁷ Andrew Boorde, *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge*, Edited and Introduction by F.J. Furnivall (London: Early English Text Society, 1870), 36-38.

²⁴⁸ Shrank, *Writing*, 61-62.

copies of Thomas Cranmer's *Recantation* that he had printed so that they could all be burnt. During his lifetime he had four other fines relating to his printing.²⁴⁹ Copeland, too, seems to have had to navigate a fine line between accommodating both the old and new religious settlements. As far as I can tell, Borde's dedication to Mary was not based on a personal relationship and was just made so as to elicit patronage from the princess, while showing his internal struggle to accept the Henrician reformation and the new meaning of Englishness.

Thomas Paynell, on the other hand, dedicated two books to Mary and very clearly had an established relationship with her. Paynell was a canon of Merton Priory and was later a chaplain to Henry VIII and orator under Mary and Elizabeth.²⁵⁰ He was a well-known Erasmian translator, and because of that was able to survive successfully under the different Tudor monarchs. Helen Moore has recently argued that part of Paynell's staying power lay in his ability to unite vernacular reading of Scripture with the development of English language. His dedications were a humanist practice that became distinctly English. Moore even praised Paynell as one of the first scholars to translate Erasmus into English.²⁵¹

In 1545, Paynell dedicated *A comemdius & a moche fruytefull treatyse of well liuyng, contaynyng the hole summe and effect of al virtue* "to the high and excellent Lady mary, deare doughter to our moost pusaunte soueraygne lorde the kynge," which

²⁴⁹ H. R. Tedder and Mary C. Erler, "William Copland," *ODNB*.

²⁵⁰ Geoffrey Eatough, "Thomas Paynell," *ODNB*.

²⁵¹ Helen Moore, "Gathering Fruit: The 'Profitable' Translations of Thomas Paynell," In *Tudor Translation*. Ed. Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 41-51.

was printed by Thomas Petyt.²⁵² This book was a translation of part of a book St. Bernard had written at his sister's request when she wanted rules so as to live a holy life, and its contents made Paynell think of Mary's virtues. He commented about her virtues, knowledge, and chastity, "consideryng your gracys estate and age."²⁵³ Paynell continued "who can deny but yf youre grace thus well lerned (as in dede ye are)," showing that her learnedness was already acknowledged within her lifetime.²⁵⁴ Paynell speculated that Mary had never read a book in English which would call her to such great devotion to obey God and the commandments. It was made for a virtuous woman, so he chose to dedicate it to another virtuous woman, "a very mirour & glasse of all goodnesse, of all virtue, of all deuocion, and perfet faith."²⁵⁵ In her can be seen the effect of godly and virtuous education. Paynell concluded by asking God to watch over Mary this New Year.

Paynell's dedication seems to have one theme: virtue. In 1545, Mary was 29 and still unmarried, so it is not really a surprise that a monk and scholar would praise Mary's virtues, as her situation was very uncommon. Moreover, Paynell may have been trying to contrast virtuous Mary with the other most prominent woman at court at that time: Katherine Parr. Paynell perhaps was commenting on Mary's Catholic virtue as superior to the evangelical virtue of Katherine Parr.

²⁵² S. Bernard, *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse of well liuyng, and contaynyng the hole sume and effect of al virtue*, Trans. by Thomas Paynell (London: Thomas Petyt, 1545), +ii. STC 1908.

²⁵³ *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse*, Paynell, +v.

²⁵⁴ *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse*, Paynell, +ii and +iii.

²⁵⁵ *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse*, Paynell, +iv.

Mary, too, had recently been out of favor at court, but during the final five years of the reign of her father, she returned to court with restored status and actually kept a good relationship with Katherine Parr. After 1542, Mary's improved status was also evidenced by an increased number of godchildren born after 1542. So her indeterminate status of the mid-1530s to early 1540s might be why she received no dedications from 1533 to 1542. But in the final years of Henry's reign Mary was frequently acknowledged for her learning and virtue, and Paynell's work contributes to that recognition.²⁵⁶

Mary was also an uncommon woman because of her education. With this dedication Paynell was making an argument for the usefulness of female education, as one of the most important females in the realm was so highly educated yet virtuous at the same time. It was previously thought that education would make women too open-minded and less obedient, but Mary was an example of education reinforcing virtue, as were the daughters of Thomas More, the only other females in England with education comparable to Mary's. Mary was now too old to receive grammar books, so the subject matter of books dedicated to her changed to topics more appropriate to her age and interests: virtue and religion. Most likely, this was not the first time that Paynell gave Mary a New Years gift. In January 1542-43, Mary's privy purse account contains payment to Mr. Pannelle (most likely Paynell) for bringing a book, and his payment was two shillings.²⁵⁷

There are some lines in this dedication that also point to an ulterior motive of Thomas Paynell for translating and printing this book by St. Bernard. Paynell used this

²⁵⁶ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 77-79.

²⁵⁷ *Privy Purse Expenses*, 106.

dedication to advocate for the need and use of cloistered life, which had just been recently eradicated in England. At one point, Paynell wrote “But by this your clene liuyng and longe continuance therof men maye now se, perceyue and fele, the effect of godly and vertuous educacion the very rote and spring, of all godly operacyon, of all vertue and clene lyfe.”²⁵⁸ Mary served as an example of the good virtues of nuns; she lived a clean life, she was educated, and she was virtuous. He continued that her beauty and chastity to some are “euyl disposicion,” referring to those in England who felt that monastic life was not proper.²⁵⁹ But Paynell saw Mary as an example of perfect chaste living and its benefits. For him, she was the “fresh remembraunce of the high and marueylons works of almighty God.”²⁶⁰ So Paynell’s dedication and translation have an underlying purpose of justifying monasticism and convents, as Mary was a good example of what a nun could and should be like.

Later, in 1550, Thomas Paynell dedicated *The Piththy and moost notable sayinges of al Scripture* to Mary, the final book that was dedicated to Mary before she was made queen.²⁶¹ *Scripture* was printed two more times, in 1552 and 1560, with both containing the original dedication to Mary. Moreover, the 1550 and 1552 editions seem to have multiple print runs. The 1550 edition has two extant title pages. Both indicate that they

²⁵⁸ *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse*, Paynell, +v and +vi.

²⁵⁹ *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse*, Paynell, +vi.

²⁶⁰ *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse*, Paynell, +vi.

²⁶¹ Thomas Paynell, *The piththy and moost notable sayinges of al scripture, gathered by Thomas Paynell: after the manner of common places, very necessary for al those that delite in the consolacions of the scriptures* (London: Thomas Gaultier at the expense of Robert Toye, 1550). STC 19494.

were printed by Thomas Gaultier, yet at the cost and expense of two different men: Robert Toye and Richard Kele. Not much is known about Toye, but the Registers of the Stationers' Company indicate that he was a printer and that he died on 12 February 1556.²⁶² The 1552 edition has four extant title pages which indicate that Thomas Gaultier printed one print run for William Bonham, and that William Copeland printed three versions, each at the expense of a different man, John Waley, Richard Jugge, and John Whight. Kele, Bonham, Waley, and Jugge were all printers by profession themselves. This suggests that perhaps only Gaultier and Copeland had the rights to print *Scripture* but these other printers wanted to profit from its printing as well. John Whight, most likely was John White, Bishop of Winchester after Stephen Gardiner and was significantly involved in the Marian heresy trials. He probably had copies of *Scripture* printed as it supported his theology and it is somewhat foretelling that he would later write verses in 1554 to celebrate the marriage of Mary and Philip at Winchester Cathedral.

As for the *Scripture*'s dedication, Paynell continued with his theme of virtue from his previous dedication, giving this one to the "moste excellent and vertuous Ladye, hath no need of any mans tuition or defense."²⁶³ He complimented Mary's "fiery and feruent mynde" and noted that "agayne your Graces benignitie and gentilnes of long tyme bounte fully to me declared enforce me to publishe in your graces name."²⁶⁴ He asked her to

²⁶² *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers in London, 1554-1640*. Volume I, Ed. by Edward Arber and Charles Robert Rivington (London: Stationers' Company, 1875-1877), 35.

²⁶³ Paynell, *Scripture* (1550), Aiv.

accept this book by her most humble servant. Paynell also asked her to read these sayings daily so that she could learn more truly to know the Lord. He called this book a gift to her, but wanted her to value it for its words, not because it is a gift from her. He concluded by asking her to accept the Word of God.

This dedication clearly traces the patronage relationship that Paynell established with Mary and seeks to cultivate her continued support. By this time, Mary was thirty-four, well-educated, well-versed, and had survived in two courts where she and her religion were constantly under attack. Between Paynell's previous dedication and this one of 1550, Mary had translated most of the Gospel of John in *The first tome or volume of the paraphrases of Erasmus vpon the newe testament*, until she was too sick to complete the translation.²⁶⁵ Nicholas Udall's dedication of the gospel to Katherine Parr praised Mary's studiousness as well as her virginity, and further praised her for making the word of God available to all Englishmen at the behest of Katherine Parr.²⁶⁶ The dedication, then, tried to paint Mary as helping the evangelical cause, even though everyone knew that she was still a Catholic. In July 1547, church injunctions required that Erasmus's *Paraphrases* be placed in every church, meaning that Udall's praise of Mary could be seen by all parishioners, downplaying her importance as a prominent Catholic figure.²⁶⁷ Yet, Paynell's dedication to Mary in 1550 was the last book dedicated

²⁶⁴ Paynell, *Scripture* (1550), Aiv.

²⁶⁵ Erasmus, *The first tome or volume of the paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testament* (London: Edward Whitechurch, 1548).

²⁶⁶ Erasmus, *First tome*, Gospel of John, Aii.r.

to her before she became queen. Under Edward, Mary was permitted some religious latitude, but by the 1550s there was less tolerance of Mary's non-conformity to the Edwardian religious settlement, and she became a threat to order.²⁶⁸

Also dealing with religion is *The Fal of the Late Arrian* by John Proctor.²⁶⁹

Printed in 1549 by William Powell, this features a lengthy seven-page dedication to Mary in which Proctor mentions that she is both daughter to Henry VIII and sister to Edward VI, again appealing to her prominent male relatives. Proctor wrote against an unnamed man who had recently been accused of the Arian heresy. The "fal" of this man honored the Virgin Mary, as Arianism held that Jesus was subordinate to God the Father, and was therefore a lesser being, not fully God. His fall in turn honored Mary Tudor because she was the Virgin Mary's namesake and lived in "perfect imitation of the other."²⁷⁰

Proctor's praise is followed by several paragraphs describing the Virgin Mary, including where she lived, that she was wife of Joseph, and that the angel Gabriel told her that she would bear Jesus. Proctor then claimed that Mary Tudor so much resembles the Virgin Mary that "in some mans head, wytte myght well gather, and reason conclude not a misse, one, & the same soule to be of bothe, the bodyes onely chaunged, accordyng to

²⁶⁷ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 90. For a fuller explanation of Mary's relationship with this text, see Aysha Pollnitz, "Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII: Princess Mary, Katherine Parr and the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 123-137.

²⁶⁸ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 93-99.

²⁶⁹ John Proctor, *The fal of the late Arrian* (London: William Powell, 1549). STC 20406.

²⁷⁰ Proctor, *Arrian*, A.ii.v.

Pythagoras law.”²⁷¹ Proctor used the Pythagorean idea of transmutation of souls to explain that since Mary Tudor resembled the Virgin Mary, then for some men Mary Tudor personified the Virgin Mary. Clearly he was exaggerating to make his point that both Catholicism and the example of Mary Tudor were antidotes to Arianism. Proctor, therefore, wanted his labors to be attached to the support of Mary Tudor. He knew that not all people would be happy with his words, or his part in the undoing of the Arian, but his doings “shall atchiue no small ornament and grace, through these four letters MARY.”²⁷² He asked Mary to favor him and his work, and further asked her to “reade my preface to my Countreimen of England.”²⁷³ He concluded by asking Jesus to continue Mary’s grace and honor forever.

Dedicated to Mary in 1549, this dedication, like those of Paynell, was given to Mary at a time when she was very prominent at court and was recognized as the most likely heir of her brother, Edward. Proctor was capitalizing on Mary’s current good fortune and reputation to encourage her to patronize him. Moreover, as the author of a book against heresy, Proctor had no better patron to give it to than Mary. His praise of Mary was overstated, as people did not actually confuse her with the Virgin Mary, but it did drive home the point that Mary was a very uncommon woman for her status and age. An unmarried princess in her thirties would have been very strange.

Also unusual about this dedication was that Proctor never names the man who was accused of Arianism. Diarmaid MacCulloch and George T. Buckley both suspect

²⁷¹ Proctor, *Arrian*, A.iiii.r.

²⁷² Proctor, *Arrian*, A.iiii.v.

²⁷³ Proctor, *Arrian*, A.v.r.

that the Arian was most likely John Ashton.²⁷⁴ According to Buckley, Ashton was a priest who recanted his religious opinions before Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in December 1548. Ashton wrote a document that defended Unitarian principles and Proctor's work refutes Ashton chapter by chapter. Proctor most likely began writing his book in 1548 when Ashton was on trial in Cranmer's court and concealed Ashton's name because Ashton was a priest and would remain a priest if he recanted, which he eventually did.²⁷⁵ Again, this has no real connection to Mary, but was dedicated to her as a Catholic Princess who could be identified with the Virgin Mary. John Proctor must have found some success with his dedication, however, as he later dedicated two books to Mary in 1554.

The first page of the dedication faces a page with a woodcut depicting the Annunciation, obviously appealing to Mary's religion, but later in the text Proctor praises Henry VIII's religious settlement.²⁷⁶ Therefore, Proctor's intentions are difficult to discern, but he may have been trying to accomplish a *via media* of religious reform.²⁷⁷ Alec Ryrie has reached the same conclusion about Proctor, noting that Proctor was not satisfied with the religious settlement of England. Proctor was neither obedient to the pope, nor a supporter of the Edwardian Reformation. Rather, Proctor wanted a return to the Henrician religious settlement and can really be understood as a "latter-day

²⁷⁴ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: The Penguin Press, 1999), 238 n30.

²⁷⁵ George T. Buckley, "Who was 'The late Arrian'?", *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 49 (1934), 500-503.

²⁷⁶ The woodcut is on A.i.v.

²⁷⁷ MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, 116-118.

Henrician.”²⁷⁸ The dedication of *Arrian*, then, can be seen as one man’s attempt to negotiate the religious settlement with Mary in the event that she would become queen.

The printed books dedicated to Mary’s half-siblings, Elizabeth and Edward, while they were princess and prince, respectively, could not be categorized as “latter-day Henrician.” As a princess, Elizabeth received three printed book dedications, all while her brother, Edward was king. Edward had one dedicated to him while he was just a prince. Those dedicated to Elizabeth were not educational, but rather evangelical in tone and included a translation of Martin Luther, an editor’s dedication of Elizabeth’s translation of *A godly medytacyon* by Margarete of Navarre, and a polemic by John À Lasco.²⁷⁹ That dedicated to Edward was a translation of *Epicure* by Erasmus.²⁸⁰ This tract by Erasmus was meant to rehabilitate Epicureanism (an idea that advocated pleasure as the highest form of good, but only if pleasure was attained in moderation) with Christian pleasure and its translator made it more Protestant by making Erasmus appear anti-papal.²⁸¹ These few dedications to Mary’s siblings reveal that as the children of Henry VIII, all three were relevant to discussions over religion as Henry VIII aged and no one was quite sure how the succession would proceed.

²⁷⁸ Alec Ryrie, “Paths Not Taken in the British Reformations,” *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 52 (2009), 8-9, 17.

²⁷⁹ See Williams, *Index of Dedications*, 61.

²⁸⁰ See Williams, *Index of Dedications*, 60. Since the publication of Williams, some books dedicated to Edward have been re-dated, so they do not comply with the dates provided by Williams.

²⁸¹ See Erasmus, *The dialoge called Fumus (1534) & A very pleasaunt & fruitful Diologe called The Epicure (1545)*, Ed. Robert Allen (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press for the Newberry Library, 1969).

These dedications also reveal that Mary had a very different educational background than did these two siblings, yet each of their educations revolved around their place within the succession. Mary had textbooks specifically designed for her education, as textbooks for females really did not exist, while Elizabeth was taught via other means. Kathi Vosevich has already pointed out many of the differences between the education of the two sisters. She argues that Mary's education was more moral in nature, while Elizabeth's was more scholarly. As a queen, Mary presented herself as a gendered queen and maternal figure because her education taught her to be so. Elizabeth, on the other hand, was taught regardless of her sex, thus encouraging her to be masculine and see herself as king upon her accession.²⁸² Essentially Mary was a learning queen, while Elizabeth was a learned queen.

Maria Dowling has illuminated the educations of Edward and Mary's other half-sibling, the royal bastard, Henry Fitzroy, son of Bessie Blount. Dowling notes that both Prince Edward and Henry Fitzroy received humanist educations meant to prepare them for royal duty, whether as king or duke. Fitzroy was born in 1519, so he would have been educated at the same time as Mary. When Mary was sent to the Welsh Marches in 1525, Fitzroy was sent north to reside at Sheriff Hutton. John Palsgrave was sent with him and was his tutor until February 1526. Richard Croke succeeded Palsgrave as

²⁸² Kathi Vosevich, "The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors, In *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Tudor and Stuart Britain*, eds. Mary E. Burke, Jane Donawerth, Linda L. Dove, and Karen Nelson (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 61-76. Aysha Pollnitz disagrees, and argues that both Elizabeth and Mary's educations were based on the pattern of Vives's *Instruction of a Christian Woman* as the best way to justify female education until at least 1555. Aysha Pollnitz, "Christian Woman or Sovereign Queens? The Schooling of Mary and Elizabeth, In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 138.

Fitzroy's tutor. Ultimately, Fitzroy's humanist education was much less successful than that of Prince Edward, as Edward had the benefit of always remaining close to the court. Under the tutelage of Richard Coxe and John Cheke, Edward learned both the Old and New Testaments, as well as Latin, but ascended the throne too early to have made much progress with Greek.²⁸³ The educations of these royal boys was also different than that of Mary, as they were more greatly prepared in the art of kingship, as well as humanism.

Recently, Mary has also been portrayed as having an unremarkable education, in that her schooling did not leave any great achievements, as did Elizabeth's with her translation of Margarete de Navarre.²⁸⁴ This assessment seems rather harsh, however, as Mary's education was commonly commented upon by visitors to the Tudor court. One Venetian remarked that at fifteen years old, "she speaks Spanish, French, and Latin, besides her own mother-English tongue, is well grounded in Greek, and understands Italian, but does not venture to speak it. She sings excellently, and plays on several instruments, so that she combines every accomplishment."²⁸⁵ Mary's formal education, however, did appear to end with the birth of Elizabeth.²⁸⁶ However, the educations of the three siblings did overlap with Vives's *Satellitium sive symbola*, which has been

²⁸³ Dowling, *Humanism*, 209-214.

²⁸⁴ Andrew Taylor, "'Ad Omne Virtutum Genus'? Mary between Piety, Pedagogy, and Praise in Early Tudor Humanism," In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 107-108.

²⁸⁵ *Calendar of State Papers*, Venice, Volume 4, entry 682.

²⁸⁶ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 91.

mentioned as being written for Mary, but was later used in the educations of Edward and Elizabeth.²⁸⁷

The eight printed books dedicated to Mary before she became queen very closely follow the politics and religion of that time. Those of her childhood and teenage years, while she was still regarded as the legitimate heir and princess, were rather straightforward with their goals and intentions. If there were negotiations mentioned or alluded to, they were handled by her parents. As such, these earliest books all related to Mary's education. Henry and Catherine negotiated with her tutors and textbook writers over the material which was most appropriate for a princess's education. It is no coincidence, then, that the dedications to Mary while she was a princess always mention her male relatives, either King Henry or King Edward. I suggest that in doing so, dedicators were appealing to the patronage of both Mary and either her father or brother. Perhaps if the king saw that a dedicator was being kind to his daughter, the king would be kind to the dedicator in return. This allusion would do two things: remind Mary of her royal connection to the king and how as a woman she should use her traditional power to appeal to him and it would remind the reader that the Lady Mary mentioned is indeed the Princess Mary.

While Jeri McIntosh has argued that Mary was the head of her own preaccession household, that leadership did not translate into the world of printed books, in which it appears as though dedications to Mary followed the negotiations of her parents.²⁸⁸ No

²⁸⁷ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 46.

books were dedicated to Mary between 1526 and 1533 because scholars were too busy writing for or against Henry and Catherine's marriage. Dedications to the princess simply were not as important as siding on the correct side of the royal divorce. Despite her high level of education, her Privy Purse accounts of 1536-1544 contain very few entries of payments for books or patronage given to book dedicators. Most of the entries that are included tend to revolve around New Year's gifts. For example, in January 1542-43, she paid a bookbinder for a gold-lined book that she gave Prince Edward for New Years.²⁸⁹ After 1533, Mary only received dedications once she had reconciled with her father and was welcome back at court. It was only in the 1540s that Mary was addressed to give her own patronage, and it was not until after her father was deceased and her brother was king that Mary was personally addressed for patronage and intercession against the new religious changes. Therefore, Mary only began to negotiate with her dedicators when she was in her late 20s, and still she did not have much effect on the religious settlement. She was not truly able to negotiate with patrons in a public way until she was queen.

Besides the political reasons why Mary was powerless to negotiate with dedicators is also the fact that her dedicators did not want to negotiate with her, but to instruct her instead. As a princess Mary needed education and her parents made sure that she got it. So, when it came to dedicating books to Mary, those that she received were mainly textbooks and books on virtue. Dedicators did not dedicate to Mary for patronage

²⁸⁸ J.L. McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State: The Preaccession Households of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, 1516 to 1558* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).

²⁸⁹ *Privy Purse Expenses*, 108.

because for most of her young life she had none to give. If dedicators wanted patronage, they appealed to her father and brother, as well as Mary, in her dedications. Rather, dedicators saw it as their duty to instruct the young woman to prepare her for some type of queenly role. The next chapter will examine the printed book dedications that Mary received when she became queen and how male dedicators still attempted to educate Mary, but now approached their dedications much differently so that negotiation had to take place.

CHAPTER IV

PRINTED DEDICATIONS TO A QUEEN

The previous chapter explored the printed book dedications that Mary received as a princess, all of which emphasized education of some sort. As a potential future monarch of England Mary needed training in both feminine and masculine spheres, such as virtue and basic political know-how via classic literature. For all of the education that Mary received, she was not truly prepared for many of her royal duties; as a woman she was not expected to be. Therefore, when she became queen, her education did not stop. The men who dedicated to Mary when she was queen felt the need to continue Mary's education so that she could perform as both a virtuous woman and a strong monarch. Under the guise of laudatory dedications, dedicators presented their ideas to Mary as a more covert and accepted way to instruct their queen, much in the same way that panegyric praise given to Elizabeth was really meant to offer her counsel.²⁹⁰ Dedicators presented Mary with some books that were overt efforts to encourage her in Catholicism, while others were given to her in the aftermath of political upheavals and rebellions. Infrequently, dedicators also wished for Mary to endorse their books to promote their ideas and increase the saleability of their books. In this respect, there was a distinct shift

²⁹⁰ Alexandra Walsham, "A very Deborah? The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch," In *The Myth of Elizabeth*, eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 147.

from the intentions of dedications to Lady Margaret Beaufort and those of her granddaughter.

The actual printed book dedications to Mary when she was queen, of which there are twenty-five identified by Williams, contain four distinct themes.²⁹¹ The four themes which they contain are virtue, the importance of obedience for royal subjects, return of the true religion, and classical literature and philosophy; all of which are subjects that reinforced Mary as a moral leader rather than a political one. For the purposes of this chapter, I will not explicitly analyze virtue as its own theme, as it runs through nearly every dedication, but then each dedication goes on to stress one of the other three themes. Mary was taught to have virtue practically from the time of her birth, and as her queenship was an anomaly, the men who dedicated to Mary, and really all Englishmen in general, continued that idea through her adult life while they tried to negotiate other subjects with her. Moreover, it was well-known that Mary led a virtuous life through her piety, so dedicators addressed more pressing needs in their dedications beyond just simply flattering the queen with talk of her virtue. What this shows, is that dedications to Queen Mary were written with a purpose, not just for flattery. Often, those purposes included educating Mary in classical knowledge, reinforcing the supremacy of the Catholic Church within England, and legitimizing Mary's queenship.

The one theme clearly missing, from both the dedications and the texts accompanying them, is statecraft. While in the sixteenth-century it would have been

²⁹¹ The Bodleian also has a Bible printed on vellum (Paris, 1538-1540) that may have been dedicated to Mary, shelfmark Auct. Y 2.1. This book has no verbal dedication to Mary, but has a leaf with an intricate Tudor coat of arms that may have been meant to serve as a dedication. I would like to thank Dr. Francesca Galligan for this reference.

difficult to separate statecraft from religion, for the purposes of this study, I consider statecraft to be the actual acts and skills of conducting government affairs. There were no dedications that addressed ways for Mary to act politically or to change current laws and policies as a queen. Most likely, this is because the dedicators did not think that Mary had enough influence or power over politics to need to educate her in this area. Politics was still viewed as a realm not suitable for a queen, so instead dedicators gave Mary books on subjects over which she did have influence, particularly religion. Moreover, Mary did not need to be educated in statecraft because she had a council which took care of that for her. However, Mary was seen as the champion of Roman Catholicism, so dedicators felt more comfortable addressing their queen on matters of religion than on matters of state, even though the directing of religious policy was seen as unnatural for a woman as was statecraft.

In this chapter I will systematically explicate the printed book dedications to Queen Mary along the themes of obedience, classical literature and philosophy, and religion. I will also address the lack of books on statecraft to Mary as demonstrative of the types of power that dedicators expected Mary to wield as a married queen. Importantly, as queen Mary was able to publicly negotiate with her dedicators. Dedicators appealed to Mary's humanist education and staunch Catholicism so as to instruct not only Mary, but also her subjects in paths towards returning England to what it was before the Reformation. Yet, Mary was able to choose to support texts that educated her subjects on proper virtue and religion.

Specifically, the dedications of religious texts reflected the notion that the Henrician Catholicism of 1547 was, for many, the accepted form of Catholicism within England; the papacy was not necessary and of no great concern.²⁹² Numerous changes to doctrine were made during Henry's reign, but upon Henry's death, the religious settlement followed the Act of Six Articles (1539). The Act did not refer to transubstantiation directly, but it stipulated that all of the king's subjects must believe in that the actual body and blood of Jesus Christ was truly present in the form of bread and wine once the words of consecration took place, thereby affirming the Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Act also condemned clerical marriage and made heresy a felony, thereby allowing the persecution of both Roman Catholics and extreme reformists. This religious settlement was actually quite conservative compared to the Ten Articles (1536), a formulary of faith, which denied four sacraments and Edward's religious settlement which allowed clerical marriage and supported a vernacular version of the Bible and a religious service in the vernacular. Henry's conservative doctrinal theology, which

²⁹² See Peter Marshall, *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 169 - 172. Here, Marshall addresses the historiographical debate of the Henrician religious settlement being "Catholicism without the Pope." It is from Marshall's discussion that I have borrowed the term "Henrician Catholicism," and while he only uses the term to discuss the early modern use of "Catholic", I use it to stress the conservative doctrinal nature of the Henrician religious settlement. See also, Peter Marshall, "Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the semantics of schism," In *Catholics and the "Protestant nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 22-48. Here, Marshall concludes that the term "Catholic" was used in many different ways after the Henrician schism, but importantly, was used to imply religious continuity and legitimacy, even if that meant removing the term's association with Rome. Therefore, for my discussion, "Henrician Catholicism" can serve as a useful term to understand the religious settlement of 1547 and show continuity with the Mary's religious settlement of 1554. Lucy Wooding also uses "Henrician Catholicism." See Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 67 – 81.

emphasized Scripture headed by the monarchy instead of the pope, was widely accepted in 1547 and the type of Catholicism desired in 1553.

Before I begin discussing the dedications, I need to clarify why some books should *not* be considered as dedicated to Mary. Williams identified three books as having dedications to Mary that upon closer inspection were not actually dedicated to her. The first of these is *The copy of certain lettres sent to the Quene, and also to doctour Martin and doctour Storye, by the most reuerende father in God, Thomas Cranmer Archebishop of Cantorburye from prison in Oxeforde*, printed in Emden, some time in 1556 by Egidius van der evre.²⁹³ The text is pro-Cranmer, as the rest of the title page notes that Cranmer suffered martyrdom in March of 1556. There is no dedication at all, just a general preface to the reader. Some of Cranmer's letters included in the book are written to Mary, but certainly this book was not printed to garner favor with her. The second of these is John Taylor's work, *The needles excellency a new booke wherein are diuerse admirable works wrought with the needle*.²⁹⁴ As mentioned in the first chapter, this was not a contemporary dedication to Mary, but rather the book contains short poems about embroidery completed by famous English women, such as Katherine of Aragon, Mary, and Elizabeth. Each poem was meant to stress each woman's Englishness and needlework, much like the skills of ordinary Englishwomen, in order to sell Taylor's

²⁹³ Thomas Cranmer, *The copy of certain lettres sent to the Quene, and also to doctour Martin and doctour Storye, by the most reuerende father in God, Thomas Cranmer Archebishop of Cantorburye from prison in Oxeforde* (Emden: Egidius van der evre, 1556). STC 5999.

²⁹⁴ John Taylor, *The needles excellency a new booke wherin are diuers admirable works wrought with the needle. Newly inuented and cut in copper for the pleasure and profit of the industrious* (London: Printed for James Bolter and sold at the sign of the Marigold in Paul's Churchyard, 1634).

needlework patterns.²⁹⁵ The third was *A supplicacyon to the quenes maiestie*.²⁹⁶ On its title page it says that it was printed by John Cawood, but really it was printed in 1555 by a Protestant exile in Strasbourg. The attribution was given to Cawood so that it would be distributed in England.²⁹⁷ It does not have an actual dedication, but the entire book is directed to Mary. The inclusion of these three books in Williams's study reflects his thoroughness, but since they are not really dedications to her, there is no reason to discuss them any further within my study.

Obedience

Three dedications address the theme of obedience, both to Mary and to God. They were not meant to instruct Mary to be obedient, but to teach her how to command obedience and to teach her subjects lessons in obedience and why it was necessary. The lessons in these dedications are unsurprising, as Mary overcame one conspiracy in order to become queen and two main uprisings and conspiracies while queen. The first, famously, was when Lady Jane Grey was made queen for nine days after Edward's death until Mary and her supporters defeated Jane and her supporters. In early-1556 there was another attempt to remove Mary from the throne, the Dudley Conspiracy. Sir Henry Dudley, the main conspirator, wanted to depose Mary and Philip and replace them with

²⁹⁵ Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 136-137.

²⁹⁶ *A supplicacyon to the quenes maiestie* (London: John Cawood, 1555).

²⁹⁷ Alec Ryrie, "John Cawood," *ODNB*.

Elizabeth as long as she took Edward Courtenay to be her husband. The plot, however, fell through and the conspirators were executed in July 1556.

The most wide-spread conspiracy against Mary that called into question the obedience of her subjects was Wyatt's Rebellion. Hatched in November of 1553, when Mary's Spanish choice of husband was announced, the rebellion consisted of conspirators who plotted against Mary and her Spanish marriage, most likely with the goal of placing Elizabeth on the throne as long as she was married to Englishman Edward Courtenay.²⁹⁸ According to David Loades, the plan of the rebels was a four-part uprising against Mary, with Sir Thomas Wyatt in charge of Kent, Sir James Crofts in charge of Herefordshire, the earl of Devon and Sir Peter Carew in charge of the south west, and the duke of Suffolk leading in Leicestershire. None of the rebellions gained any momentum apart from Wyatt's, who by 25 January had two-thousand to three-thousand armed followers. On 1 February 1554, Mary gave her famed speech declaring her marriage lawful with the approval of both her council and the people. On 3 February, Wyatt's band arrived at Southwark and on 6 February they crossed Kingston bridge so as to march on London. The actual fighting, however, turned out to be very minimal, with Mary remaining safely at Whitehall and the rebellion only lasting a few hours. Mary had approximately one hundred of the rebels executed, including Wyatt, and she had Elizabeth and Courtenay held in the Tower on suspicion of conspiracy and treason.²⁹⁹ Courtenay, who initially rebelled, then gave away part of the plot, repented, and tried to defend London from

²⁹⁸ David Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies*. 2nd ed. (Bangor, Wales: Headstart History, 1992) is still seen as the authoritative text on the rebellion.

²⁹⁹ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 211-215.

Wyatt, was not put on trial, but soon left England never to return. Elizabeth was eventually released on good faith. Lady Jane Grey and her husband were executed for her father's involvement, as she became too big a rival.³⁰⁰

While parts of the rebellion are still not clear, it probably started because of fear of domination by a foreign prince, rather than over religion.³⁰¹ Wyatt claimed (at his death) that the rebellion was because of fear of foreign invaders (i.e. Spaniards), but as his rebellion gained steam between November and February, several Protestants joined his cause.³⁰² When printed accounts of the rebellion were created a few years later, the incident was painted as heretical and xenophobic in nature.³⁰³

Two texts with dedications to Mary deal with Wyatt's Rebellion. James Cancellor dedicated to Mary his reactionary tract to the rebellion, *The Pathe of Obedience*.³⁰⁴ According to Stephen Wright, James Cancellor was employed as a chorister in the Chapel Royal when he dedicated *Pathe* to Mary, which Cancellor himself corroborates in his dedication. Wright suggests that *Pathe* was printed in 1553, as Cancellor wrote *A Treatise wherein is declared the pernicious opinions of those obstinate*

³⁰⁰ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 149.

³⁰¹ Both Loades and Richards are in agreement on that point. Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies* and Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 149.

³⁰² Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 153.

³⁰³ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 153.

³⁰⁴ James Cancellor, *The Pathe of Obedience, righte necessarye for all the king and Quenes maiesties louing Subiectes, to reade, learne, and use their due obediences, to the hyghe powers accordynge to thys godly treatise compiled by James Cancellor, one of the Quenes Maiesties moste honourable Chapell* (London: John Wayland, 1553). STC 4564.

people of Kent against the disobedience of Wyatt's Rebellion and John Bale in 1554.³⁰⁵

In 1561, John Bale wrote an unpublished response to Cancellor's *Pathe*, Lambeth Palace MS. 2001, entitled, "A retourne of James Cancellor's raylinge boke upon hys owne heade, called the pathe of obedyence: to teache hym hereafter how he shall sedicyously gyve fourth a pernicyouse disobedyence agaynst the crowne of thys realme, in stede of true obedyence." Bale's response was dedicated to Francis Russell, second earl of Bedford. Bale's manuscript was entered in the register of the Stationers' Company, but does not appear to have ever been printed.³⁰⁶

The exact dating of *Pathe* is difficult to ascertain. The dating is problematic because the title of the book suggests that England has both a king and queen, yet the dedication is only directed at Mary and does not include any of her Spanish titles. Franklin B. Williams dates the book as printed in 1553, as does Wright, but the Universal Short Title Catalogue (USTC) and EEBO suggest that the book was printed in 1556. A date of 1556 is plausible for the printing of a book on obedience because of the Dudley Conspiracy. A date a 1553 is also plausible for the printing of the book, as Mary had to overcome the disobedience of Northumberland and other conspirators in order to become queen. According to the old dating system, a date of 1553 could also be any date up to 25 March 1554, and by that time Wyatt's Rebellion had been defeated and Mary's marriage to Philip was officially arranged. So Cancellor's tract on obedience may in fact

³⁰⁵ Stephen Wright, "James Cancellor," *ODNB*.

³⁰⁶ See E.G.W. Bill, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 1907-2340* (Oxford: 1976), 30-31.

have been in reference to Wyatt's Rebellion or disobedient acts directed toward Mary in general.

It seems to me that both dates are actually correct. A quick search of EEBO reveals two editions of *Pathe*, both dated to 1556, but with two varying titles. One title, cited above, mentions both the king and queen, while the other title is simply *The Pathe of Obedience, compiled by James Cancellar*. Neither edition mentions a print date and the copy with the more simple title is incomplete. I suggest that 1553 was the original print date and that 1556 was the date of a second edition. Numerous pieces of evidence substantiate my claim. First of all, there is no mention of a specific conspiracy, so the tract could have been written for any of the conspiracies plotted against Mary or just to encourage obedience to Mary in general as the new ruler. Secondly, Mary's Spanish titles are not included in the dedication. Almost all dedications after Mary's marriage included her Spanish titles, and if the conspiracy was aimed at Philip as well, even if the dedicator did not want to include Philip, he would have included Mary's Spanish titles to implicitly legitimize Philip as King of England. Thirdly, the book stresses obedience to the Catholic Church. In 1556, Catholicism was the legal church within England, so it makes more sense that the dedicator was encouraging a return to the Catholic Church in 1553 rather than a reminder of the state-sanctioned church in 1556. Fourth, following the conclusion of the text of the book is "The copy of the Quenes Maiesties Letters Patentes." This patent gives John Waylande the exclusive right to print all primers and manuals of prayer for the next seven years. The patent is dated 24 October 1553. If *Pathe* was printed in 1553, it makes perfect sense to include the patent, but if *Pathe* was printed in

1556, it should not have been necessary to re-print the patent. Therefore, *Pathe* was probably first printed in 1553 and later reprinted in 1556 and the dedication was printed in the 1556 edition without any changes to reflect Mary's married titles.

Cancellor's dedication began by wishing Mary health, felicity, prosperity, and the obedience of all of her subjects. The rest of his dedication stressed obedience, including a biblical reference to Deuteronomy and how the children of Israel had to show obedience as an analogy for English subjects being required to show obedience to Mary. For Chancellor, faithful subjects should be obedient to their "king and gouernor," especially those who made their living directly from the king.³⁰⁷ The "reader may well understand, what a fowle, and ugly monster disobedience is," since it initially brings pleasure, but ends up with "utter confusion," "much like the poison of a scorpion rolled together in the forme of a pil sugred rounde about, and so receiued into the bodye to purge y same, in steede of purgation bringeth presente death."³⁰⁸ Chancellor concluded his dedication by asking God to preserve Mary and grant her her desires.

The dedication is interesting for two reasons. Chancellor claimed he wrote this book and dedication because people had been disobedient to their ruler. But it was ironic that Chancellor ended his dedication with the idea that people would heed his words if they liked Mary, considering that so many had just been disobedient to her. The other interesting thing to note about this dedication is its use of gendered language. In the dedication, Chancellor paraphrased from Deuteronomy, in which men are given the command to obey their king and prince. Using Deuteronomy, Chancellor explained that

³⁰⁷ Chancellor, *Pathe*, A.ii.v.

³⁰⁸ Chancellor, *Pathe*, A.iiii.r.

subjects must be loyal to their king and princes, particularly if they make their living out of service to their prince. Although Cancellor's use of "king" was generic, not specifically referring to Mary, the analogy still referred to her office as the most supreme in England. Therefore, using Deuteronomy, Cancellor implied that Mary was both king and governor, thus demanding the obedience of her people. Here, it appears as though Cancellor really did consider Mary to be both King and Queen of England, at least until she married. Through this dedication Cancellor clarified to his readers that as sole monarch Mary was both King and Queen, and as such God demanded that people be obedient to her.

Unlike Cancellor's unspecific dedication and text, John Proctor wrote specifically on Wyatt's Rebellion. Proctor attended All Souls College, Oxford, where he earned his Masters degree in 1545.³⁰⁹ On 6 July 1549 he became rector of Old Romney in Kent. By the time of Wyatt's Rebellion, Proctor was made schoolmaster of Tonbridge in Kent.³¹⁰ Proctor's *The waie home to Christ* was printed on 22 October 1554 and *The historie of wyates rebellion* was first printed in December 1554. In the November Parliament of 1554, Proctor was rewarded for his first book by being made a Member of Parliament for Chippenham in Wiltshire, and he was rewarded for his second book by being made a Justice of the Peace for Kent by spring of 1555, "as part of the Queen's drive to purge local government for political and religious reasons."³¹¹

³⁰⁹ Bryson, "Order and Disorder," 324.

³¹⁰ Bryson, "Order and Disorder," 326.

³¹¹ Bryson, "Order and Disorder," 335.

John Proctor's *The historie of wyates rebellion* was first printed in December 1554, and quickly reprinted on 10 January 1555, both by John Caly.³¹² Interestingly, the dedication was only directed towards Queen Mary but included both her English and Spanish titles. If Proctor wrote about heresy to de-emphasize the Spanish marriage, it is interesting that he included the Spanish titles when he could have just used Mary's English titles to emphasize her Englishness. But, perhaps the Spanish titles were included because Mary chose not to de-emphasize her marriage to Philip even though it was not very popular. Leaving out the Spanish titles may have made Proctor seem as though he did not approve of the Spanish match either. Clearly, more than flattery was happening in Proctor's dedication.

In the dedication Proctor claimed that it had been practice in all ages to write down the stories of those who threatened their commonweals. Written accounts comforted those who read them to see from what evils they had been delivered. Proctor wrote that he was moved to write of Wyatt and his rebellion so that Wyatt's name would always have a bad connotation. Working in the style of other Tudor historians, Proctor sifted through many reports about Wyatt, some of them not true.³¹³ He also mentioned

³¹² John Proctor, *The historie of wyates rebellion* (London: John Caly, 1554 and 1555). STC 20407. Alan Bryson, "Order and Disorder: John Proctor's History of Wyatt's Rebellion (1554)" in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603*. Eds. Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 327. The book was not printed again until the nineteenth century.

³¹³ Proctor used actual sources for his narrative, in accordance with many other Tudor history writers, such as John Bale and Edward Hall. Proctor was in Kent as the rebellion mounted, so he was able to gather first-hand information. Bryson, "Order and Disorder," 324 and 327. Bryson examines Proctor as a historian and how he used the recent past to help the Catholic Reformation of England. For another explanation of Proctor, see

another book recently printed in Canterbury about Wyatt's rebellion which was missing many facts, so as to stress the completeness of his own account.³¹⁴ At the end of the dedication Proctor asked Mary to accept this book, as "it hath pleased you to accept my former bookes dedicated unto your highness."³¹⁵ He concluded by noting that he set forth this text so that the good may be encouraged in obedience and quit their bad purposes. Surprisingly, the dedication did not end with a prayer. Most dedications ended by asking God to bless Mary and her reign, but Proctor's text did not. It is surprising because in the body of the text Proctor cited heresy and religious differences as the cause of rebellion. One would think that he would first invoke Mary's Catholicism within the dedication.

There is also some surprising use of gendered language within the dedication. There are two lines in which Proctor refers to Mary as "prince." In one line, Proctor noted that traitors "who through hatred to their prince or countrey shall either of their own malicious disposition be stirred."³¹⁶ In a second line about traitors, Proctor claimed "or of malice to their prince wyll entre into that horrible crime of preuie conspiracie or open rebellion."³¹⁷ When Proctor used the word "prince," he did so in the context of

Thomas Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 144-146.

³¹⁴ This book has since been identified as the Breviat Chronicle issued by John Mitchell sometime before 25 March 1554. However, the two texts were more similar than different, with each attributing heresy as the cause of the rebellion. Bryson, "Order and Disorder," 327-328.

³¹⁵ Proctor, *Wyates*, a.v.r.

³¹⁶ Proctor, *Wyates*, a.iii.r.

rebellions and rebels in general, in that rebels by nature offended their leaders. But Proctor did not take the time to qualify the term, so for Proctor, Mary was a prince. Other dedicators chose to call Mary both princess and queen in their dedications, especially when noting that Mary was daughter of Henry VIII. Proctor, however, reinforced Mary's legitimacy by claiming that she was both queen and prince, and therefore she was owed obedience.

Proctor did not even mention Philip, who could also be called prince. He probably did not include Philip in the dedication and spun the rebellion as one of religious treason so as not to exacerbate dislike of Philip all these months after the rebellion had ended. There would have been no benefit in reminding Englishmen that they had previously risen up against their king if it would possibly encourage them to do so again. And, if Proctor's book was written at the behest of the queen, she would not have wanted a book that noted that her own subjects disliked her husband so much that they rebelled. Instead, heresy was a common enemy that could be safely used in the book, while deflecting most of England's xenophobia for a Spanish king. For England, it was not as though Philip was disliked personally (although he may have been by some who proposed other marriage matches for Mary), but that Philip was too close to the papacy.³¹⁸ Proctor's dedication did not mention Philip so as to deflect the crown's connection with the papacy, and instead highlight the Catholic religious settlement that most English Catholics preferred, Henrician Catholicism, of which Proctor appears to have been an advocate.

³¹⁷ Proctor, *Wyates*, a.iii.r.

³¹⁸ For a discussion of Anti-Spanish print, see Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 257.

Heresy was a common theme in the other writings of Proctor as well. As he alluded to in the dedication to his history of Wyatt's rebellion, Proctor previously had dedicated two other printed books to Mary. The first was *The Fal of the Late Arrian*, printed in 1549 and mentioned in the previous chapter. The other was *The waie home to Christ and truth leadinge from Antichrist and errour*, first printed on 22 October 1554 by Robert Caly.³¹⁹ A second edition was printed on 20 January 1556. While Proctor noted that *Arrian* and *Waie home* were previously accepted by Mary, there is no existing evidence to suggest that Proctor was rewarded for the dedications to any of these three texts, even though *Waie home* was authorized by the queen "to be sette furth for the reliefe of diuers Englishe menne."³²⁰

Proctor's dedication to *Waie home* also called Mary by both her English and Spanish titles. This dedication, however, specifically instructed Mary in returning England back to the Catholic Church. Proctor noted that England long fought "wicked follye armed with princely authoritie," referring to her brother's religious settlement which was made by royal authority but mistakenly was protestant.³²¹ Under Edward, Mary lacked the authority to change policies, but now she had many hands to help her godly purposes. Proctor claimed that he had much good will and little power, so the only

³¹⁹ John Proctor, *The waie home to Christ and truth leadinge from Antichrist and errour, made and set furth in the Latine tongue, by that famous and great clearke Vincent, Frenche man borne, aboue .xi. hundred yeres paste, for the comforte of all true Christian men, against the most pernicious and detestable crafte of heretickes, whiche in his tyme by all subtell wayes, deuised to obscure and deface the doctrine and religion of the vniuersall churche* (London: Robert Caly, 1554). STC 24754. This is a translation of St. Vincent of Lérins' Latin *Liber de Catholicae fidei antiquitate*.

³²⁰ Proctor, *Waie home*, A.i.r.

³²¹ Proctor, *Waie home*, A.ii.r.

way he could help Mary was to offer her this little book so that she could accept and authorize it so that others could enjoy her wisdom. Proctor also claimed that in the book he was both loyal to Mary and showed affection towards his countrymen whom he wanted to return to the true faith. Proctor ended his dedication with a prayer for God to bless Mary.

Throughout the dedication, Proctor practically claims that he translated St. Vincent of Lérins' book because Mary was not restoring Catholicism fast enough for him. In October 1554, Mary had been queen for more than a year, was married to the son of the Holy Roman Emperor, and was cousin to a papal legate, so she had every resource that she needed to make England Catholic again. Mary's familial connections also explain why Proctor mentioned that she had many men who could help her accomplish a return to the true religion. But what Proctor did not realize was Mary's strategy in restoring Catholicism, which was to do it lawfully, through Parliament, so that there could be no more rebellions accusing her of not taking her people's thoughts on religion into consideration. Proctor's book was printed just three weeks before Mary's third calling of Parliament, on 12 November 1554, whose main task was religious reconciliation with Rome.³²²

Proctor, like many other English Catholics, however, may have been satisfied with a Catholic restoration that did not involve the papacy, at least until the necessary Parliaments could have made the legal changes. Vincent of Lérins' work on Catholic piety dated from the fifth century, long before the bishop of Rome got the prominence

³²² Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 105.

that he later acquired. In translating Vincent of Lérins' work, Proctor may have been suggesting that Mary should restore Catholicism in a way that did not require submission to the pope. His book advocated for complete obedience to Mary, both as a requirement by God and as head or representative of the English Catholic church. Upon her accession, Mary did in fact have the title "Supreme Head of the Church," and even though she did not enjoy using the title, it gave her the power to reinstate Latin services and the mass without having to follow all of the guidelines and restrictions of the papacy.³²³ Like Proctor's book on Wyatt's Rebellion, this dedication and selection of text demonstrated that Henrician Catholicism was indeed acceptable and the preferred English Catholic religious settlement under Mary. After twenty years without papal interference and control of religion within England, there was no desire for it to return. Yet, Catholics did want the return of conservative doctrine and religious ritual.

The third book dedicated to Mary that addressed obedience was John Christopherson's *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion*, which also focused on Wyatt's Rebellion.³²⁴ John Christopherson was educated at Cambridge, exiled himself to Louvain during Edward VI's reign, and returned to England in 1553. Christopherson established a relationship with Mary possibly as early as 1547, as he dedicated a manuscript to her sometime during her brother's reign, which will be

³²³ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 191.

³²⁴ John Christopherson, *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion: wherein are set forth the causes, that commonlye moue men to rebellion, and that no cause is there, that ought to moue any man there vnto, with a discourse of the miserable effectes, that ensue therof, and of the wretched ende, that all rebelles comme to, moste necessary to be redde in this seditiouse and troublesome tyme* (London: John Cawood, 1554). STC 5207.

discussed in the next chapter. Christopherson later served as one of Mary's chaplains while she was queen. His book was printed on 24 July 1554, one day before Mary and Philip's marriage at Winchester Cathedral.

Christopherson began his dedication by wishing Mary a long and prosperous reign with increased daily virtue. He continued by offering an analogy that compared England to the human body, in that both could be harmed by disease if the disease was not cured. An analogy of disease and remedy would not have been lost on Mary as she was often sick and under the care of royal physicians. Christopherson's analogy suggested that as a physician was sought to fix the body, so must remedy be sought to fix the realm, as it has recently been sick with rebellion. To fix the realm, the cause of the disease (rebellion) must be diagnosed and medicines given to cure it. Other remedies for rebellion already existed, such as not allowing the gathering of unlawful assemblies, and dissolving those which have formed, even if it required arms, but Christopherson argued that the best remedy for rebellion was persuading men's hearts. He offered his book as his suggestion to cure the disease of rebellion.

At the end of his dedication, Christopherson noted that neither gain nor commendation moved him to write this, only duty to his country and to Mary; his book being sanctioned by Mary and having an effect on its readers would be worthy recompense enough. Besides, the queen had already given him bounty (by making him a chaplain) when he was destitute, which allowed him to serve God, write this book, and follow his vocation. However, Mary also rewarded him for this text. On 4 April 1555 Mary granted Christopherson a lifetime mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge and on

9 November 1556 she granted him the bishopric of Chichester, although he was not installed until 21 November 1557.³²⁵ On 12 November 1558 Mary further granted him the patronage of certain vicarages, parsonages, and other promotions in his diocese.³²⁶ While Christopherson's grant of the lifetime mastership of Trinity began in 1555, he must have become a master there earlier, because sometime between the marriage of Mary and Philip and November 1554 the king and queen sent a letter to Trinity regarding him. The letter reminded the college that both Henry VIII and Mary have given it large endowments, so now Mary and Philip wanted their chaplain, John Christopherson, and eight fellows to make statutes for the college. Those who did not follow the rules ratified by Christopherson were to be expelled from Trinity College.³²⁷ Christopherson and Mary must have maintained a friendly relationship, as he is mentioned in the New Year's gift list of 1557, in which it is noted that he gave Mary a red velvet-covered book and received a gilt cruse of 14 ounces in return.³²⁸

Both Christopherson's dedication and text have many similarities to Proctor's dedication and text on rebellion. Like Proctor, Christopherson explained that a man should not rebel "agaynste his prince."³²⁹ Also like Proctor, Christopherson probably meant "prince" generically, as in any ruler, but neither dedicator qualified the term or

³²⁵ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. II, 79 and Vol. III, 243.

³²⁶ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Mary I.* C.S. Knighton, ed. (London, Public Record Office, 1998), Entry 914.

³²⁷ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Mary I*, Entry 139.

³²⁸ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 359. Mary's New Year's gift list of 1557 is reprinted in Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 358-369.

³²⁹ Christopherson, *Exhortation*, A.vi.r.

used the incorrect term princess. Therefore, both Christopherson and Proctor presented Mary as the head of the body politic, in spite of her sex.³³⁰ Both dedications also appealed to humanism with their references to ancient texts and ancient rebellions as authoritative examples of rebellions destroying society. And, both men linked rebellion with heresy. But they had slightly different approaches; Proctor's text found that heresy caused corruption and explained the relationship between heresy and lust by representing heresy as a temptress desiring rebellion, while Christopherson represented rebellion as sinful first and then heretical.³³¹

Most importantly, however, there is evidence that both of these men were successful in negotiating with Queen Mary, as both were recipients of her patronage. James Cancellar also received patronage from Mary, but it is not clear if it was due to his service in the royal chapel or for his book.³³² Cancellar received five grants for leases of land.³³³ One scholar has even argued that because Proctor and Christopherson were so close to the court and reaped rewards that their books must have been commissioned, especially if Christopherson's text was the "official" response to Wyatt's Rebellion.³³⁴

³³⁰ Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 113-114.

³³¹ Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*, 145.

³³² Loach, "The Marian Establishment," 142-143.

³³³ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, 4 vols. (London: Public Record Office, 1970). Vol. II, pp. 30; Vol. III, pp. 32, 40-41; Vol. IV, 149 and 395.

³³⁴ Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 63 and 71-72. Duffy argues that Christopherson's text was the official response to Wyatt's Rebellion, but I cannot find any evidence to support that claim, apart from Duffy's insistence that since Proctor and Christopherson were close to

Jennifer Loach suggests that the text may have been official because it was printed by John Cawood, the royal printer.³³⁵

John Cawood printed five of the books that were dedicated to Mary when she was queen. According to Alec Ryrie, John Cawood took the place of royal printer after Richard Grafton. Grafton was the royal printer to Edward VI, but made the mistake of supporting Lady Jane Grey and styling himself as her printer. Upon Mary's accession, she removed Grafton and Cawood was made Mary's official printer on 29 December 1553.³³⁶ Cawood quickly became very wealthy. Cawood was also a primary printer of Catholic books under Mary. Yet Cawood was not so closely tied with Marian Catholicism that he fell out of favor under Elizabeth. Richard Jugge was made Elizabeth's royal printer and printed the proclamation of her accession, but Cawood quickly was made royal printer along with Jugge in 1560.³³⁷

James Cancellor, John Proctor, and John Christopherson each gave Queen Mary a printed book dedication that emphasized the importance of obedience, both to the current

the court, they must have been writing on Mary's behalf. It is interesting that the official response would stress heresy rather than politics, but I have addressed this discrepancy already. Bryson also suggests that the book was "granted a royal license", Bryson, "Order and Disorder," 327.

³³⁵ Loach, "Printing Press," 142.

³³⁶ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol.1, 53. "Grant for life to the queen's servant John Cawood of the office of queen's printer of all books and statutes, acts, proclamations, injunctions and other volumes to be issued by the queen, her heirs and successors, in the English tongue and to be put in print." The office is void because Richard Grafton, the King's Printer, "forfeited it by printing a proclamation in which was contained that a certain Jane, wife of Guildeford Dudley, was queen of England." Edward VI granted Reynold Wolff the office of King's Printer for all books in Latin, Greek and Hebrew and Cawood was granted Wolff's office if Wolff died before him.

³³⁷ All biographical information from Alec Ryrie, "John Cawood," *ODNB*.

monarch and to God. These three Marian polemicists, as each has been recognized by modern scholars, wanted their texts to serve as a catalyst for the purgation of Protestant texts and beliefs.³³⁸ They each used a strategy in which they cited lists of Protestant beliefs which demonstrated the discontinuity of these beliefs, which made the contradictory beliefs textually “pointless.”³³⁹ I suggest that these three dedications advocating obedience were not really meant to instruct Mary, but they were meant to instruct Englishmen and women. Mary did not need a lesson in obedience (although maybe her father or brother would have disagreed), but she needed her people to be obedient to her. Cancellor, Proctor, and Christopherson each gave their readers examples of disobedience and why it was both offensive to Mary, England, and God. Mary then rewarded these authors not because she found their lessons useful for her, but because she found their lessons supportive of her authority in England.

Cardinal Pole, however, did feel the need to instruct Mary regarding obedience. In a letter dated 15 February 1554, Pole told Mary that Wyatt’s rebellion was the result of “disunion and disobedience,” but not only of the heretical rebels, but also of Mary. Mary was slow in returning England to Rome and God punished her with a rebellion (the exact action she feared if she returned England to Rome too quickly). Pole continued, “God allowed rebellion and suppressed it so you would understand obedience.” Rebellions within the realm would only stop once Mary reunited England with the papacy.³⁴⁰ In

³³⁸ Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*, 125.

³³⁹ Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*, 124-125.

³⁴⁰ Thomas F. Mayer, ed., *The Correspondence of Reginald Pole*. Vol. 2 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), letter 815.

truth, it seems as though Mary was much more pragmatic about returning England to Rome than was Cardinal Pole. For Mary, this type of rebellion was exactly what she feared would become wide-spread if she hastened to reunite England with the papacy without the consent of the people and Parliament. Pole, on the other hand, wanted immediate action from Mary and told her that she would continue to be punished without it. Mary must have been in a very difficult position to decide if it was more important to place Catholicism or her kingdom first. Ultimately, she chose both by slowly reconciling England with the papacy and compromising with England and the pope on many issues, such as not restoring all church property that was confiscated and sold off by her father. Mary even suffered the threat of excommunication because her religious reforms generally reinstated the religious settlement of her father. But before I consider the books on religion dedicated Mary, I first want to turn to perceptions of Mary as a knowledgeable queen.

Classical Literature and Philosophy

Queen Mary had three books dedicated to her in which both the dedication and the subject matter of the book stressed knowledge through classical literature and philosophy. As the previous chapter has shown, it was well-known that Mary had a solid humanist education. Mary received education in Latin and classical texts. It is not difficult to suspect that Mary would continue to be interested in such subjects, or in just furthering her own knowledge, when she became queen. The three books on classical literature and philosophy that follow consider two authors with whom she may have been

familiar, Boethius and Virgil, and one subject with which Mary was most likely not familiar, astronomy.

George Coldewel (or Coluile) dedicated his translation of Boethius' *Consolations of Philosophy* to Mary (he uses both last names in his dedication).³⁴¹ Coldewel translated the book out of Latin with the intent that people in England would be able to read the English version, while including the Latin version of the text in the margins. Only one edition was printed in 1556 by John Cawood, the printer to the king and queen, but this was not the first English translation of Boethius. In 1525, John Walton translated this same book into English and his translation was printed by Dan Thomas Rychard, a monk in the monastery of Tauestok in Denshyre. Not much is known about George Coldewel. According to P. Botley, Coldewel may be identified with a Coldewel who was a physician in Northampton. His translation of Boethius is all that can firmly be attributed to him. Allegedly, his translation was printed three more times – there is an undated version and printings dated 1561, 1566 – but there are no extant versions beyond 1556. His translation of Boethius is considered to be generally accurate.³⁴²

Coldewel's dedication to Mary did not mention Philip, but listed both her English and Spanish titles. In it, Coldewel explained to Mary that one of the most valuable things in life was for a body to have a perfect mind; a body could be weak, but a person could still be satisfied with a good mind. Coldewel complimented Mary for the perfect mind

³⁴¹ George Coldewel, *Boetius de consolation philosophiae. The boke of Boetius, called the comferte of philosophye, or wysedome, moche necessary for all men to read and know, wherein suche as be in aduersitie, shall fynde muche consolation and comferte, and suche as be in great worldly prosperitie may knowe the vanitie and frailtie therof, and consequently fynde eternall felycytie* (London: John Cawood, 1556). STC 3201.

³⁴² P.Botley, "George Covile," *ODNB*.

and matching body that God had given her, even though a moral body is imperfect and sinful. Coldewel also declared his goodwill towards Mary and hoped that she might have continual health of body and mind so as to long continue to reign. Coldewel concluded his dedication with a plea for patronage by noting that he dedicated it to Mary so that he “myghte obtayne more fauour of the readers, under the protection and fauour of your name.”³⁴³ Coldewel hoped that by having his book connected to Mary that would be widely purchased and read.

It is obvious that Coldewel was not part of Mary’s courtly circle or someone who even knew Mary personally. This dedication is formulated very similarly to those of her years as princess, in that a man dedicated a text to her with some hope of a blind patronage reward. Coldewel outright asked for Mary’s favor and admitted that he only dedicated this book to Mary so that it would be linked with her and have better reader reception. Based on this, it is doubtful that Mary was even given a presentation copy of the book. Coldewel simply hoped that if the book appeared to be endorsed by Mary it would do well commercially and he justified his appeal by incorporating her knowledge and hinting that her endorsement would spread education. What this does show is that the commercialization of book dedications made popular by other royal ladies, such as Lady Margaret Beaufort and the six consorts of Henry VIII, had not disappeared by the mid-sixteenth century, but was no longer the prevalent form of dedication. Additionally, the linkage of a royal lady with a book must have enhanced its commercial prospects or it would still not be done.

³⁴³ Coldewel, *Boetius*, A.ii.r.

Additionally, Coldewel could not have been close to Mary because anyone close to Mary would have known that she was anything but the picture of health. As a child she was often sick. David Loades has claimed that a “prolonged period of psychological stress [the annulment proceeding of her father and mother] did Mary lasting damage.”³⁴⁴ Loades’s claim is based on his assessment that generally Mary was a failure as a monarch and wife, but this explanation of her poor health is unsatisfactory. Rather, Mary suffered from stomach ailments from the time she was a child, and these ailments carried over into her adult life.³⁴⁵ By 1556, the time of Coldewel’s dedication, Mary suffered what most modern scholars have come to consider a “phantom pregnancy.”³⁴⁶ Sometime during October or November 1554, Mary believed that she and Philip conceived a child.³⁴⁷ Coinciding with Cardinal Pole’s return to England and Parliament’s decision to restore papal authority, Mary’s pregnancy was announced at mass the morning of 28 November by Cardinal Pole.³⁴⁸ By July 1555 it was clear that there would be no child and Mary felt that she was deceived by her doctors.³⁴⁹ Mary’s known medical condition and her misguided pregnant state make it seem doubtful that Coldewel knew Mary personally.

³⁴⁴ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 91.

³⁴⁵ Judith Richards has suggested that some instances of Mary’s poor health were political rather than actual illnesses. Richards surmises that Mary may have feigned illness to avoid confrontations over her personal religious practices and political situations with her father and brother. See Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 89, 99, 104, and 106.

³⁴⁶ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 254.

³⁴⁷ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 232.

³⁴⁸ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 174.

Robert Recorde dedicated a book to Mary about education, and it is unlikely that Recorde knew Mary either. Recorde was a mathematician and a prolific author of texts on subjects ranging from mathematics to medicine to navigation. During the reign of Edward VI, Recorde was appointed to work at the Bristol mint and later the Durham mint. Recorde had frequent conflicts with Sir William Herbert, the earl of Pembroke. One of their disagreements resulted in a lawsuit and Recorde's imprisonment in the king's bench prison, where he died. However, Recorde was well-known for his learning, especially in British history and the classics.³⁵⁰

Recorde's *The castle of knowledge*, printed in 1556 by Reginald Wolfe, contained a dedication in English to Queen Mary, a dedication in Latin to Cardinal Pole, and also a preface to the reader.³⁵¹ It was reprinted in 1596 by Valentine Sims, and Sims's edition kept the dedication to Queen Mary and the preface to the reader. Recorde's text served as an elementary introduction to astronomy, particularly the mathematical calculation of spheres. In it, he explained Ptolomy's model of astronomy. Importantly, he also explained the heliocentric theory of Copernicus (although he was not willing to commit to Copernicus's theory), bringing Copernicus's theory to the attention of English readers.

Recorde's dedication to Mary listed both Mary's English and Spanish titles, but he, too, did not mention Philip. Recorde noted that he had recently returned from a long

³⁴⁹ See Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 173 – 179 for a discussion of Mary's first pregnancy. Richards suggests that this pregnancy was really a case of pseudocyesis, or an actual medical condition of a phantom pregnancy.

³⁵⁰ All biographical information comes from Stephen Johnston, "Robert Recorde," *ODNB*.

³⁵¹ Robert Recorde, *The castle of knowledge* (London: Reginald Wolfe, 1556). STC 20796.

exile (a fall from grace after the failure of some silver mines under his control), and that his return inspired him to write of a castle of knowledge. He suggested that his advanced work on explaining varying models of astronomy should be patronized by Mary so that during her reign knowledge may be recovered from exile. God had put Mary on the throne, and under her protection her subjects could defeat ignorance by reading Recorde's text. Recorde concluded his dedication by complimenting Mary's own knowledge, the knowledge of her councilors, and asking God to preserve her.

Recorde's dedication, like Coldewel's, was a general plea for patronage, and did not give any indication of personal knowledge of the queen. But it confirms my argument that it was thought that Mary was not truly in control of the politics of the realm, but had councilors around her who ran things for her. Recorde noted that "God not only hath endewed [Mary] with excellent knowledge, but also hath ayded with such prudent Councillars."³⁵² Recorde suggested that since Mary was educated, she would have an interest in further education or at least the education of her subjects. But, as was traditional, he also presumed that Mary relied on her council for handling the political aspects of running the realm. All of the dedications to Queen Mary acknowledged Mary as the highest authority in the realm, except for the few which Mary and Philip share which treated Mary and Philip as equally authoritative in England. Recorde regarded Mary as the highest authority, but he was the first to suggest that while she might be queen, she could only be a queen with guidance. Unlike Proctor and Christopherson who considered Mary to be their "prince," Recorde considered Mary to be a "princesse."³⁵³

³⁵² Recorde, *Castle*, A.ii.v.

Thomas Phaer, translator and dedicator of the last book concerning classical literature and philosophy, did not know Mary personally either. Phaer served as solicitor to the council in the Welsh Marches beginning in 1547, under Edward VI, a job he seems to have procured through the patronage of William Paulet, first marquess of Winchester. Paulet served the last four Tudor monarchs in various positions in the household, privy council, and treasury. Phaer authored many books on law and medicine which reached wide readership, but his most famous book was his translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* that he dedicated to Mary in 1558. Phaer undertook to translate the *Aeneid* as early as 1555, and on 28 May 1558, he published *The seuen first bookes of the Eneidos of Virgill*, printed by John Kingston for Richard Jugge.³⁵⁴ Jugge was also a printer in London, so Kingston probably printed this for Jugge's shop. Phaer continued to translate the *Aeneid*, only completing books eight, nine, and part of ten before his death in 1560.³⁵⁵ His ten-book translation was posthumously printed in 1562 and dedicated to Sir Nicholas Bacon. Phaer's translation was amended and added to by Thomas Twyne in 1573, who completed the English translation of the entire *Aeneid*.³⁵⁶

³⁵³ Recorde, *Castle*, A.ii.r.

³⁵⁴ Thomas Phaer, *The seuen first bookes of the Eneidos of Virgill* (London: John Kingston for Richard Jugge, 1558). STC 24799.

³⁵⁵ Steven Lally, ed., *The Aeneid of Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne: A Critical edition introducing Renaissance Metrical Typography* (New York: Garland Publishing, inc., 1987), xiv. Lally's introduction largely ignores Phaer's translations of the first seven and nine books in favor of exploring the Phaer-Twyne translations of 1573 and later. In Lally's discussion of the printing of the *Aeneid*, he begins with the 1573 edition.

³⁵⁶ Lally, ed., *The Aeneid*, xii and xxii. The Phaer-Twyne edition was printed six times between 1573 and 1620.

Phaer's dedication to Mary was brief and straightforward. Like most dedications to her, it gave both Mary's English and Spanish titles, but there was no mention of Philip. He dedicated his translation to Mary as her poor servant. Phaer noted that he was preferred to Mary's service by her councilor William, marquess of Winchester, Phaer's first patron. He hoped that this dedication and book was pleasing to Mary so that she would read it and pass it along to be read by others. He indicated that he intended to translate the rest of the *Aeneid*. Phaer ended his dedication by saying that he would pray for Mary's estate, virtue, and prosperity.

Phaer's dedication was largely impersonal, like those of Recorde and Coldewel. By writing "if this my beginning maie please your maiestie," referring to his dedication, Phaer made it clear that he did not know if Mary was even interested in learning, education, or the classics, but simply hoped that a royal endorsement would increase the readership of his book.³⁵⁷ Much like the dedications and colophons to Lady Margaret Beaufort, Phaer only included Mary's name at the beginning of the book to make it appear as though it had a royal endorsement. The rest of the language indicates that Phaer was not even looking for a reward from Mary, as he already served her as a solicitor in Wales, but that he simply wanted her to suggest that others read this book. He hoped that if Mary's name was attached it would sell more copies. Phaer did not even take the time to appeal to Mary's own known knowledge and education. Phaer did, however, mention his patron, Winchester, from whom he probably did expect some type of patronage from as a result of his printing. The layers of patronage in this dedication indicate that Phaer understood that his career rested on that of Winchester which rested

³⁵⁷ Phaer, a.ii.r.

on the good favor of Mary. Phaer's best chance of reaping any rewards was through one of the two.

Thomas Phaer did receive benefits deriving from both of them. Phaer married the widow Anne Revel some time between 1548 and 1551. On 16 June 1556, Phaer was granted the value of Anne's marriage portion and custody of her children in the event of her death before his.³⁵⁸ His marriage and preferment of her property probably resulted from Winchester's work on Mary's council. Mary, however, must have been personally pleased by Phaer's translation and dedication because Phaer was mentioned two more times in the Calendar of Patent Rolls, both in 1558. On 26 June 1558, Phaer was given a lease of land for twenty one years.³⁵⁹ But, more importantly, on 6 May 1558, Phaer was given a license by the king and queen, in consideration of his translation of the *Aeneid* and its purpose for young readers, that during his life he was the only man allowed to have printed an English translation of the *Aeneid*. Moreover, no other person was allowed to print Phaer's translation for the next ten years, upon forfeiture of the book and ten pounds for each book sold.³⁶⁰ Therefore, Mary must have found Phaer's work so pleasing that she royally sanctioned its printing and recommended that it be read by young readers, meaning those being educated in humanism, no doubt. Unlike most, Phaer's dedication to a royal patron actually achieved its goal. This patent, however, was dated twenty-two days before Phaer's book was first printed, meaning that Phaer must

³⁵⁸ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. III, 74-75.

³⁵⁹ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. IV, 363.

³⁶⁰ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. IV, 309. There is no similar license in the records of the Stationer's Company.

have first given Mary a presentation copy that she found so pleasing that she ordered it to print.

George Coldewel, Robert Recorde, and Thomas Phaer each dedicated one book to Mary in which both the subject matter and the dedication emphasized classical literature and philosophy. Queen Mary was known to be highly educated, herself, and had textbooks dedicated to both her and her mother as testaments to her learning. As a humanist queen, Mary continued her interest in reading and education, as will be further discussed in a later chapter.³⁶¹ These three dedications by Coldewel, Recorde, and Phaer, however, indicate that none of these men had close personal relationships with Mary and that all three of them hoped for some type of patronage in return, whether it be payment or endorsement of their text. Each man dedicated a book about education to Mary because she had a reputation for being educated and might take interest in their work enough to sponsor it. As has been shown, Mary only sponsored Phaer's book. These three men, therefore, were not trying to instruct Mary on anything specifically, but rather to offer her texts which she could learn from if she chose. Moreover, these three men wrote their books with no specific end in mind, apart from gaining wide readership to spread their ideas or translations. The authors in the next section, however, those who dedicated to Mary with the hope of returning England to Catholicism, wrote their books with a specific end in sight and specifically towards Mary and the current religious situation in England.

³⁶¹ Judith Richards has recently suggested that Mary should be re-evaluated and considered a humanist queen based on her educational background and the influence of her parents. Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 65.

Return of the True Religion

There were fourteen books dedicated to Queen Mary whose dedications addressed a desire for the return of the Catholic Church to England. Two of these books will be mentioned in the following chapter and one has been mentioned above in the discussion of John Proctor. The eleven printed book dedications in this section, then, represent a small portion of Catholic polemic writing that was done for the purpose of supporting the Catholic Reformation within England. It is only a small portion because many authors contributed to Catholic polemic literature, but only a few dedicated their books to Mary. Moreover, upon Mary's accession there were many other poems and pamphlets that celebrated Mary's victory over Lady Jane Grey and Northumberland, but only one was dedicated to Mary, John Seton's *Pangyrici in Victoriam*.³⁶² For Seton, Mary was chosen by God, would root heresy out of the realm, and reunited England with the Catholic Church; not only was she a mother to the people, she was a triumphant queen.³⁶³ Seton's verses, much like many others that celebrated Mary's accession, were probably also meant to appeal to an international audience.³⁶⁴ According to Lucy Wooding, the accession of Mary gave Catholic reform writers the opportunity to write specifically concerning the new needs of the Marian restoration rather than importing foreign ideas.

³⁶² Paulina Kews, "The Exclusion Crisis of 1553 and the Elizabethan Succession," In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 51. John Seton, *Pangyrici in Victoriam* (London: Reginald Wolf, 1553). STC 22258.

³⁶³ Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 256-257.

³⁶⁴ Loach, "Printing Press," 144.

Essentially, Marian writers wrote with a unique style specifically supporting Marian Catholicism as an extension of Henrician Catholicism.³⁶⁵ While these Marian writers bolstered the Catholic Reformation, they also aimed to instruct Mary on ways in which to most effectively root out heresy and return England to the true church.

John White, headmaster of Winchester College and later Bishop of Winchester, dedicated one of the first books that Mary received as queen. Dated December 1553 and printed by Robert Caly, *Diacosio-martyrion, id est ducentorum virorum testimonium, de veritate corporis, et sanguinis Christi, in evcharistia* is a tract in which White challenged Peter Martyr's idea that there was no real presence in the eucharist.³⁶⁶ Both the dedication and the body of the text are in Latin. The dedication is brief, but what is interesting about it is, like the dedications to Mary when she was a princess, it mentions one of her male relatives. White called her sister to Edward VI. This is interesting because White's book defended the real presence of Christ, a Catholic and Lutheran idea, which the Edwardian church rejected. White had nothing to gain by making the connection, but probably did so just to establish Mary within the line of kings of England. White may also have been trying to remind Mary of his loyal service to the crown, as he had previously written verses supporting the royal supremacy. Mary must have been satisfied with his dedication because on 18 March 1554, John White, was absolved of his

³⁶⁵ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 150.

³⁶⁶ John White, *Diacosio-martyrion, id est ducentorum virorum testimonium, de veritate corporis, et sanguinis Christi, in evcharistia, ante triennium aduersus Petrum matryem* (London: Robert Caly, 1553). STC 25388.

sins (he was excommunicated in 1551 by archdeacon John Philpot for being too conservative) and on 1 April 1554 was made Bishop of Lincoln.³⁶⁷

Thomas Paynell, who dedicated two books to Mary when she was a princess, as mentioned in the last chapter, dedicated two more books to Mary when she was queen, and he, too, mentioned at least one of Mary's male relatives at each occurrence. The princess-era books included a translation of part of a book by St. Bernard and a translation of some scriptures. Both of these books emphasized virtue and advocated for cloistered life. Upon Mary's accession, Paynell immediately dedicated a third translation to her, *Twelue Sermons of Saynt Augustine* (Bishop of Hippo).³⁶⁸ It was printed in 1553, but did not give an exact date or month. It most likely was printed for Mary as a New Year's gift because in the colophon Cawood calls himself "prynter to the Quenes Maiestie," a title which he was legally granted on 29 December 1553.³⁶⁹ Cawood acted as the queen's printer earlier, but was not officially her printer until late December, which most likely was when he printed the *Sermons*. Paynell also had a history of giving Mary New Year's gifts, so this was probably his first after she became queen. However, only one New Year's gift roll exists from Mary's queenship, that of 1557, so it is not possible to determine if this in fact was a New Year's gift and Paynell or Cawood received payment for its completion. *Sermons* was printed again in 1557, but with a variant title, *Certaine Sermons of Saynt Augustine*. This version was also printed by Cawood, but it

³⁶⁷ Mayer, *The Correspondence of Reginald Pole*, Vol. II, Letter 836.

³⁶⁸ Thomas Paynell, *Twelue Sermons of Saynt Augustine* (London: John Cawood, 1553). STC 923.

³⁶⁹ Paynell, *Twelue Sermons*, L.viii.r.

contained seventeen sermons, not twelve, so its new name reflected its expansion.

Paynell's dedication was kept in the 1557 edition, with some minor word changes.

However, even though St. Augustine of Hippo was a favorite among Protestants, these sermons were not actually by St. Augustine. They were either written by Paynell or were some of the pseudo-Augustinian sermons that were being circulated at the time.³⁷⁰

Paynell's dedication to *Sermons* follows very closely the model of the two dedications he gave to Mary when she was a princess. Paynell's stress on virtue was again emphasized, as was the need for England to root out sin and heresy. He also mentioned that she was the daughter of Henry VIII, who was King of England, France, and Ireland, but did not list any of Mary's titles. This, too, was how the dedications to Princess Mary were begun, with her connection to the most recent male monarch.

Paynell continued by complaining of the rampant sinning currently taking place, bemoaning that "usury and Symony" continue to be accepted, that "imperate lyuyng [remain] used and estemed," and that "to kepe a concubyne is not muche blamed."³⁷¹

These were basically the same complaints that Paynell had always had, in that he did not like how reformers had allowed monks and priests to marry. Paynell noticed that "true preachynge" was happening, but it had few followers.³⁷² Instead, the current trend was for every man to "be his owne doctour, his owne interpreter of scripture."³⁷³ The church fathers were no longer highly regarded as evangelicals claimed they were just men, not

³⁷⁰ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 144, fn 108.

³⁷¹ Paynell, *Twelue Sermons*, A.ii.r.

³⁷² Paynell, *Twelue Sermons*, A.iii.v.

³⁷³ Paynell, *Twelue Sermons*, A.iiii.r.

certain authorities on interpretation. Paynell argued otherwise, that church fathers were “holy confessors, the chosen servants and vessels of God,” and highlighted the superlative wit, learning, and scriptural dedication of St. Augustine.³⁷⁴ Paynell wrote that he chose twelve sermons from St. Augustine to remind men to return to virtuous living. He concluded his dedication by asking Mary to accept these sermons.

Paynell’s final dedication to Mary accompanied another translation. Some time in 1558, Cawood printed *Certaine Godly and Deuout Prayers*, Paynell’s translation of some Latin prayers by Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham.³⁷⁵ Both Paynell’s queen-era books were printed by Cawood, the royal printer, indicating that Mary in fact favored Paynell and his works. As in his other three dedications, Paynell began by associating Mary with her father. Also like the other three, Paynell noted that even from a young age Mary demonstrated continuous virtue. To increase her devotion (if possible), he wrote that he translated these prayers by Father Cuthbert Tunstall in order to offer spiritual comfort to Mary and her “vertuous ladies” and “chaste damselles.”³⁷⁶

Paynell’s choice of translating Tunstall’s sermons is quite interesting. First of all, Tunstall was still alive in 1558. Secondly, Tunstall served on Katherine of Aragon’s defense counsel regarding her annulment from Henry VIII. Tunstall defended her to the best of his abilities, but eventually accepted the king’s marriage to Anne Boleyn. Thirdly, Tunstall was incredibly adaptable when it came to each Tudor monarch’s

³⁷⁴ Paynell, *Twelue Sermons*, A.iiii.r.

³⁷⁵ Thomas Paynell, *Certaine Godly and Deuout Prayers* (London: John Cawood, 1558). STC 24318.

³⁷⁶ Paynell, *Certaine*, A.ii.v.

religious policy. Even though Tunstall opposed many of the religious changes made by Henry VIII and Edward VI, once those changes became law, Tunstall defended them and remained obedient to each king. In 1539 Tunstall went as far as announcing in his Palm Sunday sermon that he was dissatisfied with the papacy for being arrogant. Fourth of all, and most important, was Tunstall's personal actions regarding religious policy. For example, in his diocese he forbade Tyndale's New Testament, but actually purchased copies of it in order to burn them rather than persecute people who personally owned copies. When it came to the Marian persecutions, Tunstall was equally as tolerant, preferring recantation to burning.³⁷⁷ Tunstall's biographical information reveals that he was most likely a Henrician Catholic, himself, which was probably the main reason that Paynell chose to translate his particular sermons. Presenting Tunstall's sermons must have been an endorsement of both Henrician Catholicism and Tunstall's tolerance.

Like the dedications which Paynell gave to Mary before she was queen, clearly these two dedications to Mary when she was queen were meant for her instruction, as well as the instruction of a larger readership. As Mary was already an example of virtue and piety, the men and women who read these dedications and books would better be instructed in how to root heresy and sin out of their own lives in favor of Catholicism. Paynell argued that if given the right instruction on scriptural interpretation that men and women would see the folly of their misinterpretations and will return back to the true church. Also, if given the opportunity to read prayers of the current Bishop of Durham in English, men and women would get a modern interpretation of scripture that would

³⁷⁷ All biographical information comes from D.G. Newcombe, "Cuthbert Tunstal," *ODNB*.

encourage faith and piety. Paynell did not explicitly call for a return the true church, but in referencing the benefits of Christianity and expelling sin, Paynell was inferring the faults of the reformers as he saw them.

While all four of Paynell's dedications follow the same model, what is most interesting about them is the appeal to feminine virtue as the chief element that could defeat heresy and sin. It almost seems as though Paynell understood virtue to come from God and the Church, but females were uniquely qualified to exemplify virtue and teach it to others. For instance, in the dedication to Tunstall's prayers, Paynell asked Mary and her ladies specifically to read these prayers. Why? It has to be that Paynell thought that if favored by Mary and her ladies they had the best chance of being passed on to wider readership, who obviously needed lessons in virtue more than Mary and her ladies did. If Mary was virtuous in her father's house, then the ladies within Mary's household should be virtuous also. And, whomever the ladies advocated Paynell's work to should become virtuous by extension. Therefore, Paynell's translations were meant to have an effect on the reader and society, they were not just done as a humanist practice.³⁷⁸

The famous Catholic polemicist, Miles Hogarde, also meant for his books to be read and have an effect on the reader and society. Hogarde dedicated four books to Queen Mary: *The assault of the sacrament of the altar; A treatise declaring howe Christe was banished out of this realm; The displaying of the Protestants; and, A mirrour of loue.*³⁷⁹ Miles Hogarde was a London hosier who was vehemently anti-Protestant.³⁸⁰ His

³⁷⁸ Helen Moore, "Gathering Fruit: The 'Profitable' Translations of Thomas Paynell." In *Tudor Translation*. Ed. Fred Schurink (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 41.

books, especially, *The displaying of the Protestants*, have been extensively examined by modern scholars as “reading as an act of faith,”³⁸¹ as the Marian writer who best used metaphor,³⁸² and as effectively covering the disruptive nature of Protestantism.³⁸³ J.W. Martin notes how unusual Hogarde was for being a London artisan who was not only interested in printing, but exemplified the significance of increased literacy and the involvement of laity in religious affairs.³⁸⁴ Hogarde’s ability to combine biblical ideas along with medieval imagery, while writing in English, showed the innovation of Marian writers who wanted their works to supplement the restoration of Catholicism.³⁸⁵

³⁷⁹ Miles Hogarde, *The assault of the sacrament of the altar containyng aswell sixe seuerall assaultes made from tyme to tyme against the sayd blessed sacrament: as also the names & opinions of all the heretical captaines of the same assaultes* (London: Robert Caly, 1554). STC 13556.; *A treatise declaring howe Christe was banished out of this realm: And howe it hath pleased God to bryng Christ home againe by Mary our moost gracious Quene* (London: Robert Caly, 1554). STC 13560.5.; *The displaying of the Protestants, and sondry their practises, with a description of diuers their abuses of late frequented* (London: Robert Caly, 1556). STC 13558.; and, *A mirrour of loue, which such light doth giue, that all men may learne, how to loue and liue* (London: Robert Caly, 1555). STC 13559.

³⁸⁰ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. I, 386. On 25 November 1553, Hogarde (Huggarde) was given a grant for life as the queen’s hosier, with daily wages of 12 pence.

³⁸¹ Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*, 151.

³⁸² Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 149.

³⁸³ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 72-74, 76.

³⁸⁴ J.W.Martin, “Miles Hogarde: Artisan and Aspiring Author in Sixteenth-Century England,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 34 (1981), 359.

³⁸⁵ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 150. See also Seth Lerer, “Medieval Literature and Early Modern Readers: Cambridge University Library Sel. 5.51-5.63,” *The Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 97 (2003), 311-332.

The assault of the sacrament was actually written by Hogarde in 1549, but as the frontispiece explains, could not be printed until Mary was queen because of “heresie then raigning.”³⁸⁶ It was printed on 20 September 1554 by Robert Caly. *The assault* actually has no separate dedication to Mary, but simply notes on the title page that it is “dedicated to the Quenes moste excellent maiestie, beyng then ladie Marie.”³⁸⁷ This very minimal dedication to Mary does not make much sense for Hogarde in 1554. Just because Hogarde was appointed Mary’s hosier on 25 November 1553, that did not mean that the two had any personal relationship. But, as I suggest below, he had given Mary a previous dedication, so he did not write this one line dedication fearing displeasing her and losing his position as hosier. When his book was finally printed in 1554, there was no reason to change the dedication or add an additional one because by that time he had a position at court and his dedicatee was not out of favor.

Interestingly, Caly printed all of Hogarde’s books, as well as many other Catholic polemical books by authors such as John Proctor and Thomas Martin, but Caly never had a patent as the royal printer.³⁸⁸ Rather, Cawood was the queen’s printer, and on 20 July 1556, John Wayland was given a license to be the sole printer of primers, matins, and manuals of prayer for seven years.³⁸⁹ Wayland’s appointment may have been a reward for his printing of the 1556 edition of Cancellar’s book on obedience. According to

³⁸⁶ Hogarde, *The assault*, frontispiece.

³⁸⁷ Thank you to the librarians of the Huntington Library and Exeter and Brasenose Colleges of Oxford for checking their copies for any possible additional dedication.

³⁸⁸ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 76.

³⁸⁹ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. III, 509.

Eamon Duffy, with the accession of Mary many Protestant printers were forced to hand their shops over to Catholic printers. Richard Grafton's press went to Robert Caly and Edward Whitchurch's bible-printing shop was given to John Wayland.³⁹⁰

Also printed in 1554 by Caly was Hogarde's *A treatise declaring howe Christe was banished out of this realm*. Hogarde also gave Mary a presentation manuscript copy of his text.³⁹¹ Hogarde's dedication to Mary only contained Mary's English titles, so it was probably printed before her marriage in July 1554. It is obvious that Hogarde greatly respected and enjoyed his position as the queen's hosier because he called attention to how he was a poor man who pleased the queen with his services. Hogarde continued that many were blind in error, being offending by the truth. They ran free like unbridled horses, but were really in folly. Mary [the Virgin] fled into Egypt with Christ, but then Mary brought Christ home again. Many times within the text Hogarde notes that Mary brought Christ home again, with Mary meaning both the Virgin Mary and Mary Tudor. Christ was banished from England, but God heard the prayers of the people and gave them Mary as Queen. Hogarde claimed that he wrote this thinking of how Mary would bring Christ home again to England. He also claimed that he did not write this to flatter Mary, but because of his conscience. He concluded by taking blame for any negligence found within the book itself.

While the dedication to *A treatise* praised how Mary's presence alone brought Christ home, his next dedication to Mary celebrated how Mary brought England back to the true church. In May 1555, Hogarde dedicated *A mirrour of loue* to Mary. In the

³⁹⁰ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 58.

³⁹¹ British Library, Harley MS 3444.

dedication, Hogarde told Mary how it must be through God's love for her that England was brought back to the true church. He wrote that he again was using his wits to serve Mary and hoped that she favored his work enough that it might pass forth to print, as she had done before. If it were printed, Hogarde hoped that others might read and understand it so as to learn how to love.

The dedication to *A treatise* is similar to the dedication *A mirrour of loue* in that in both Hogarde expressed his gratitude for his position as the queen's hosier. While Hogarde's expression of his appreciation was fairly conventional, it is clear that Hogarde took his duty very seriously and had an established relationship with Mary in which the two negotiated over the printing of Hogarde's books. Both dedications also show how Hogarde took advantage of his position to be able to write books that celebrated Mary and Catholicism and had a platform with which to print them. Neither asked for additional patronage, but simply that Mary read his book because he would like others to read it as well. While it is known that Hogarde gave Mary a presentation copy of *A treatise*, the dedication to *A mirrour of loue* indicates that Hogarde first gave her a presentation copy of the dedication and book, as Hogarde asked her to please prefer this book so that it may pass to print. Since *A mirrour of loue* was printed, Mary must have endorsed a manuscript version of the text first.

For all of their similarities, Hogarde's most famous work, and the only one in prose, *The displaying of the Protestants*, is very different from his previous works, as is its dedication. In it, Hogarde did not focus on the merits of God's love, but simply

attacked Protestants as wrong and deserving of their punishments.³⁹² The dedication began by listing both Mary's English and Spanish titles. Hogarde recounted that there were sins which provoked God's vengeance, "chiefly infidelitie," because it dishonored God, and rebellions against regal rulers who were appointed by God.³⁹³ Hogarde mentioned that God executed punishment on rebels in old times, but now rebels fear neither God nor man. He then listed some biblical examples of rebels and infidelities, which men must no longer remember or they would not commit these crimes. He was moved to display the horrible actions of the Protestants who were both rebellious and unfaithful, using this book to discredit Protestants and confirm Catholics. In this work, Hogarde must have been one of the first writers to use "protestant" in a general sense, not specifically referring to the princes who protested in Germany. Hogarde credited the assistance of an unnamed friend in making the book. He indicated that this book has been previously printed, but perfected by him and his friend. He concluded his dedication with a prayer of protection and preservation for both Mary and Philip.

The displaying was first printed in June 1556 and was immediately released in a second edition one month later. Hogarde only included the dedication to Mary in the second edition. This dedication was unusual in that it mentioned Philip, when almost all dedications to Queen Mary gave her Spanish titles but purposefully did not mention her husband by name. Philip left England shortly after Mary's "phantom pregnancy" ended and arrived in Brussels on 8 September 1555.³⁹⁴ Philip did not return to England until 20

³⁹² Martin, "Miles Hogarde," 367.

³⁹³ Hogarde, *The displaying*, 3r.

March 1557.³⁹⁵ In the dedication, Hogarde asked that God bless the “kinges maiestie and graunt vnto his highness a safe retourne to bothe your noble heartes desires, and comforte of bothe your maiesties realms.”³⁹⁶ Even when Hogarde did mention Philip, it was not by name, so as to praise Philip, but not draw too much attention to him. When this book was printed for the second time Philip had not been in England for nearly a year and anyone who knew Mary knew that she steadfastly awaited his return. Hogarde’s prayer for Philip’s return must have been meant to offer consolation to Mary and shows a more personal relationship that had developed between Mary and Hogarde by this third dedication.

This dedication by Hogarde is unlike the previous two because it does not happily recount how God has blessed England by giving it Mary as its queen and calling England back to the Catholic Church. Rather, this dedication is more negative in tone, attacking those who maintain their Protestantism nearly two years after it was legally proscribed, and emphasizing the destructive nature of Protestantism.³⁹⁷ For Hogarde, Protestantism was a heretical infection within England.³⁹⁸ The dedication’s attacking tone suggests that Hogarde was secure in his position as hosier and no longer needed to engage in overt flattery of Mary before getting to the point of his text.

³⁹⁴ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 254.

³⁹⁵ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 274.

³⁹⁶ Hogarde, *The displaying*, 5r.

³⁹⁷ Tom Betteridge, *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 136-137.

³⁹⁸ Betteridge, *Literature and Politics*, 154.

Three other dedications to Mary actually mentioned Philip. One of them is John Redman's *A compendius treatise called the complaint of Grace*, printed by Robert Caly in 1554.³⁹⁹ Redman was a doctor of divinity and master of Trinity College, Cambridge. He died in 1551. Thomas Smyth undertook to compile Redman's text in 1554, and it was Smyth who dedicated his compilation to Mary. In the dedication, Smyth noted that Redman's text had been commented upon since Redman's death by those who wished to slander him, but now (1554) Redman's text would find favor. In 1551, men would not look to the true light (Catholicism), but true religion was restored under Mary. Smyth decided to compile Redman's work and dedicate it to Mary as the clearest light of Catholicism. Smyth concluded his dedication by commenting that Mary had matched herself with a noble and worthy king, who would hopefully give her a child. Therefore, this book must have been printed right after Mary and Philip's marriage to specifically mention their marriage and the prospect of a child, but before November, when it was publicly announced that Mary was pregnant.

John Angell, a chaplain to Mary, dedicated *The agreement of the holye fathers, and Doctors of the churche, vpon the cheifest articles of Christian religioun as appeareth on the nexte syde folowinge, very necessary for all curates*, and his dedication also mentioned Philip.⁴⁰⁰ William Harford printed the text, but the exact date of its publication is unknown. Most likely, the text was printed some time during 1555. The

³⁹⁹ John Redman, *A compendius treatise called the complaint of Grace* (London: Robert Caly, 1554). STC 20826.

⁴⁰⁰ John Angell, *The agreement of the holye fathers, and Doctors of the churche, vpon the cheifest articles of Christian religioun as appeareth on the nexte syde folowinge, very necessary for all curates* (London: William Harford, 1555). STC 634.

printing date of 1555 is probably accurate because it specifically praises how true religion has just returned. The laws regarding Catholicism were approved by Parliament in late November 1554, so some time in early 1555 seems like an appropriate date for this text. The *Calendar of Patent Rolls* gives no indication of a reward for Angell for this text, but there are other entries which show that he must have been favored by Mary. First, Angell was a chaplain in Mary's household. But earlier, in 1554, John Angell was granted oversight of the hospital of St. Katherine in Bedmynster, Bristol and the vicarage of Deptford.⁴⁰¹ After Angell's book was printed, Angell was actually presented to the hospital of St. Katherine.⁴⁰²

In the dedication, Angell mentioned that Mary was wife to "Lorde Philip," but clearly the dedication was only directed at Mary.⁴⁰³ Angell suggested that of all the great gifts that God had given England, there was none which bound England more to Him than the return of the true religion. True religion died with Henry VIII, but existed again with Mary and her gifts of grace and virtue. Lately, England had been "seduced" by ignorance and stubbornness.⁴⁰⁴ England was led by false interpreters, "Tyll suche tyme that it pleased God of his infinite mercy, to sende us a newe Judith, by whose godlines the trewe light and knowledge of Goddes worde is nowe by her brought agayne."⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰¹ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. III, 203 and 254.

⁴⁰² *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, Vol. IV, 143.

⁴⁰³ Angell, *The agreement*, A.ii.r.

⁴⁰⁴ Angell, *The agreement*, A.ii.v.

⁴⁰⁵ Angell, *The agreement*, A.ii.v – A.iii.r.

It is noteworthy that Angell compared Mary with the biblical Judith. Judith was a Hebrew woman who defeated the Assyrians by beheading Holofernes, the Assyrian general. But Angell was not the first or only man to compare Mary to Judith. According to Sarah Duncan, the image of Judith was used at Mary's coronation to compare "Mary's triumph over Northumberland with Judith's defeat of Holofernes." Angell probably meant for Holofernes to be representative of Edward, as in the dedication Angell explicitly said that true religion died with Henry VIII and lately England was subject to false interpreters. Edward's religious settlement must be the Holofernes that Mary was able to overcome. Catholic writers also compared Mary not only to Judith but also the Virgin Mary (as was noted in one dedication to Princess Mary). In doing so, Mary personified a triumphant queen who defeated her religious enemies.⁴⁰⁶

The most important aspect of this dedication, however, is not Angell's allusion to Judith or that his text demonstrates that Mary and Angell negotiated over patronage and rewards or that Angell praised Mary for restoring the Catholic Church to England, but that Angell gave insight into Mary's religious settlement appearing to be the religious settlement of her father. It was commonly thought by Catholics that Edward's religious settlement was Protestant, but the final religious settlement of 1547 had been true English Catholicism. Angell linked Mary's religious reforms as restorative of her father's religious settlement, thus reaffirming the idea that the Henrcian Catholicism of 1547 was the accepted form of Catholicism.⁴⁰⁷ The language of the Marian reformation focused on

⁴⁰⁶ Duncan, *Mary I*, 161.

⁴⁰⁷ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 119-120. On 20 August 1553 Mary sent a letter to the Bishop of Winchester orderinh him to restore all of the religious statutes and

the Mass and the Bible because England was influenced by fifty years of humanism and twenty years of royal supremacy which de-emphasized the role of the papacy.⁴⁰⁸

Angell's brief mention of "Lorde Philip" is case-in-point. By not calling him "King Philip," Angell de-emphasized Philip's position in England and Philip's relation to the papacy. Angell wanted Mary to restore the English Catholicism of her father, not the Roman Catholicism of her husband.

Mary's biographers have even concluded that Mary's preferred form of Catholicism was that of her father, as she never seemed to place much emphasis on papal authority, either personally or within her realm, nor did she engage in many spiritual pilgrimages.⁴⁰⁹ Not only might Mary's practices have demonstrated that she preferred the religious settlement of her father (de-emphasizing the role of the papacy), but it would have been a politically wise move also, thereby appeasing both Catholics and conservative reformers. During her queenship, Mary was committed to the Catholic restoration of England, but not on following orders of the pope, with whom she did not agree the method of restoration, such as whether or not to take previous religious lands from the families who purchased them after the Dissolution of the Monasteries. One biographer even argues that "she was convinced that she had a personal relationship with

ordiances as they were at the end of her father's reign. See Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), MS 106, entry 315.

⁴⁰⁸ Lucy Wooding, "The Marian Restoration and the language of Catholic Reform," In *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: The Achievement of Friar Bartolomé Carranza*. Eds. John Edwards and Ronald Truman (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 58.

⁴⁰⁹ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 196-197. John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 230-231.

her Savior Jesus Christ, such as the reformers and evangelicals of her time... This is the perspective from which her excellent Renaissance humanist credentials should be viewed.”⁴¹⁰ As a humanist queen, Mary had an evangelical nature that reflected the changing religious tone of sixteenth century, especially as played out in English Catholic literature.⁴¹¹ Furthermore, this reformed Catholic literature, from which many books in my study draw, stressed Catholic teaching deriving from scripture, not the papacy, very much like the literature of the Henrician reformation, and the political benefits of this would have been noticeable.⁴¹²

The third dedication that mentioned Philip did not even mention him by name, but simply called him “King.”⁴¹³ Richard Smith, a doctor of divinity at Oxford, dedicated *A bouclier of the catholike fayth of Christes church, conteynyng diuers matters now of late called into controuersy, by the newe gossellers* to Mary some time in 1554 and only listed her English titles. The second part of Smith’s work was published in 1555 and did not contain any dedications. Smith began his dedication with a quote from scripture of a prophet mentioning the coming of Christ. He continued that many remembered how Mary survived at the hands of her enemies for so many years to come into her rightful inheritance of the crown of England. For Smith, it was a work of God that Mary was able to overthrow political men to become queen. God took vengeance on Mary’s enemies,

⁴¹⁰ Edwards, *Mary I*, 229.

⁴¹¹ Wooding, “The Marian Restoration,” 50.

⁴¹² Wooding, “The Marian Restoration,” 53 and 55.

⁴¹³ Richard Smith, *A bouclier of the catholike fayth of Christes church, conteynyng diuers matters now of late called into controuersy, by the newe gossellers* (London: Richard Tottell, 1554), C.v.r. STC 22816.

and those she was gracious enough to pardon must obey her and God lest they suffer a worse punishment than before. “Lette them beware, and forsake their newe wycked religion, and retourne agayne to the Catholyke Churche.”⁴¹⁴ Smith went on to give an example from scripture to prove that the Catholic Church was the one true church. Smith was thankful that the Catholic Church was now restored again to England with the help of God, the Queen, the King, and the Cardinal. The “newe believe” was not a true faith because Catholic Mary became queen, thus proving that the “newe believe” was false.⁴¹⁵ Smith ended his dedication with a prayer, but not for Mary, instead he implored that God grant English subjects a return to Catholicism.

Two things are interesting about this dedication. First, Smith only listed her English titles, but clearly this was printed after her marriage since it stated that Catholicism had already been legally restored by Parliament, Cardinal Pole, Mary, and King Philip. This is unusual that the Spanish titles were not used, but it was probably done for emphasis on the return of Catholicism to England without the larger influence of the Spanish. England was its own realm with its own Catholic monarch who chose to restore the true faith. What else is interesting is that Smith referred to Wyatt’s Rebellion when the rebellion would have been over for many months. Again, this is why I think that Smith emphasized Mary’s Englishness as the reason for Catholic restoration. Philip was useful in restoring the faith, as he too was Catholic, but he could become dangerous if he intended to make England a puppet of Spain.

⁴¹⁴ Smyth, *A bouclier*, C.iiii.r.

⁴¹⁵ Smyth, *A bouclier*, C.v.r.

Surprisingly, there is a dearth of Spanish works printed in England that were dedicated to Mary and Philip. In fact, there appears to be only one. *The Diall of Princes* was written by Don Anthony of Guevara.⁴¹⁶ In December 1557 an English translation of this by Thomas North was printed by John Wayland.⁴¹⁷ Even though it was a Spanish text, North translated it from a French edition, but he must have also used a Spanish edition because he incorporated letters from a Spanish edition that were not included in the French version.⁴¹⁸ What is more interesting is that it was a Spanish text, but it was not dedicated to Mary and Philip, just Mary, yet it included both her English and Spanish titles. According to Victor Houlston, Anthony Munday reprinted the English version in 1568 and 1582, keeping the dedication to Mary in both versions. This is an example of how “Spanish literature connected with Mary continued to circulate despite the divisions within Elizabethan Catholicism.”⁴¹⁹ Another edition was printed in 1619, and this edition removed the dedication to Mary and instead has a dedication to Sir Henry Montague by Anthony Munday, who also edited the 1619 edition.

In North’s dedication to Mary he explained that Plato spent his life trying to fix the barbarity of the Greeks and came up with the idea that bad members of society should

⁴¹⁶ Thomas North, *The Diall of Princes* (London: John Wayland, 1557). STC 12427.

⁴¹⁷ There is a Thomas North mentioned in the New Year’s gift roll of 1557, but it most likely is not the same North, as he gave Mary Queen Mary 10 live partridges and his payment from Mary is not listed. Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 366.

⁴¹⁸ A.F. Allison, *English Translations from the Spanish and Portugese to the Year 1700* (Kent: Dawson & Sons Ltd., 1974), 89.

⁴¹⁹ Victor Houlston, “Her Majesty, who is Now in Heaven: Mary Tudor and the Elizabethan Catholics,” In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 46.

be banished. Plato also decided that those who honored the gods and benefitted the commonwealth should be honored. Therefore, Don Anthony of Guevara deserved to be honored because his works both praised God and edified Spain. North suggested that no other author (except the holy fathers) wrote more effectively of God than Guevara, which was why North translated this work into English. North asked Mary to accept his translation out of goodness so as to encourage older persons to engage in translating texts. With these translations, God would be glorified, Mary's name would be honored, and England would benefit.

The printed book dedications that celebrated the return of the Catholic Church to England all have a few things in common. First, each dedicator must have thought that Mary had significant enough influence over the religious policy of England that it was worth directing books to her about expelling Protestantism from England. Unlike statecraft, an area in which sixteenth-century authors were not yet ready to accept a female, religion was an arena in which Mary carried extensive authority. Second, these dedicators appealed to Mary, Cardinal Pole, Parliament, and even Philip to return the true church, but not one of them mentioned the papacy. This confirms the interpretation that ideal Catholicism within England was the Henrician settlement version. Third, each dedicator offered his text for the instruction of Mary and her subjects on the appropriate way to return Catholicism to England. Whether through reading translations of scripture, reading revered scriptural interpretations by the holy church fathers, or simply adhering to the seven sacraments, Mary could serve as an example of ideal Catholicism which her subjects could then follow.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined most of the printed book dedications that Mary received when she was queen. I have shown that just as dedicators sought to educate Mary when she was a princess, they continued to do so when she was queen. But as queen, Mary was also in a position to educate her subjects. Therefore the authors of many of these books sought to educate both. If Mary read and accepted their texts, then she could pass them on for wider readership. There is even evidence that in some cases she did favor the books so that they went on to be printed, but it is nearly impossible to gauge how widely they were read or how thoroughly Mary read them. Covering themes of obedience, classical literature and philosophy, and the return of the true religion these books instructed Mary on how to stimulate obedience from her subjects while encouraging her subjects to be both obedient to Mary and to God; they appealed to Mary's knowledge and interest in humanism so that her subjects would take greater interest in the same subjects; and, they educated Mary on different ways to re-establish Catholicism within England with the help of the church fathers and scripture, while encouraging Mary's subjects to turn away from heresy. Importantly, religion was an area where both men and women could negotiate to stabilize all types of confessionalizations.⁴²⁰

In the following chapter, I will examine all of the manuscripts dedicated to Mary during her entire lifetime. I will explore themes they addressed and why dedicators chose to only have their work copied by hand instead of being reproduced mechanically.

⁴²⁰ See Smith, "*Grossly Material Things.*"

Though scribal publication could involve multiple copies, I have only found evidence of single copies of the manuscripts dedicated to Mary, indicating that they were more personal in nature than printed books. The next chapter will also examine all of the remaining printed books dedicated to Mary when she was queen, including four books that were dedicated to Mary and Philip jointly and two other books that engage with the return of the true church. These printed books are best situated within the chapter on dedicated manuscripts because they are closely related to some of those manuscripts.

CHAPTER V
MANUSCRIPT DEDICATIONS TO MARY

While all of the previous chapters have examined printed books dedicated to Mary and some of her royal predecessors, this chapter will explore manuscripts dedicated to her. As noted in the first chapter, during the lifetime of Mary there was still significant overlap in desire for, prestige of, and readership of manuscripts and printed books. Julia Boffey has recently argued that during the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries books and manuscripts co-existed because readers used them side-by-side. Print had advantages of saved labor cost, commercial profit, and “speedy multiplication,” but readers made no clear distinction between books and manuscripts.⁴²¹ The fact that during her lifetime Mary received at least eighteen dedicated manuscripts compared with thirty-three printed books shows that there were blurred lines between the two types of book production.

However, there was a difference in intentionality between manuscripts and printed books that were dedicated to Mary. The printed books, which I have explained at length, were mass produced and meant to be read by the queen, her court, and anyone else who was literate or had the opportunity to have books read to him or her. Printed books, therefore, had a public audience. Manuscripts, on the other hand, were much more personal and directed specifically at Mary. In having an audience of one or a select

⁴²¹ Boffey, *Manuscript and Print*, 46-47.

few, manuscripts were able to appeal more directly to Mary's interests and patronage with less concern for who else might read the author's supplication. The dedicated manuscripts to Mary followed similar themes as the printed books given to her, specifically virtue, classical literature and philosophy, and the return of the true religion. So, dedicators did not give Mary manuscripts to address more private topics, but to make their appeals more personal and meaningful.

This chapter is the first account of all of the manuscripts that were dedicated to Mary. It will first examine the eight manuscripts that were dedicated to Mary by Henry Parker, Lord Morley. His dedications to Mary represent a traditional patronage relationship; Morley annually presented Mary with the gift of a book and was annually rewarded for his gift without having to ask for his reward. Then, I will move on to manuscripts written by, and usually translated by, individuals who were either clients of Mary or hoped to become her clients. These manuscripts often engaged in textual negotiation with the queen, asking her to change economic or religious policy, such as two manuscripts engaging in a discussion over the legality of clerical marriage. Often these manuscripts by individuals blindly sought Mary's patronage in some form of payment. I will conclude the chapter by exploring dedications to King Philip and the range of his literary patronage within England, as those to Philip were tangential to the dedications to Mary. Falling in line with the recent revisionist accounts of Philip within England, this chapter suggests that Philip held little power while in England and was only truly celebrated for his and Mary's potential child because it was safer than praising him for his involvement in statecraft or religion. This chapter will demonstrate that like the

men who dedicated printed books to Mary, manuscript dedicators also only chose to dedicate manuscripts to Mary in arenas in which they expected Mary to have power: encouraging virtue and the reformation of the English church. Yet, manuscript dedicators purposely chose to make their books more personal to Mary and not necessarily for the benefit of Mary's subjects.

Dedications by Henry Parker, Lord Morley

Henry Parker, Lord Morley, dedicated at least eight manuscripts to Mary, all of which were given to her as New Year's gifts over a period of several years, from approximately 1537 to 1556. According to David Starkey, contributor of an article on Morley's biography, Morley has previously been misunderstood as a courtier with contradictory loyalties (as his daughter was Lady Jane Rochford, wife of George Boleyn), but really, Morley was a relatively unimportant man who sometimes attended court but always remained consistent in his writings and translations, no matter their dedicatees. Henry Parker regularly gave New Year's gifts to Henry VIII, Princess Mary, and Thomas Cromwell, which is evidence that his writings were ceremonial as much as political.⁴²² Many of his dedications make clear that he and Mary were engaged in a traditional patronage relationship, in which his annual gifts were rewarded with annual payments.⁴²³

⁴²² David Starkey, "An Attendant Lord? Henry Parker, Lord Morley," In James P. Carley and Marie Axton, eds., *"Triumphs of English": Henry Parker, Lord Morley Translator to the Tudor Court* (London: The British Library, 2000), 1-7.

⁴²³ Natalie Zemon Davis suggests that gift-giving inherently required reciprocity. New Year's gifts in particular implied a hope for the continuation of patronage in the upcoming year. Davis, *The Gift*, 14 and 24. Therefore, Mary would have been obligated to give Parker a gift or payment in return, even though he all desired was Mary's favor.

Recently, James P. Carley and Marie Axton have edited a collection which serves as a revisionist account of Morley's life and writings.⁴²⁴

Starkey also notes that Parker's relationship with the royal family had earlier beginnings, when Parker was a member of Lady Margaret Beaufort's household. Lady Margaret later paid for his education at Oxford. There is no evidence to prove that Lady Margaret set Parker up in the household of her son or grandson. Therefore, he cannot be considered a courtier, as he usually has been, but he did attend court for special occasions. Moreover, Parker did not receive a place at court or patronage in the first half of Henry VIII's reign because Parker did not participate in Henry's athletic court spectacles, such as jousting, nor in Henry's wars against France. Since Parker did not serve the crown in the way that Henry valued, Parker never got rewarded. By 1520 Parker began using the title Lord Morley, but it is not known if this was by ancient inheritance or a newly created peerage. Henry VIII's annulment offered Morley a new type of ceremonial role, one that he was more suited to fulfill. Morley was loyal to Henry in his Reformation Parliaments, which makes it difficult to explain why a man loyal to the king and Anne Boleyn retained a friendly relationship with Princess Mary, often giving her a translation each year as a New Year's gift. Even more difficult to understand is Parker's relationship with Thomas Cromwell, to whom he also remained loyal.⁴²⁵ Perhaps Parker was not actually loyal to anyone, but made himself appear to be so in order to remain in favor.

⁴²⁴ James P. Carley and Marie Axton, eds., *"Triumphs of English": Henry Parker, Lord Morley Translator to the Tudor Court* (London: The British Library, 2000).

⁴²⁵ Starkey, "Attendant," 1-7.

Over the course of three decades, Morley gave at least eighteen New Year's gifts to Henry VIII, Thomas Cromwell, and Mary. The exact number is not known because it is suspected that some of his gifts and translations are no longer extant. For the purposes of this chapter, I will only examine the gifts and dedications that Morley presented to Mary. Starkey argues against the idea that Morley had a long-standing relationship with Mary beginning in her childhood. Rather, he suggests that what has previously been taken as evidence for this is tentative at best, improbably based on dates of supposed service of Parker women in Mary's childhood household. Most likely, the first recorded meeting between Morley and Princess Mary came on Whitsunday 1536, just weeks after Anne Boleyn's execution, at Hunsdon.⁴²⁶ With Anne's death and the status of Elizabeth demoted, Mary was considered by many to be heir apparent again. In one dedication to Mary, Morley recalled his time waiting upon Mary at Hunsdon house, so Morley knew her at least as early as January 1536.⁴²⁷

Like the unknown date of when Morley and Mary met, none of the eight dedicated books that Morley presented to Mary are dated either. There are, however, several clues to date them. The first of these is the entries of payments to Morley that are located in Mary's princess Privy Purse accounts. As early as January 1536-37 she gave Morley 10 shillings. Later, in November of that year she gave him 3s. 4d.⁴²⁸ In the following January she gave Morley another five shillings.⁴²⁹ As Mary most likely did not

⁴²⁶ Starkey, "Attendant," 14-15.

⁴²⁷ British Library, Royal MS 18 A.XV.

⁴²⁸ *Privy Purse Expenses*, 49.

meet Morley until January 1536, it is likely that the payment she gave him at New Year's 1537 is for the first book that Morley ever gave to her. In January 1540 she gave five shillings each to Morley and Thomas Elyot.⁴³⁰ But the first time an entry connected to Morley mentioned a book was not until January 1542-43, which noted that Mary gave Morley five shillings for bringing a book, but the entry contains no detail or title to determine which book he gave her.⁴³¹ The expense register for the following January (1543-44) contains another entry of giving Lord Morley five shillings for a book, but again does not give any specific details.⁴³² As for another possible method of dating Morley's works, James P. Carley has come up with date ranges for each text based on their language, such as whether the dedication refers to Mary as Lady or Princess, if Prince Edward is mentioned, and if a wife of Henry VIII is mentioned.⁴³³ Carley's dating of the texts will be included below.

Of the eight extant dedicated manuscripts that Morley presented to Mary, seven of them were given before she became queen.⁴³⁴ All but one of these seven are manuscripts

⁴²⁹ *Privy Purse Expenses*, 51.

⁴³⁰ *Privy Purse Expenses*, 82.

⁴³¹ *Privy Purse Expenses*, 97.

⁴³² *Privy Purse Expenses*, 143.

⁴³³ James P. Carley, "The Writings of Henry Parker, Lord Morley: A Bibliographic Survey," In James P. Carley and Marie Axton, eds., "*Triumphs of English*": *Henry Parker, Lord Morley Translator to the Tudor Court* (London: The British Library, 2000), 34-36. Carley's article is the most up-to-date bibliographic catalogue of Parker's manuscripts. See p. 36-36 for bibliographic notes on the eight manuscripts Parker presented to Mary.

that Morley translated for Mary, a skill he must have learned at Oxford. The one manuscript that Morley did not translate, just writing a prefatory verse instead, is Richard Rolle of Hampole's Latin Psalter, and it was given to her some time before she became queen.⁴³⁵ Morley's dedication to the psalter began by noting that all men should praise "the moste noble Lady Mary" for living a virtuous life while being the daughter of a king.⁴³⁶ Morley presented her with an old book, "specially in that this is Catholyke," because she was wise enough to appreciate a psalter and would value it more than pearls or stones.⁴³⁷ (Mary was known for a love of jewelry, so Parker may not have been exactly correct with that assumption.) All Morley asked for in return for his book was Mary's good will. He concluded his dedication by praying for her father, Prince Edward, Mary, and the future children of the king.

Morley's last prayer indicates that the date of this particular manuscript must be either 1538 to 1540 or in 1543.⁴³⁸ This is because her father was still king, so it has to be from before 1547, but more importantly, no queen is mentioned and these are the years in which Henry was not married and was expected to remarry to have more children. This particular manuscript gift by Morley is significant because it is a previously created psalter, not an original translation by him. As such, the psalter, paired with Morley's

⁴³⁴ The dedications to each manuscript have been reprinted in Herbert G. Wright, *Forty-six Lives* (London: Early English Text Society, 1943), 168-184.

⁴³⁵ British Library, Royal MS 2 D. XXVIII.

⁴³⁶ British Library, Royal MS 2 D. XXVIII, fol. 1b.

⁴³⁷ British Library, Royal MS 2 D. XXVIII, fol. 1b.

⁴³⁸ Carley, "Writings," 35.

insistence that it was important because it was Catholic, demonstrates not only that Morley gave this psalter to Mary because she valued psalters (as her personal collection of them affirms), but also that Morley probably gave it to her so that it would not be destroyed for being a Catholic manuscript. Catholic manuscripts, especially those that came from dissolved religious houses, were often given to important Catholic patrons in an effort to keep them intact.⁴³⁹ Importantly, this dedication highlights the issue of audience. Morley may have mentioned Henry and Edward, but only did so out of form and to remind Mary that she was indeed part of the royal family (whether or not she was in favor at the time), but Morley was able to stress that this manuscript was Catholic, which he would not have been able to do if he gave her a printed book on religion.

The other six dedications that Morley gave to Mary before she was queen are similar in that they all praise her virtue and mention either her father, her brother, or both, much like the printed book dedications that Mary received before she became queen. Many of them are religious in subject matter, and the two that are not are translations of Seneca and Cicero, authors with whom Mary would probably have been familiar because of her humanist education. In his dedication to his translation of two epistles of Seneca, Morley defended his choice of New Year's gift because the letters were worthy to be looked upon as "dya monde or saphyre."⁴⁴⁰ He continued that the subject matter of the epistles did not really pertain to Mary, as she was the daughter of a victorious king and enjoyed his love and felicity, but the subject matter was important for facing bad fortune. Such people could read his translation in English because it should be more accessible

⁴³⁹ Carley, "Writings," 50.

⁴⁴⁰ British Library, Royal MS 17 A.XXX. Quotation from Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 174.

than the Latin version for them. This indicates that he may have hoped Mary would support this manuscript into print or at least pass it around her household to be read by others.

As for why Morley chose to present Mary with a translation of Cicero, he noted that in past years he had given Mary notable Christian books either in Latin or translations from Latin, but this year (a year during Edward's reign) he gave her his translation of Cicero's *Dreame of Scipio*, even though "I thynke that in the Laten ye haue allredy seene yt."⁴⁴¹ This particular text comes from book six of Cicero's *On the Republic* and its message is that mortal time is but brief and while one is alive he/she should be true to himself/herself and not consider the opinions of others. For Morley, this text shows that Cicero followed virtue even though he did not know Christ, while many who know Christ still managed to fall into sin. Morley chose this text not for Mary to learn of virtue, but to give her an opportunity to read Cicero in English and to embrace virtue as he represented it, if she had in fact not already read Cicero.

The two dedications of texts by Seneca and Cicero reflect Mary's precarious religious position at court during certain points of the reigns of her father and brother. At these times it would have been safer to give Mary translations from antiquity rather than books on church doctrine which were no longer acceptable. Cicero's text was particularly apt because it could have served as an allegory for the current religious settlement in England, that of Edward. If Scipio can be understood as Mary, then in the myth, Scipio/Mary is told in a dream by his elders that earth is but a small piece of the

⁴⁴¹ British Library, Royal MS 18 A. LX. Quotation taken from Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 174.

universe and is unimportant compared to eternity with God. After Scipio's dream ends he eventually becomes an important Roman general who defeats some of Rome's enemies. Perhaps with this translation Morley was suggesting that Mary was the legitimate heir of Edward and that under her England would thrive again as a Catholic nation, but in the mean time for Mary never to forget that eternal reward was worth any suffering on earth, saying "and after this transitory and troubleouse sea to bryng youe to the courte celestiall for youre merytes."⁴⁴² This dedication and text by Morley serves as a good example of a dedicated manuscript created with a specific message for one specific audience.

The four remaining dedicated manuscripts to Mary before she became queen include two expositions of Psalms, a translation of a work on the Virgin Mary by Erasmus, and a translation of a work by Thomas Aquinas. Morley's dedication to his English translation of the Psalms was based upon the Latin version as translated from the Greek by Angelus Polycyanus.⁴⁴³ It was written in either 1541 or 1544 to 1546/7 because Morley acknowledged Prince Edward and the queen, but named no specific queen.⁴⁴⁴ Morley noted that it was "superfluous" to give Mary a copy of the Psalms since she already read them daily, but psalms were being printed everywhere and one had to make sure to read well-done versions and translations.⁴⁴⁵ Interestingly, this is the only dedication where Morley mentioned printed books. All of Morley's gifts to Mary were

⁴⁴² Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 175.

⁴⁴³ British Library, Royal MS 17 C.XII.

⁴⁴⁴ Carley, "Writings," 35.

⁴⁴⁵ Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 169.

manuscripts, and this dedication implies that Morley preferred handwritten, personal translations to mass produced print translations of psalms. Here, Morley was not pleased with the collision of manuscript and print. This dedication, then, shows that Morley preferred to give a gift of a manuscript even if a printed edition existed because a hand-produced manuscript was more unique, personal, and flattering to a dedicatee than a printed book.⁴⁴⁶

The reading of psalms must have been something which Mary and Morley shared an interest, as Morley also gave Mary a translation of an exposition on the 36th Psalm.⁴⁴⁷ In this dedication, Morley mentioned that he waited upon Mary at Hunsdon house, and that one day they talked about psalms. She mentioned a specific psalm that she enjoyed, “Noli emulari in malignantibus,” because it discusses how sinners who are vain forsake God.⁴⁴⁸ This psalm was important because the world was full of people who value objects more than God and were hopeless if their objects got taken away from them. Morley explained that Mary did not have this vanity, so he offered her this translation and his good will that he bore towards “youe, next youre victoriouse father, oure naturall and leage Lorde, and your and noble, towarde brother Prynce Edward.”⁴⁴⁹ Unlike when dedicators of printed books mentioned Mary’s male relatives in an effort to elicit patronage or favor from them as well, manuscript dedicators, specifically Morley, did so to reinforce Mary’s legitimacy and status.

⁴⁴⁶ Boffey, *Manuscript and Print*, 57.

⁴⁴⁷ British Library, Royal MS 18 A.XV.

⁴⁴⁸ British Library, Royal MS 18 A.XV, fol. 2a.

⁴⁴⁹ British Library, Royal MS 18 A.XV, fol. 2b.

In his dedication accompanying his translation of “The Angelical Salutacion” by Thomas Aquinas, Morley mentioned the same psalm on vanity.⁴⁵⁰ As in his dedication to the 36th Psalm, Morley praised Mary for taking the advice of this particular psalm and dismissing worldly pleasures so as to increase goodness. Morley remembered when Mary was scant twelve years old and was “so rype in the Laten tonge” that she was able to read, write, and translate it.⁴⁵¹ He particularly admired her translation of a prayer by Saint Thomas Aquinas so much that he had put it in his prayer books, as well as the prayer books of his wife and children so that they remembered to pray for Mary.⁴⁵² For Morley, Mary was an honor to all women as the daughter of a king should be a mirror for all other women to follow. He concluded his dedication by asking God to preserve Mary this New Year and as a king’s daughter may she have never-ending joy.

Morley’s last dedication to Mary before she became queen (not in date, just in the order in which I have examined them) accompanied his translation of Erasmus’s *Paeon Virgini matri dicendus*, “Laude or prayse to be saide unto the Virgyn Mary mother of Chryste Jesu.”⁴⁵³ Morley chose this text to use the common trope of comparing Mary Tudor with her namesake, the Virgin Mary. In the dedication, Morley noted that there were those who say that to honor the Virgin Mary “is a dymynysshynge of the honour of Godd,” but these people were so heretical that they eventually dishonored God and the

⁴⁵⁰ British Library, Royal MS 17 C.XVI.

⁴⁵¹ Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 173.

⁴⁵² For an explanation of the political meaning of Mary’s translation of Aquinas, see Jaime Goodrich, “Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas: The Politics of Pious Translation at the Henrician Court,” *ANQ*, Vol. 24, (2011), 11-22.

⁴⁵³ British Library, Royal MS 17 A.XLVI.

sacrament of the Altar.⁴⁵⁴ These people have become so blinded by heresy it was as if the end of the world was coming. Therefore, Morley chose to translate this work of Erasmus because it prayed for the preservation of Christ's church, the martyrs, and the Blessed Virgin to be kept from abuses. Morley dedicated it to Mary because she was "the secunde Mary of this wourlde in vertue, grace and goodenes."⁴⁵⁵

The date of this particular manuscript can only be narrowed down sometime between 1537 and 1547, based on two clues. First, Morley was careful to mention that Mary's father was a "moste Chrysten Kyng," but that there were others who denied God and spent their days living in sin.⁴⁵⁶ Morley would not have had to make that disclaimer about Mary's father before he declared himself Supreme Head because there would not have been rumors of her father being a heretic and tyrant. Second, Morley told Mary that he prayed daily, not just with his lips but with his heart, that God and the blessed Virgin send Mary health, remove Mary from all sorrow, and send her long life which should culminate in her spending eternity with the Virgin Mary. In praying that Mary be relieved of her sorrows, Morley indirectly referred to her troubles at court with her demotion, her mother's removal, and the expulsion of Catholicism. This dedication to Mary actually would have been quite subversive, and if others used similar language, it is unsurprising that some of his New Year's gifts to her no longer exist.

⁴⁵⁴ British Library, Royal MS 17 A.XLVI, fol. 1b.

⁴⁵⁵ British Library, Royal MS 17 A.XLVI, fol. 3a.

⁴⁵⁶ British Library, Royal MS 17 A.XLVI, fol. 1b.

There is only one extant manuscript that Mary received from Morley when she was queen, an account of the Miracles of the Sacrament.⁴⁵⁷ It must have been given to her sometime after 1554 because it mentioned Philip and listed both her English and Spanish titles. What is unusual about this dedication is that it is not just a dedication, but an entire prologue to her which traced the precedent of heresy. Morley explained that Mary was a ruler who led with virtue, so as Claudian (a Latin poet) once wrote, her subjects should follow in her virtuous steps, rather than fall into vice. Morley argued that now that Mary was Queen she had the opportunity to act on her title of Defendress of the Faith by fighting against heretics who denied the sacraments, the pope, and the Virgin Mary. Though Mary held many titles, including those given to her through her marriage to Philip, her most important title was Defendress of the Faith, a title which her mother also used.

After this proclamation, Morley diverted to trace the history of heresies and how they hurt the Jews, Greeks, Italians, Egyptians, Africans, Bohemians, Spanish, Britons, and Germans. After he told of the heresies of these nations, Morley returned to present-day England. He dared not say much, but did say that the bounty of England had been significantly reduced since the days of Henry VII, Lady Margaret Beaufort, and Henry VIII. Gone was the harvest and cattle and all gold became brass. But since Mary was “folowyng the wise counsel of the vnculpable, vertuous Cardinall, your cosyn,” the realm should prosper again.⁴⁵⁸ Morley, then, chose to translate miracles that God performed to people who did not believe in Him in hope that Mary’s “obedient subiectes that by false

⁴⁵⁷ British Library, Additional MS 12060.

⁴⁵⁸ Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 183.

teaching of the heretyckes haue had, or have, any vngodly opinion in ther stomack, with Goddes mercy and your most Cristen example they shall revert home to ther mother, Holy Church, againe.”⁴⁵⁹

Morley’s dedication to Queen Mary had a much different tone than did the seven dedications to Mary before she became queen. Most obviously, it is much longer than all previous dedications by Morley. This length is because Morley could speak freely to her since she was queen and there were no male relatives to be courteous to. Also, this manuscript is Morley’s most critical discussion of the religious changes that happened in England, which must also be linked to both Henry and Edward being dead. Previously, Morley made considerations for Henry and Edward and linked Mary’s position and virtue to each of their kingships. But when Mary became queen in her own right, Morley was able to be more forthright with her and her religion. To make sure the dedications were not subversive, when Morley criticized aspects of heresy apparent in England he made sure to exclude Henry from them. For example, when describing religious policy, such as denying the sacrament of the Eucharist, Morley made sure to mention that this denial occurred in everyone except Henry who was a most Christian prince.

Lorraine Attreed and Alexandra Winkler have suggested that this particular treatise was meant to advise Mary on issues of statecraft, particularly how to balance her religious and political commitments, and did so via the example of her grandmother, Lady Margaret Beaufort.⁴⁶⁰ But I slightly disagree with their findings. I suggest that

⁴⁵⁹ Wright, *Forty-six Lives*, 183.

⁴⁶⁰ Lorraine Attreed and Alexander Winkler, “Faith and Forgiveness: Lessons in Statecraft for Queen Mary Tudor,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 36 (2005), 971-989.

neither Morley, nor any other man, was quite ready to accept that a queen had as much political power as a king. Therefore, this dedication, like all of Morley's other dedications, was meant to encourage and instruct Mary in concepts of virtue and religion.

While Morley offered Mary many texts on virtue and religion, none ever explicitly instructed Mary to return England to the true church. His dedications to her were clearly Catholic in nature, as they accompanied psalters and texts on the Virgin Mary and even in some instances explicitly stated that they supported Catholicism. Yet, Morley's dedications to Mary only encouraged her to be a model for religious virtue, even when she was heir apparent. As such, Morley never really attempted to textually negotiate with Mary, but simply encouraged her to be steadfast in her faith while those around her diminished it. Importantly, Morley's dedications to Mary also offer insight into the competing markets of manuscript and print and how Morley was able to more intimately address Mary and her personal religion because his manuscripts were intended to be read by her only.

Individual Manuscript Dedications

Mary received ten other manuscript dedications besides those from Henry Parker, Lord Morley.⁴⁶¹ Two of these manuscripts will be discussed in the next chapter, as they can positively be identified as having been in Mary's library, while the remaining eight will be examined below. Of these eight dedications, three are in English and five are in

⁴⁶¹ Modern bibliophile Arthur Vershbow may have owned a presentation copy dedication to Mary and Philip. His entire collection was sold at auction in 2013. From the parts of his collection catalogue that I was able to examine, I could not find any such manuscript, but it may have just transferred into other private hands.

Latin. These dedications to Mary follow similar patterns as the printed books that were dedicated to her; most of them explicate themes of either virtue or religion. Only one attempted to negotiate with Mary concerning Mary's political powers when it asked her to reconsider rents being charged to her subjects. Yet, these authors were also mindful to appeal to Mary's humanist education and interest in classical literature and philosophy by referring to antique and medieval texts as sources supporting both the true church and the virtue of women.

The three English-language manuscripts dedicated to Mary each had a very specific agenda to garner patronage. William Forrest's *The History of Grysilde the Second* did so by invoking Katherine of Aragon through the story of a well-known medieval woman. Mary Clarke Basset, in an effort to begin restoring the name of Thomas More, translated a text by Eusebius out of the original Greek. Philip Gerrard, not an eloquent orator or translator like Forrest and Basset, took a more straight-forward approach and simply wrote a short text to Mary that expressed a desire for social change.

William Forrest was an ordained priest famous for his poetry. He was a kinsman of John Forrest, a Franciscan and chaplain to Katherine of Aragon who in 1538 was burnt for heresy. William Forrest had a pattern of seeking important patronage, dedicating manuscripts to William Parr (brother to Katherine Parr), the duke of Somerset, and Edward VI. Under Mary, Forrest continued to write poetry and became one of her chaplains in 1555. Forrest was able to find favor under Elizabeth as well. He was appointed parson of Bledlow in Buckinghamshire on 1 July 1556, a position he kept for twenty years. During this time, he continued to write poetry, especially related to how

the Virgin Mary was mistreated by Protestants. Forrest died sometime shortly after his resignation from Bledlow on 13 November 1576.⁴⁶²

In 1558, Forrest presented Mary with a dedication to his manuscript, *The History of Grysilde the Second*. The original presentation manuscript is held in the Bodleian Library, and a modern edition of the entire text was printed in 1875.⁴⁶³ The manuscript is written in English, on paper, and was originally bound in black velvet that contained lace and satin, which at the time W.D. MacRay examined the book was largely destroyed, and it was rebound in 1897.⁴⁶⁴ Griselda was a character in works of Boccaccio, Plutarch, and Chaucer who was known for her patience and being set aside by her husband so that he could marry a younger woman. Obviously, there were clear connections between Griselda and Katherine of Aragon, and Forrest capitalized on those similarities in his version of a second, yet real-life, Grysilde. Forrest's version of Grysilde was a direct comparison of the two women, which he explicitly declared in his dedication to Mary. Much like Elyot's comparison of Katherine with Queen Zenobia, Forrest identified similarities between Katherine and Grysilde, in that both had husbands who appealed to Rome for a divorce and both were stripped of their title of Queen.⁴⁶⁵ Forrest, however,

⁴⁶² All biographical information comes from Peter Holmes, "William Forrest," *ODNB*.

⁴⁶³ Bodley Summary Catalogue MS 8590 (shelfmark MS Wood empt. 2); Madan Falconer, H.H.E. Craster, and N. Denholm-Young, eds. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. In seven volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895 -1953), Vol. II, Part II, 1198; William Forrest, *The History of Grisild the Second: A Narrative, In verse, of the Divorce of Queen Katharine of Aragon*. Ed. by W.D. MacRay (London: Chiswick Press, 1875).

⁴⁶⁴ Falconer, *Summary Catalogue*, Vol. II, Part II, 1198. Forrest, xx-xxi.

was also concerned with the wrongs done to Mary after her father's marriage to Anne Boleyn, such as Mary's jewels being given to Anne and Mary having the clothing with the emblem from her household being replaced with clothing bearing the arms of the king.⁴⁶⁶ Even though Forrest clearly stated in his dedication that Katherine was the patient Grysilde of the story and that Henry VIII was Walter, Mary, too, was included to make his tale of Grysilde even more relevant to Mary. In chapter three, God favored Walter and Grysilde and sent them a daughter Mary, and in chapter four Mary was instructed in Latin by a Thomas Lynaker.⁴⁶⁷

What is interesting is that the story of Grysilde was one that Vives approved for Mary to read in his *Epistolae duae*. In his list of approved authors, Vives mentioned "Griselide vulgate iam fabula" as a story that promoted virtue.⁴⁶⁸ So, perhaps besides the similarities between the situations of Grysilde and Katherine, Forrest adapted this story and dedicated it to Mary because it was a story that she was familiar with since childhood, meaning that Forrest may also have read Vives. This was the only book that Forrest dedicated to Mary, but he did write a few more pieces that praised her. *A new Ballade of the Marigold*, printed in London by Richard Lant, was a broadside that celebrated Queen Mary's accession to the throne in a poem of fourteen stanzas, each

⁴⁶⁵ Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 237.

⁴⁶⁶ Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, 237.

⁴⁶⁷ Forrest, *Grisild*, 9.

⁴⁶⁸ Juan Luis Vives, *Introductio ad sapientiam; Satellitium sive symbola; Epistolae duae de ratione studii puerilis* (Antwerp: Merten de Keyser, 1530), L2r; MacRay, xx.

comprised of eight lines.⁴⁶⁹ Forrest also wrote two other poems celebrating Queen Mary, one a version of *Pater Noster* and the other a version of a *Te Deum*. MacRay indicates that they do not exist in original form, but were printed in the first edition of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, and that Foxe introduced them as poems that were "compiled or rather corrupted" by William Forrest.⁴⁷⁰ Foxe's inclusion of the poems later solidified Forrest's Catholic reputation.⁴⁷¹

One other work by Forrest and associated with Mary is his *Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, a poem that praised the Virgin. There is a note written on the flyleaf that says "W. Forest's poems to Q. Mary." The note is not in the same hand as the manuscript text, but looks only to be slightly later. However, MacRay dates this manuscript from 1572 to 1581, so I am not so sure if this handwriting refers to Queen Mary or the Virgin Mary who could also be regarded as the Queen of Heaven.⁴⁷² This poem was written after Mary's death and after Forrest wrote *Grisilde* which was obviously about Mary and her mother, so it is not a stretch to assume that a reader could have been reminded of Queen Mary when reading the poem and scribbled a note of it, but more likely it refers to Mary the Virgin.

⁴⁶⁹ Forrest, *Grisild*, xxiv-xxv. MacRay does not indicate the location of the original (which means it may not exist), but a copy of the original is held in the library of the Society of Antiquities at Burlington House and it was reprinted by Thomas Park in Volume X of the *Harleian Miscellany* of 1813 on page 253.

⁴⁷⁰ Forrest, *Grisild*, xxv. John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1563), 1139-1140. MacRay suspects that they were printed as broadsides.

⁴⁷¹ Holmes, "William Forrest," *ODNB*.

⁴⁷² Forrest, *Grisild*, xxiv. British Library, Harley MS 1703.

As for Forrest's actual dedication to Mary in *Grysilde*, it was written in a rhyming scheme that contained eighteen stanzaz. It mentioned Mary's Spanish and English titles, but there was no mention of Philip. Forrest's dedication began by offering a lesson for Mary: children who read of the good deeds of their parents and how their parents did God's work would choose to follow the good deeds of their parents. Therefore, it was appropriate to give Mary a book of the deeds of Katherine of Aragon's life because she was always virtuous and withstood her enemy [Henry VIII]. Moreover, under Mary it was safer to write about Katherine's life, when only recently she was rejected as the country fell into schism and became possessed by Satan. Forrest claimed that his work was small compared with the example of Katherine's whole life. For Forrest, Katherine was Grysilde because of her patience, and Henry VIII was Walter because he was noble but was led astray. Importantly, in the Grisilda stories, Grisilda was eventually rewarded for her patience. Thus, Forrest's analogy concluded that with Mary's accession and England's return to Catholicism, Katherine was ultimately rewarded for her patience. Forrest directed his dedication and manuscript to Mary because she was the best legacy left of Katherine; Mary was virtuous, godly, and unwavering in her commitment to Catholicism. Forrest's text was best given to Mary as a manuscript because his comparison and vindication of Katherine would have held such personal meaning for Mary.

Katherine of Aragon could not be invoked by Mary Roper Clark Basset in her dedication, as she gave her translation to Mary before she became queen and it would not

have been safe.⁴⁷³ However, Basset's dedication still managed to continue her family's support of Catholicism.⁴⁷⁴ Mary Roper Clark Basset was a granddaughter of Thomas More, by his daughter Margaret Roper. Roper educated her daughter in an environment similar to the one that More set up for his children, advocating for English Catholicism, particularly through the use of translations of classics into English.⁴⁷⁵ Roper hired John Morren, Henry Cole, and John Christopherson to tutor her children.⁴⁷⁶ Interestingly Morren and Christopherson also dedicated manuscripts to Mary, which will be discussed below.

Basset translated Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* sometime between 1547 and 1553, as Basset addressed Mary as sister to the king. Basset's translation consists of 379 folios, the first eight of which are her dedication to Mary. In her dedication, Basset indicated that she was pressured by friends to undertake this translation, and that it was painful for her to complete. She wanted to refuse, but did not want her friends to think that she was stubborn. But, she was able to complete her labor because it reminded her of Mary, who was of royal blood, virtuous, and knowledgeable. Basset thought the translation might interest Mary because Mary was so learned. Moreover, Basset "was I well affirmed that yf of yowr highness my doynge were approved, they shoulde undoubtedly be of all other a greate deal y better accepted," by which she meant would

⁴⁷³ British Library, Harley MS 1860.

⁴⁷⁴ Jaime Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clark Basset's Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*." *English Literary Renaissance* 40 (2010), 308.

⁴⁷⁵ Goodrich, "Basset," 301.

⁴⁷⁶ Goodrich, "Basset," 303.

probably be put into print.⁴⁷⁷ Basset acknowledged that she was a woman, and not as skilled as a man who is an expert in literature, but nevertheless the translation made her think of Mary. Basset ended her dedication with a prayer asking God to preserve Mary and send her long and healthy life.

Basset's dedication, then, had a few purposes. Its first purpose was to explain that a Catholic woman could translate texts related to the history of the early church just as well as could Protestant women translators, such as Elizabeth Tudor.⁴⁷⁸ Elizabeth undertook four religious translations between 1544 and 1547/8, all of which she presented to members of her family as New Year's gifts. Basset translated a text that supported the idea that the history of the early church was just as important as Scripture when it came to forming the modern church. Basset's translation must have been a political act because it challenged the reformed idea that *sola scriptura* purified the church, instead balancing scripture with church history.⁴⁷⁹ She also knew that if Mary supported her translation, then it had the possibility to be printed and reach a much wider readership, thus leading into its second purpose. The second purpose of Basset's translation was to support English Catholicism as personified in Mary Tudor.⁴⁸⁰ Mary must have enjoyed Basset's translation, as both Basset and her husband, James Basset, later served in the royal households of Mary and Philip. For Basset, however, the most important purpose of her translation was to invoke the memory and restore the name of

⁴⁷⁷ British Library, Harley MS 1860. The dedication appears on fols. 1r to 8v.

⁴⁷⁸ Goodrich, "Basset," 315.

⁴⁷⁹ Goodrich, "Basset," 316.

⁴⁸⁰ Goodrich, "Basset," 318.

her grandfather, Thomas More. She was not quite able to do so with this translation, but in having Mary's support and entering Mary's household, an effect of this translation, Basset was able to do so with a second translation.

In 1557, Basset translated Thomas More's *De tristitia Christi* from Latin into English. This translation was included in William Rastell's *The Works of Sir Thomas More*. Rastell compiled *Works*, and it was printed at the expense of John Cawood, John Waly, and Richard Tottell.⁴⁸¹ Rastell dedicated this compilation to Mary. Rastell suggested that the writings of Thomas More were so excellent "whereby his workes be worthy to be hadde and redde of euerye Englishe man."⁴⁸² More's works explained Catholic doctrine and how to be a virtuous Christian, but they were also eloquent works of English. Rastell gathered all of More's writings (including letters), both printed and unprinted, that he could find so that they did not "perish and vtterly vanish away."⁴⁸³ Rastell hoped that this volume would inspire Mary to purge England of heresies, as she and More admired one another while he was alive. Rastell wrote that he did not doubt that More prays for Mary, her subjects, her realm, and for Catholicism. Rastell ended his dedication by asking Mary to patronize his book.

⁴⁸¹ Thomas More, *The Works of Sir Thomas More*, William Rastell, ed. (London: John Cawood, John Waly, and Richard Tottell, 1557). STC 18076. The Bodley has a manuscript edition of "Works by Sir Thomas More" from 1555. Written in the manuscript is "M.Regina" and "Vivat Regina Maria," that appear to have been written there while she was queen. Bodley Library, MS 431. See Falconer, *Summary Catalogue*, Vol II, Part I, 331.

⁴⁸² More, *Works*, C.ii.r.

⁴⁸³ More, *Works*, C.ii.r.

Not only did Basset translate and contribute to Rastell's book, she also supplied the funding for his project, thereby helping to secure Thomas More's reputation as the most important English martyr of the Tudor era.⁴⁸⁴ Basset used her first translation (of Eusebius) to defend Catholicism and earn Mary's favor, which let her undertake a second translation furthering the reputation of her grandfather. In that sense, Basset was a much more astute woman than she projected herself to be in the Eusebius dedication. Basset used her translations, and her modesty as a woman, to defend the work of her grandfather.⁴⁸⁵ Choosing to undertake a manuscript translation for her dedication to Mary also highlights the importance of audience. By making Mary her sole audience for her first translation, Basset was able to appeal directly to Mary's fondness of Basset's family to begin the process of ensuring Thomas More's reputation as a Catholic martyr. Dedicating the same translation as a printed book would not have had the same effect because it would not have been as personal and meaningful to Mary.

Philip Gerrard, the author of the third English-language dedication to Mary, was not nearly as successful as Basset in receiving royal support.⁴⁸⁶ Not much is known about Gerrard except that he was a yeoman of the Guard and gave to Mary an exhortation regarding rents which he previously dedicated to King Edward VI. The existing manuscript contains both the dedication to Edward and the newer dedication to Mary, with that to Mary placed before Edward's. In his dedication to Mary, which he must have given her immediately after she became queen, Gerrard noted the people of England

⁴⁸⁴ Goodrich, "Basset," 309.

⁴⁸⁵ Goodrich, "Basset," 308.

⁴⁸⁶ British Library, Royal MS 17 B.XL.

were faithful subjects because she was their dear sovereign lady and governor. He asked that she speedily reform the oppressive rents of the people, and that if she did, the reformation of the rents would be a memorial to her fame and glory. He first presented his idea to his Captain, Sir John Gates, to give to Edward, but “aft that my capten had read it he nothyng at all saueryng the effected therof, would not delyver it.”⁴⁸⁷ Now, he presented his work directly to Mary, saying, “surely, your grace is not ignorant of the plight of her subjects & wants to be benign to them.”⁴⁸⁸ He asked that Mary return them to their former estates. Gerrard noted that he wrote on behalf of the poor, not using flattery, but reminding Mary that a reformation of this sort would make her beloved. Gerrard’s desire for Mary to make economic changes for the benefit of England was very similar to the ideas of the commonwealthsmen of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, made popular during Oliver Cromwell’s protectorate of the 1650s. The word “commonwealth” existed in Tudor England, but it was much denigrated and associated with political subversion to help the poor.⁴⁸⁹

There is no evidence that Mary supported Gerrard’s supplication. The manuscript itself has no marginalia or indications that she ever read it. At the very end of the text of the manuscript Gerrard wrote another supplication to Mary in addition to the dedication. In it he asked, “most vertuous quene, I most humbly beseche your grace, (that yf if shall be your pleasure) put your hand to thys, and let me haue it agen, that it mane be printed w

⁴⁸⁷ British Library, Royal MS 17 B.XL, fol. 2r.

⁴⁸⁸ British Library, Royal MS 17 B.XL, fol. 2r.

⁴⁸⁹ Blair Worden, *God’s Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 303-304.

your graces priuilege...⁴⁹⁰ Mary must not have granted his request, because there is no evidence that this was ever printed. Gerrard previously had a book printed, *A godly inuectiue in the defence of the Gospell*, but his tract on rents must not have met Mary's approval.⁴⁹¹ Also, around the time in which this would have been written or printed, Mary's subjects were proving themselves not to be as loyal as Gerrard claimed, as Wyatt's Rebellion was being planned as early as November 1553. Furthermore, not only did Mary not support the printing of Gerrard's book, neither did she support his reformation of rents, as no changes to rents were made in Parliament in 1553 nor in April 1554.⁴⁹² It was not until late August 1555 that the Privy Council wrote a report to Philip and Mary suggesting a revision in the process of collecting rents so as to receive

⁴⁹⁰ British Library, Royal MS 17 B.XL, fol. 12r.

⁴⁹¹ Philip Gerrard, *A godly inuectiue in the defence of the Gospell* (London: Richard Grafton, 1547). STC 11797.

⁴⁹² Previously, scholars have suggested that economic reform could not be made under Mary because of a so-called "Mid-Tudor Crisis," stemming from large-scale social and religious disorder. See Whitney R.D. Jones, *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1563* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973). Revisionist scholars, such as David Loades and Jennifer Loach disagreed largely with Jones's findings, arguing that the term "Mid-Tudor Crisis" is generally inaccurate and unhelpful. There was no actual crisis because both the monarchy and England survived, and in terms of economics, while the economy struggled, the lives of most people were relatively unchanged. There was even sufficient continuity between the different Tudor governments. See David Loades, *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545-1565* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992) and Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler, eds., *The Mid-Tudor Polity, c.1540-1560* (London: The Macmillan Press, 1980). Post-revisionist scholars argue that both the traditionalists and revisionists oversimplify their arguments. Rather, there was no crisis, but the state survived in a period of trauma while contributing little achievements. See John Matusiak, "Mid-Tudor England: Years of Trauma and Survival," *History Review* 52 (2005), 31-36.

payments more quickly while reducing the cost of collection. But the rents themselves were not lowered.⁴⁹³

Gerrard's text, then, had three specific audiences. The first was his captain, whom he asked to deliver the text to Edward. The captain, by Gerrard's own admission, did not think that Gerrard should address Edward in such a way over the matter of rents, and refused. Edward, Gerrard's target audience, never even saw the text. Mary became Gerrard's third specific audience, and she too, rejected his text. Here, perhaps Gerrard misjudged making his supplication one singular manuscript for the eyes of the monarch only. Had Gerrard printed his ideas on rent reformation, others may have had the opportunity to read his suggestions and actually attempt to make changes within Parliament. As dedicated manuscripts had a much more limited audience, Gerrard limited his chances of being able to be a catalyst for social change.

The five Latin-language manuscript dedications to Mary do not appear to be nearly as politically charged as the three English-language manuscript dedications. Rather, all five Latin dedications precede books with subject matter of religion or virtue. The most politically charged dedication came from Arthur Yeldard. Yeldard dedicated *Documenta quaedam admonitoria Agapeti Diaconi* to Mary shortly after she became queen with nothing significant to gain from his dedication.⁴⁹⁴ His translation from Greek was of letters from Pope Agapetus to the Emperor Justinian. In 536, Pope Agapetus travelled to Constantinople to address Emperor Justinian on matters of politics and religion. When Agapetus arrived in Constantinople he found that under the suggestion of

⁴⁹³ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, Mary I, Entry 220.

⁴⁹⁴ British Library, Royal MS 7 D.IV.

Empress Theodora, Justinian had placed a man by the name of Anthimus as head of the church. Agapetus and Justinian disagreed over who had the authority to place men into such ecclesiastical positions to the point where Justinian threatened to banish Agapetus. But eventually, Justinian deposed Anthimus instead. Four letters between Justinian and Agapetus survive, and the incident is important because it is an example of papal prerogative being exacted over imperial authority. It was thus an implied commentary on the Act in Restraint of Appeals of 1533.

According to Clare Hopkins, Yeldard was educated at Cambridge and came to know Mary when she was a princess through her chaplain, Francis Mallet, dean of Lincoln. Mary supported Yeldard annually until he became tutor to the sons of Sir Anthony Denny. In 1552, Yeldard traveled with the Denny boys to the continent, where he found himself in 1553 when he dedicated *Documenta* to Mary. After 1553 Yeldard was no longer a client of Mary, but instead was made a fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, where he remained until his death in 1599.⁴⁹⁵ Yeldard's dedication to Mary expressed praise and gratitude towards his patron, probably for supporting him until he was able to find a lucrative position as a tutor, and later a fellow of Oxford. He referred to Mary as being honored by God and as a blessing to England. Yeldard's choice of text also suggests that he supported Mary's efforts to return the English Church to Catholicism, especially as Yeldard mentioned "vera religion oppressa et propem ex timeat," (true religion was oppressed out of fear) in his dedication.⁴⁹⁶ Clearly, Yeldard thought that Catholicism needed to return and would return with Mary as queen. By dedicating a

⁴⁹⁵ Clare Hopkins, "Arthur Yeldard," *ODNB*.

⁴⁹⁶ British Library, Royal MS 7 D.IV, fol. 7r.
212

work that supported papal prerogative over imperial authority, Yeldard made his point that the Act in Restraint of Appeals should no longer be enforced and that true religion should return to England.

Not much is known about the Frenchman Hierome Colas, but his dedication to Mary also accompanies a text on religion, specifically, a dispute between a Christian man and a Turkish atheist (probably meaning non-Christian). *Acerba admodum inter Christianum et Atheum hominem contentio* was written by Colas in London and presented to Mary in June 1553, approximately five weeks before Edward died.⁴⁹⁷ Before writing this manuscript to Mary, Colas dedicated a tract on principles of government to Thomas Cranmer in 1548.⁴⁹⁸ In 1551, Colas was mentioned in a letter by Jane, Lady Southampton, the wife of the late Thomas Wriothesley, minister to Henry VIII. In her letter to Sir William Petre, Jane implored Petre to send Hierome Colas back to her house, where he was French tutor to her children. For the last two years Colas had been at court, and Jane feared that he would not return to her house unless Petre sent Colas to her.⁴⁹⁹ In 1551, Colas wrote a French grammar book.⁵⁰⁰ Nothing is known of Colas after his dedication to Mary in 1553.

Colas's dedication offered Mary goodwill and peace, because she was the originator of all good, and hoped that she was the receiver of good fortune for her

⁴⁹⁷ British Library, Royal MS 8 A.XVI.

⁴⁹⁸ British Library, Royal MS 12 D.V.

⁴⁹⁹ Mary Anne Everett Wood, ed., *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, From the Commencement of the Twelfth Century to the Close of Reign of Queen Mary*, Vol. III (London: Henry Colburn, 1846), 255-256.

⁵⁰⁰ British Library, Royal MS 16 E.XXVII.

merits.⁵⁰¹ He noted that she had a most blessed life, which her approved morals could attest. Colas expressed hope that the argument between the Christian and the Turk could be the greatest proof of Christianity.

John Morren, tutor to the Roper children, also gave Mary a religious book while she was a princess. Not much else is known about Morren, except that he was a member of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He offered to Mary part of a Greek Menology, or a liturgical book of saints, translated into Latin from a Greek manuscript at Oxford.⁵⁰² In his dedication, Morren noted that he labored in the liberal arts of antiquity for his translation for Mary and now he understood the intense desire for virtue often mentioned in antique texts. He often incorporated Greek and examples from antiquity to support these ideas of virtue. Morren ended his dedication to Mary promising to be bound to her and praying that God gave her perpetual days and nights and that she go to Heaven to spend eternal glory with Jesus.⁵⁰³

The final two Latin-language dedications to Mary also have Greek connections, as they are two translations of Plutarch, one by John Christopherson and the other by Herman Crusier. In 1554, Christopherson dedicated his printed book on Wyatt's

⁵⁰¹ "Gratiam, ac Pacem ab eo precatur, qui bonorum omnium est author, et largitor, quique, vnicuique secundu sua merita redditurus est." British Library, Royal MS 8 A.XVI, fol. 2r.

⁵⁰² British Library, Royal MS 13 B.X.

⁵⁰³ "Ego sunt, quo ad vixero, tuae seraenitate addictissimum spondeo: ac taelestem, potentenque dei dextram eminentissima tuae publinitatiscuram gerere, perpetuo dies ac noctes precabor, quam dominus Jaesus fealicissimis auspicy ad lucidissimae aeternitatis gloriam subuehat." British Library, Royal MS 13 B.X. fol. 13r.

Rebellion to Mary, stressing the importance of obedience to the monarch.⁵⁰⁴ As previously mentioned, Christopherson was rewarded with the bishopric of Chichester for his 1554 work and must have remained in Mary's good graces as he is mentioned in the New Year's gift list of 1557. Christopherson dedicated his version of Plutarch's *De futili Loquacitate* ("Of the Futility of Wordiness") to Mary sometime while her brother was king.⁵⁰⁵ Christopherson's manuscript is in both Latin and Greek and consists of eighty-two folios, each with approximately eighteen lines. The dedication to Mary is on the first eight folios, followed by Christopherson's Latin version of Plutarch, followed by the original Greek.

Cruser's text is also a translation of Plutarch.⁵⁰⁶ He dedicated his translation of *De virtute mulierum* ("On the Bravery of Women") to Mary in 1555. Cruser was a Dutch doctor who served Duke William of Cleves, brother to Henry VIII's fourth wife, Anne of Cleves. Cruser probably met Mary on one of his six journeys to England when he was part of an envoy sent by Duke William to check on the well-being of his sister.⁵⁰⁷ Both

⁵⁰⁴ John Christopherson, *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion: wherein are set forth the causes, that commonlye moue men to rebellion, and that no cause is there, that ought to moue any man there vnto, with a discourse of the miserable effectes, that ensue therof, and of the wretched ende, that all rebelles comme to, moste necessary to be redde in this seditiouse and troublsome tyme* (London: John Cawood, 1554). STC 5207.

⁵⁰⁵ Cambridge MS Dd.VI.56. See *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, Vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1856), 309.

⁵⁰⁶ British Library, Royal MS 15 B.XIII.

⁵⁰⁷ Retha Warnicke, "Anne of Cleves," *ODNB*. In her entry, Warnicke suggests that Anne of Cleves actually received three printed book dedications, that by Elyot, that by Becon, and one from Richard Taverner in his translation of Wolfgang Capito's *An*

William and his wife, Mary, Duchess of Cleves and Julich, sent numerous letters to Mary Tudor containing recommendations for and credentials of Cruser, beginning in September 1553.⁵⁰⁸ His lengthy dedication to Mary complimented her knowledge, as well as the reproductive aspects of women. A celebration of strong and powerful women would have been an apt translation to give to the first ruling Queen of England. He invoked Mary's grandmother, Isabella, asking "Who is decorated in virtue and power more than your grandmother queen Isabel of Spain?"⁵⁰⁹ Cruser also mentioned Queen Mary of Hungary, noting that, "ex eadem stirpe Regina Hungariae Maria est consobrina tua," both Marys were of the same stock.⁵¹⁰ He told Mary that he chose to translate this book of Plutarch because he admired the virtues of women. Cruser's manuscript to Mary does not appear particularly used, showing only minor wear around the edges with no marginalia.

All of these Latin-language dedications and manuscripts have some sort of connection to classical literature and philosophy, an area in which dedicators expected

Epitome of the Pslams (1539). Taverner's dedication, however, is not to Anne of Cleves, but to King Henry VIII. The final two pages of the dedication mention that Henry has a new queen waiting to be transported into the realm as long as the weather cooperates, which is why Warnicke may have considered it to be directed to Anne of Cleves. But, the dedication simply mentions that Anne is on her way to England to become queen and must have been written late in 1539, as the marriage contract was not signed until October of 1539. Anne arrived in England on 1 January 1540 and the couple was married on 6 January 1540.

⁵⁰⁸ William B. Turnbull, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Mary, 1553-1558* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1861), pp. 12, 66, 117, 165.

⁵⁰⁹ "Avia tua Elysabetha Hispaniae regina quam insignibus decorate virtutibus suit?" British Library, Royal MS 15 B.XIII, fol. 4a.

⁵¹⁰ British Library, Royal MS 15 B.XIII, fol. 4b.

Mary to take some interest. Yeldard presented Mary with an early-medieval conflict between church and state that ultimately justified ecclesiastical authority as being above state authority. Colas invoked a Turkish atheist while Morren supplied Mary with a Greek Menology so as to interest her with texts that both supported her Catholicism while appealing to her humanist education. And, Christopherson and Cruser gave Mary translations of Plutarch assuming that she would be interested in their texts and offering them patronage because she was already familiar with Plutarch.

Taken all together, these manuscripts reveal that dedicators dedicated to Mary in hopes of receiving patronage, but they did so in a more personal way than dedicators of printed books. Printed books were meant to reach a wide audience and hopefully the queen, while single manuscript dedications were meant only for Mary. Manuscript dedicators must have understood manuscripts to be more presentable and desirable as gifts and must have hoped Mary had an appreciation for hand-crafted books over or in addition to printed books.⁵¹¹ What is unique about these manuscripts is that at least two of their authors asked Mary to support the manuscripts so that they would be welcome in printed versions, the texts of Mary Roper Clark Basset and Philip Gerrard, yet neither manuscript was ever printed. What this shows is that there was a pattern or precedent for Mary to receive presentation manuscripts before they were turned into printed books. More presentation manuscripts probably existed for books that were printed, but have since been lost because they only existed in single copies. What this also demonstrates is that Mary was active in negotiating patronage and print with dedicators. If Mary did not

⁵¹¹ Julia Boffey, "From Manuscript to Print: Continuity and Change," In *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476 – 1558*, eds. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014), 20-21.

support a text, such as that of Gerrard, then she stopped it from being spread publicly via print or simply ignored it, thus consigning it to oblivion. Therefore, Mary held power in this personal gift arena; not only was she given gifts, but she had the ability to reject those gifts.

Dedications to King Philip

While Franklin B. William's *Index* lists three books dedicated solely to King Philip of England, none of them were dedicated to him while he was King of England. Rather, all were dedicated to him after Mary's death. One of the books that William lists no long seems to be extant, while the other two are English reactions to the Spanish Armada of 1588, as the two dedicated books were printed in 1589 and 1590, respectively. Moreover, neither of these two books were really dedicated to him; rather, each contained negative verses about Philip, acting more like anti-dedications. The first is an anonymous poem entitled *A Skeltonicall salvation, or condigne gratvlation, and ivst vexation of the Spanish nation that in a bravado, spent many a crvsado, in setting forth an armado England to Invado*.⁵¹² The poem is only a few pages, first printed in English followed by an abbreviated Latin version, most likely to make it easier for both English and continental audiences to understand. The poem concludes:

Because it is plaine,
That the Devil of hell,
Loved Spaniards so well,
That he carried them all,

⁵¹² *A Skeltonicall salvation, or condigne gratvlation, and ivst vexation of the Spanish nation that in a bravado, spent many a crvsado, in setting forth an armado England to Invado* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1589). STC 22619.

Both great and small,
Either dead, or quicke,
Through thinne and thicke,
Both body, and soule,
To his pinnefole,
And the place appointed,
For the Popes anointed.⁵¹³

The second is *A trve and perfecte description of a straunge Monstar borne in the Citty of Rome in Italy in the yeare of our salvation, 1585*.⁵¹⁴ This text is strongly anti-papal, referring to the current pope, Sixtus Quintus, as the “Queen of new Babilon.”⁵¹⁵ The anonymous author criticized Philip as the pillar of the pope who usurped both Portugal and East India. Philip did receive actual dedications, however, but none printed within England. For example, Girolamo Ruscelli’s Italian text *Le Imprese Illustri* was dedicated to Philip in 1566.⁵¹⁶

Dislike of Philip in England and fear of both Spanish and papal control has already been discussed in relation to his marriage to Mary and the Wyatt Rebellion. However, by the time of the Spanish Armada, the roots of a so-called “Black Legend” of

⁵¹³ *A Skeltonicall salvation*, A6v.

⁵¹⁴ *A trve and perfecte description of a straunge Monstar borne in the Citty of Rome in Italy in the yeare of our salvation, 1585. Vnder which is described both the originall and triumphant state of the Holy League, and also the sodain and desperate fall thereof in the year 1588. With certain verses exhortatory to the King of Spayn, that hee would withdraw his persecuting hand from the Church of Christ*. London: John Wolfe, 1590. STC 15107.

⁵¹⁵ *A trve and perfecte description*, A2r.

⁵¹⁶ Girolamo Ruscelli, *Le Imprese Illustri* (Venice: Francesco Rampazetto, 1566). A copy owned by modern bibliophile Arthur Vershbow was just recently sold at auction by Christies.

Spain were fully planted.⁵¹⁷ The Black Legend suggested that Spain was unable to modernize as a nation because of its bigotry and backwardness and depicted Spaniards as cruel and untrustworthy. Much of this legend was perpetuated by Protestant Europe out of hatred of Catholic Spain.⁵¹⁸ Often anti-Spanish sentiment centered around its activities in the New World. Yet, according to William S. Maltby, the high point of anti-Spanish sentiment was England's defeat of the Armada. It symbolized English Protestant conquest over Roman Catholicism, thereby cementing the Black Legend within England.⁵¹⁹ Thus it is not surprising that Philip received two anti-dedications in the aftermath of Spanish conquest in the New World and the Spanish Armada.

Philip was, however, the recipient of five joint dedications with Mary. One dedication prefaced a book on the Spanish colonies of India (the New World). Two dedications accompanied texts that celebrated their marriage. Another dedication preceded a text against the Lutheran heresy. And, the fifth joint dedication to the couple was actually printed in 1567. *The decades of the newe worlde or west India* is a text that was translated into English by Richard Eden in 1555, comprised of large chunks of texts on colonization written by Peter Martyr of Angleria and Gonzalo Oviedo.⁵²⁰ Martyr was

⁵¹⁷ See William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England: The development of anti-Spanish sentiment, 1558-1660* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1971).

⁵¹⁸ Maltby, *Black Legend*, 4.

⁵¹⁹ Maltby, *Black Legend*, 76.

⁵²⁰ Peter Martyr of Angleria, *The decades of the newe worlde or west India conteynyng the nauigations and conquests of the Spanyardes, with the particular description of the moste ryche and large lands and ilands lately founde in the west ocean perteynyng to the inheritaunce of the kinges of Spayne*, Richard Eden, trans. (London: William Powell, 1555). STC 645.

an Italian who became famous for writing the *Decades* about Spain and its explorations into the New World and Oviedo also wrote about colonization in new India. Eden was educated at Cambridge and had a significant interest in science, chemistry, and alchemy.⁵²¹ Eden later went on to work as a secretary to Sir William Cecil, under whom he supported plans for England to surpass Spain's colonies in the Americas. It was in 1533 that Eden translated his first book on colonization, *A Treatyse of the Newe India*, originally written by Sebastian Muenster. *Decades* was Eden's second major translation. Eden's dedication praised both Philip and Mary, as well as Spanish colonization. Interestingly, Spanish colonization was praised in 1555 as an act of piety towards Indians, but by 1588 was seen as morally wicked.⁵²²

Eden's dedication is entirely in Latin, but the text is entirely in English. Eden must have done this for two reasons. As for the English translation of the text, Eden mentioned in the text, "quandoquidem Anglica lingua tibi Serenissima Regina vernacular est," that the Queen's vernacular language was English and this text already existed in writing for the King.⁵²³ If in English, the queen, as well as other Englishmen, could read about the riches of the New World. (Even though the queen could read Latin). As for the Latin dedication, Philip knew very little English, but was fluent in Latin. Eden wrote the dedication to ensure that both Philip and Mary could read it, but especially Philip as the texts praised his family and his country for their efforts in colonizing and Christianizing

⁵²¹ All biographical information on Eden comes from Andrew Hatfield, "Richard Eden," *ODNB*.

⁵²² Maltby, *Black Legend*, 24.

⁵²³ Martyr, *The decades of the newe worlde or west India*, C1r.

the New World. However, while Eden wanted both Philip and Mary to be able to read both the dedication and the text, the dedication very much seems directed towards Mary, as it frequently mentioned her virtues. Eden did this so that Mary and other Englishmen would read the accounts of the Spanish in the New World so as to join the Spanish effort of colonization, either in conjunction with Spain or solely as an English endeavor. I suspect that the only reason that Philip was even mentioned was because Spain was so far ahead of English colonizing efforts. This dedication was clearly meant to be read by the dedicatees and had a very specific purpose.

Moreover, Eden mentioned the dedication that Philip and Mary received from Leonard Goreti (or Goreki) to celebrate their matrimony. Eden noted that he would not recount the virtues, piety, and chastity of Mary because Goreti had already done so, as well as praised Philip, Mary, and their ancestors. Goreti's dedication, printed by William Powell, as was Eden's, is entirely in Latin, as is the entire text of his celebratory oration.⁵²⁴ In the dedication, Goreti recounted how England had recently been in calamity, as many previous kingdoms had been in calamity because of religion. But for England, "Germaniam vero haec nostro calamitoso seculo."⁵²⁵ (Luther and Zwingli infected the clergy of England and oppressed true religion). Goreti continued that Philip and Mary had been made King and Queen so as to preserve the true religion and get rid of the German oppressors. What is most interesting about this text, however, is neither

⁵²⁴ Leonard Goreti, *Oratio Leonhardi Goretii Equitis Poloni de matrimonio serenissimi ac potentissimi, serenissimae potentissimaeque Dei gratia Regis ac Reginae Angliae, Hispaniae & Ad populum principesque Angliae* (London: William Powell, 1554). STC 12090.

⁵²⁵ Goreti, *Oratio*, A2v.

the dedication nor the body of the text, but a small paragraph at the conclusion of the text.⁵²⁶ In this paragraph Goretì acknowledged that this marriage might be unpopular, but Mary came from a line of kings and it was too hard to satisfy everyone regarding her marriage. Mary came from her father King Henry, who came from Edward IV. Now, Queen Mary had been chosen, comparing her accession to the selection of leaders by the Roman Senate, because her predecessor had died. Goretì wanted his story to offer good advice to its readers, but he knew that it was difficult to satisfy everyone, as was the case with Mary's marriage.

The other dedication that Philip and Mary received regarding their marriage is a small paragraph accompanying Hadrianus Junius's *Philippeis, sev, in nvptias divi Philippi, avg. pii, max & heroine Mariae avg.*⁵²⁷ Junius was a Dutch scholar and translator who spent a few years in England at the request of the Duke of Norfolk. Unlike Goretì's dedication, Junius's dedication is straightforward and simply called Philip and Mary's marriage a blessed union and did not apologize for Mary's choice of husband. This text was aimed at a broad audience, claiming that the union of Philip and Mary brought together two nations while rooting out the evils of heresy, France, and even the Turks.⁵²⁸ Interestingly, these are the only two book dedications that Mary received

⁵²⁶ "Cum incidet optime lector in narratione in nomen principis Semeriae, sane ex aliis intellexi curam Regis Edouardi illi a Henrico Rege patre non fuisse commissam, sed uniuerso senatui, quae, postea erat delata ad eum, ac si ille moreretur, ut tandem Mariam hanc in Reginam cooptarent. Reliqua foeliciter legas ac bene consulito. Etenim in tam vasta oratione difficile est omnibus satisfacere." Goretì, *Oratio*, K4v.

⁵²⁷ Hadrianus Junius, *Philippeis, sev, in nvptias divi Philippi, avg. pii, max & heroine Mariae avg.* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1554). STC 14861.

⁵²⁸ Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, 259.

regarding her marriage, and neither were “official” commissioned responses or propaganda requested by the government. Only one proclamation was printed that explained the marriage treaty and justified Philip as King of England based on his close filial relationship to the English royal family.⁵²⁹

Johann Slotan’s *De retinenda fide orthodoxa et catholica adversus haereses et sectas, et praecipue Lutheranam* also praised Philip and Mary for upholding Catholicism and being adversaries to heretics.⁵³⁰ Slotan’s text was first printed in 1555 and was printed again in 1560, keeping the dedication to Mary and Philip. Slotan offered this book to them as a small book of congratulations. Based on the title and subject matter, Slotan could have been congratulating the couple on the recent religious changes made within England. On 28 November 1554, Cardinal Pole (with Parliamentary approval) announced the restoration of papal authority in England.⁵³¹ However, that same day at Mass Cardinal Pole also announced that Mary was with child. Catholics rejoiced at both announcements, while Protestants were dismayed, many having hoped that she was unable to conceive.⁵³² The dedication’s date of 4 April 1555 suggests that Slotan’s congratulations were meant for the impending birth of Philip and Mary’s child, rather than a six-month delayed response to the restoration of Catholicism.

⁵²⁹ David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, & Religion in England, 1553-58*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1991), 112.

⁵³⁰ Johann Slotan, *De retinenda fide orthodoxa et catholica adversus haereses et sectas, et praecipue Lutheranam* (Coloniae: Ioannes Novesianus, 1555).

⁵³¹ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 174.

⁵³² Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 175.

A few pieces of evidence also support the idea that Slotan's text was meant to celebrate Mary and Philip's child. Slotan's text might have been about Catholicism overcoming heresy in England, but religious subject matter would have been more appropriate to send to both the king and queen than a text on childbearing. Slotan's text was never printed in England, which was not unusual, as many Catholic texts were printed abroad during Mary's reign. However, if it was meant to celebrate the birth of a new prince(ss) then it probably would have found more favor within England. To that last point, New College, Oxford has in its possession the presentation copy of Slotan's text intended for Mary.⁵³³ This particular copy is bound in calf leather with decorative gilt stamping. The front cover also has "Maria.Regina.Angliae." stamped on it. Little is known of the provenance of this copy, and there is actually no evidence that Mary ever even owned this presentation copy; it may have never reached her. I suggest that the text was meant to celebrate Philip and Mary's child, which is why the presentation copy was either never given to Mary or Mary quickly rejected the text, resulting in no evidence of Mary's ownership of it. By July 1555 it was clear that Mary was never actually pregnant, and all preparations for celebrations regarding the child's birth were called off.⁵³⁴ For a text with a dedication letter dated 4 April 1555 to be printed in Germany and then be shipped to England, it probably would have arrived around the time that Mary finally accepted that she was not going to have a baby. If Slotan's text was meant to congratulate Mary and Philip on their fight against heresy, Mary probably would have kept Slotan's book. But if the text was meant to congratulate the couple on their new

⁵³³ New College, Oxford, BT3.145.20.

⁵³⁴ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 178.

child, Mary may have rejected the book or it may never have been given to her so as not to remind her of her false pregnancy.

The final dedication shared by Philip and Mary was actually not printed until 1567 and accompanies a text that is a refutation of another book that was dedicated to Mary in 1554. In 1554, Thomas Martin dedicated *A Traictise Declaring and Plainly Prouyng, that the pretended marriage of Priests, and professed persones, is no mariage*.⁵³⁵ Martin's text was a reaction to the religious changes put in place by Mary's first parliament, called on 5 October 1553 with the purpose of repealing Edward's acts on religion.⁵³⁶ According to Jennifer Loach, On 31 October 1553, a bill was introduced into the Commons that reversed much of Edward's religious policies, particularly revoking the right of priests to marry. Thus religious policy was made to reflect that of the final religious settlement of Henry VIII. The bill finally passed on 8 November. During that same session, the Lords passed into law a bill that declared the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon to be valid.⁵³⁷

Martin's dedication to Mary praised Mary for making changes "toward the furtherance of true Religion," as Mary lived as a virgin, contrary to what the heretics prefer of ordained men and religious women.⁵³⁸ Most of Martin's dedication focused on

⁵³⁵ Thomas Martin, *A Traictise Declaring and Plainly Prouyng, that the pretended marriage of Priests, and professed persones, is no mariage, but altogether vnlawful, and in all ages, and al countreies of Christendome, bothe forbidden, and also punyshed* (London: Robert Caly, 1554). STC 17517.

⁵³⁶ Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 74.

⁵³⁷ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 77-78.

what he considered to be abuses against clergy that had come at the hands of heretics, as priests became unworthy because they preferred patronage and friends over learning and spirituality. Specifically, heretics were able to poison religious orders by removing the sacrament of taking holy orders, thereby asking all priests, monks, and nuns to marry. Martin explained that in this treatise he would elucidate with Scripture how those heretics were wrong to do so. Most importantly, Martin beseeched the Queen to accept his book because he wanted to help her reform the Church of England and restore Catholicism.

The dedication that Philip and Mary shared in 1567 was Matthew Parker's rebuttal to Martin's book, *A defence of priests mariages*.⁵³⁹ Parker's *Defence* was only one in a series of books debating the legality and morality of the marriage of priests, along with another defense by John Ponet (bishop of Winchester, 1551-1553), Martin's response to Ponet (above), and a reprinted response by Ponet.⁵⁴⁰ As Nancy Bjorklund has pointed out, Matthew Parker always supported clerical marriage and was married during

⁵³⁸ Martin, *A Traictise Declaring*, A.iv.r of the dedication.

⁵³⁹ Matthew Parker, *A defence of priestes mariages stablysshed by the imperiall lawes of the realme of Englande, agaynst a ciuilian, namyng hym selfe Thomas Martin doctour of the ciuile lawes, goyng about to disproue the saide mariages, lawfull by the eternall worde of God, by the hygh court of parliament, only forbydden by forayne lawes and canons of the Pope, coloured with the visour of the Churche* (London: John Kingston for Richarde Jugge, 1567). STC 17518.

⁵⁴⁰ Aaron J. Kleist, "Matthew Parker, Old English, and the Defense of Priestly Marriage." In *Anglo-Saxon Books and Their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss's Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, eds. Thomas N. Hall and Donald Scragg (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2008), 107-108. John Ponet, *A Defence for Mariage of Priestes* (London: Reynold Wolff, 1549) (STC 20176) and *An Apologie Fully Aunsvveringe by Scriptures and Aunceant Doctors, a Blasphemose Book Gatherid by D. Steph. Gardiner, Nou Lord Chauncelar and D. Smyth of Oxford, and other Papists, as by Ther Books Appeare, and of Late Set Furth Vnder the Name of Thomas Martin Doctor of the Ciuile Lawes as of Himself he Saieth, Against the Godly Mariadge of Priests* (Zurich: Christoph Froschaue, 1555).

the reign of Edward VI. When Mary repealed Edward's laws allowing priests to marry, Parker refused to divorce and repent in order to keep his benefices.⁵⁴¹ Rather, Parker was stripped of all of his offices, lost much of his stipend, but remained happily married.⁵⁴² Upon Elizabeth's accession, Parker was named Archbishop of Canterbury and consecrated on 17 December 1559, probably more because of Parker's loyalty to Anne Boleyn than for Elizabeth's affection for Parker. Yet, Elizabeth was not eager to approve clerical marriages and many stipulations were put in place in order for clerical marriage to be legal, such as forcing a potential wife to be approved by a bishop and two justices of the peace.⁵⁴³

By the late 1560s, Parker still did not feel that clerical marriage was secure, so he began producing tracts to support the idea. The most famous of these was *A defence of priests mariages*. There has been some contention over the authorship of the text, as Parker himself claimed that another man wrote this text shortly after the accession of Mary, but recent scholarship seems to agree that Parker wrote the majority, if not all of the text.⁵⁴⁴ Parker did not sign his name to the preface, there is no date of print, and he presented the book as having been written during the reign of Philip and Mary by a man

⁵⁴¹ Nancy Bjorklund, "A Godly Wyfe is a Helper': Matthew Parker and the Defense of Clerical Marriage." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* Vol. 34, No. 2 (Summer, 2003), 347-365. On 29 January 1555, Pole issued a tract which absolved married clergy so long as they abandoned their wives and repented.

⁵⁴² Bjorklund, "Godly," 355-357.

⁵⁴³ Bjorklund, "Godly," 357-358.

⁵⁴⁴ See Kleist, "Matthew Parker," 106-135.

who died shortly after having written it.⁵⁴⁵ The text was first published in 1567 and was expanded and printed for a second time in 1568 when Parker had access to more manuscripts that supported his position.⁵⁴⁶ Parker argued that these manuscripts explained that before the Norman Conquest, clerical marriage was legal in England.⁵⁴⁷ Parker's contention that clerical marriage was legal before the Conquest is most likely true, as at the same time as the Conquest the church was going through a century-long process to separate clerical and lay responsibilities and make clerical marriage illegal. That process was finalized everywhere by the 1150s. Like many reformers, Parker sought evidence of an early English church that had not yet been diluted by Roman Church practices. Parker found that church doctrine from 1066 should supplant all current church doctrine.

Both the 1567 and 1568 editions contain a Preface to the Reader and a lengthy, forty-three-page dedication to Philip and Mary, in which is also embedded a dedication to the (Privy) Council, a dedication to the Prelates of the Church, the lower house of Parliament, the subjects of the realm, and a summary of Parker's book. In the portion of the dedication specific to Philip and Mary, Parker claimed that "the chief root whence spryngeth the greatest part of mannes felicitie, or infelicity in this mortall life, is wedlock."⁵⁴⁸ Parker pleaded with both sovereigns about recent changes regarding clergy.

⁵⁴⁵ Kleist, "Matthew Parker," 109.

⁵⁴⁶ Bjorklund, "'Godly,'" 362. STC 17518 and 17519. The STC dates both editions as 1567.

⁵⁴⁷ Bjorklund, "'Godly,'" 363.

⁵⁴⁸ Parker, *A defence*, A.i.r.

Parker then just addressed Mary and how often she had been told that priestly copulation was wrong. Why did she dissolve what had so recently been accepted? But, Parker made sure to compliment Mary on her piety, mercy, charity, and justice, and hoped that God would allow her to reign prosperously with His benefits. Parker only addressed both monarchs so far as to say that he did not mistrust them, but could understand why they made these religious changes. This seems to be a fine example of negotiation between the dedicator and Mary, as Parker actually addressed Mary and how he wanted her to change her policies. But then one realizes that Mary had been dead for nine years so it was impossible to negotiate with her and that Philip never would have approved of Parker's suggestions.

While Parker's words to Philip and Mary were exceptional compared with other dedications to Mary, what is even more interesting is Parker's dedication to Mary's council. Parker praised Mary as a queen and woman, but blamed her decisions on advice given to her by her council. This is in keeping with early modern policy critiques, which blamed councilors instead of the monarch, but most likely this reflects Parker's disbelief that Mary was actually making religious policy changes on her own and that he believed she may choose otherwise if not for men speaking against clerical marriage to her. His point was that Mary had been told by spiritual advisors that priestly marriage was unlawful, but learning and old sources had revealed that clerical marriage was lawful. In the dedication Parker reminded her councilors that their power came from God, matrimony was natural, and that it was better to follow God's law than man's tradition of no marriage. Following his words to Mary's council Parker offered a nine-page

dedication to the Prelates of the Church in which he quoted much Scripture and bemoaned the selling off of the wives and children of the clergy.

While I cannot determine if or when Parker indeed wrote the first edition of this text, two things are obvious about its publication in 1567. As Mary had been deceased since 1558 and Philip no longer had any influence in England, it was safe to print a dedication that questioned Mary's religious policies. By this time Mary was unpopular, as was Catholicism, and there would have been no backlash against Parker for printing this text. More importantly, as the status of clerical marriage was still not secure in 1567, this dedication must also have been a veiled dedication to Elizabeth and her council regarding clerical marriage. Parker could no longer influence Mary's religious policy, but while Elizabeth and her council were still making changes, Parker did not want Elizabeth to choose against clerical marriage. But as it would have been unsafe to say these words to Elizabeth, Parker addressed them to Mary and her council instead. Perhaps Parker also hoped that Philip would be made aware of the dedication and text to try to influence him about clerical marriage as well. The dedications of both Martin and Parker, then, are two good examples of dedications as negotiations. Not only did the authors negotiate with Mary and her influence on religious policy, they also negotiated with one another over what was morally and religiously "true." The dedication of Parker even managed to negotiate with two queens over the position of clerical marriage.

As for English manuscripts dedicated to Philip, there is scant evidence that he had one manuscript dedicated to him, while he and Mary shared three manuscripts which are not quite dedicated to them, but contain verses about the couple. According to Nixon and

Foot, Pepys Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge has a book bound in turkey leather that has an inscription from Clement Adams to Philip while he was husband to Mary.⁵⁴⁹ Two manuscripts to both Philip and Mary, unsurprisingly, are general works celebrating their marriage: Joannes Stratius's *De regis nuptiis Philippi & Mariae potentissimorum principum gratulatio* and *Ad Phillippvm et Mariam semper Augustos Puerorum Collegii Wickamensis Apud illustrem Wintoniam Carmen nuptial* written by several boys at Winchester College.⁵⁵⁰ The third manuscript shared by Philip and Mary is a handwritten address celebrating the birth of a prince.⁵⁵¹

Joannes Stratius wrote *De regis nuptiis Philippi & Mariae* on vellum. Stratius wrote a similar tract celebrating the marriage of Francis I of France in 1530. In that to Mary and Philip, Stratius called himself their “addictissimus cliens,” while also incorporating their titles, ancestry, and how they were blessed by God.⁵⁵² Stratius also asked God to bless their union. However, this text has no marginalia or marks of ownership, so it is hard to determine if Philip and Mary actually ever saw this text. Philip and Mary most likely did see the other manuscript written in honor of their wedding. The two were married at Winchester Cathedral, and each boy at Winchester College wrote Latin verses celebrating the marriage, collectively titled *Ad Phillippvm et Mariam semper Augustos Puerorum Collegii Wickamensis Apud illustrem Wintoniam Carmen nuptiale*.

⁵⁴⁹ Howard M. Nixon and Mirjan M. Foot, eds., *The History of Decorated Bookbinding in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 28. Pepys Library, MS 1663. I have not yet seen this manuscript to determine if the inscription is indeed a dedication.

⁵⁵⁰ British Library, Royal MS 12 A. XI and British Library, Royal MS 12 A.XX.

⁵⁵¹ British Library, Royal MS 12 A.XLIX.

⁵⁵² British Library, Royal MS 12 A. XI, fol.23v.

These verses were probably presented to Philip and Mary during their stay at Winchester. The manuscript begins with a family tree in the shape of a circle showing their joint ancestor, John of Gaunt. At the bottom of the circle, Phillip and Mary are joined together and they lead into an empty spot shaped like a bubble where the name of their first child and heir would be written. The verses are quite general and include ideas of long life and being blessed with children. For example, William Dibbens ended his poem asking that Philip and Mary live long lives, while Henry Twichener wrote that Philip and Mary should be king and queen for years.⁵⁵³

The manuscript celebrating the birth of a prince has been given the title *Boxall his oration in the praise of the Kinge of Spaine*. The manuscript itself has no date, but has been dated to approximately 20 April 1555, near the due date for Mary's first phantom pregnancy. The manuscript was written by John Boxall, a secretary of Queen Mary and later Dean of Peterborough. Boxall's oration praised Philip as observed to be an excellent King in his marriage, or "obseruantia in excellentem Regnem maritum suum."⁵⁵⁴ Boxall was impressed by Mary's knowledge and education, which was fitting of a royal lady because it took up her time, especially because she knew Latin accurately.⁵⁵⁵ This manuscript has no marginalia or ownership markings. Really, it is surprising that it exists at all, as it is likely that orations for a prince that was never born

⁵⁵³ British Library, Royal MS 12 A.XX . "Nominis alterutrius pulchra election certe est, sine dies longi, seu breue fie titer," fol. 5r. and "Salueto Hispani nona nupta Maria Philippi. Saluetote omnes Rex & regine per annos," fol. 6v., respectively.

⁵⁵⁴ British Library, Royal MS 12 A.XLIX, fol. 4r.

⁵⁵⁵ "que Regiam virginem decerent, tempus in sumebat. Latinam linguam & intelligebat accurate." British Library, Royal MS 12 A.XLIX, fol. 5r.

would all have been destroyed. One must wonder if it was ever in Mary's possession either, like Slotan's dedication celebrating Mary's pregnancy.

These three manuscripts shared between Philip and Mary differ in tone from many of the printed books that mentioned the king. They are not negative and did not attempt to downgrade Philip's position and influence within England. This is because they were written when Philip first entered England or when it was thought that he fathered an heir, thereby fulfilling his duty as England's king. But, more importantly, these manuscripts highlight how manuscripts and printed books could differ in tone because of their audience. Manuscripts were aimed at a singular audience (or in this case, an audience of one couple), while printed books were aimed at a public audience in addition to the dedicatee. The manuscripts shared between Mary and Philip were positive and praised both Mary and Philip because they were meant to be read only by Mary and Philip. Printed books that mentioned Philip were much more negative because they were meant to be read by a much wider audience that had a great dislike and distrust of him.

The joint dedications to Philip and Mary are very revealing about Philip's status within England. The most obvious reason Philip did not receive any solo dedications while married to Mary was that their marriage was generally unpopular. England was largely anti-Spanish and much anti-Spanish print reflected those feelings, principally fearing that Philip would seize the English throne on the death of Mary, especially if they had a young child over whom Philip was regent.⁵⁵⁶ Also, Philip was unsuccessful in impregnating Mary, so he did not hold up his end of his marriage contract.⁵⁵⁷ Finally,

⁵⁵⁶ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 257.

according to their marriage contract, Philip was virtually powerless in England.⁵⁵⁸ He was given no revenue to distribute for patronage, so perhaps he had nothing to offer in return or dedicators did not want Spanish money.⁵⁵⁹

Judith Richards has argued that it is hard to understand how much influence Philip had in England. Philip's entourage complained of a lack of respect and how Philip ate on silver plates while Mary ate on gold, yet Philip's name appeared before hers in official titles and proclamations leading others to believe that Philip really was holding power over Mary. But there is little evidence that Philip had power separately from Mary, and Richards takes book dedications to Philip and Mary as reinforcing this idea. Mary received many book dedications both before and after her marriage, while Philip received none. The lack of dedications to Philip suggests that he really was not a viable font of patronage or independent power.⁵⁶⁰ Many dedications to Mary included both her English and her Spanish titles, but generally dedications related to Philip suggested that when it came to matters of religion and politics Philip was too close to the papacy and too foreign for Englishmen to even want Philip's intercession. Besides, during their four-year marriage, Philip's total time in England was only a little over a year, so he did not even reside in England enough to be considered to be a viable influence.

⁵⁵⁷ Duncan, *Mary I*, 163.

⁵⁵⁸ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 233. See Duncan, *Mary I* for a discussion of the imagery used in their marriage negotiations.

⁵⁵⁹ David Loades, "Philip II and the government of England," In *Law and Government Under the Tudors*, eds. Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 180-181.

⁵⁶⁰ Richards, *Mary Tudor*, 179-180.

The same is true when it came to book ownership and library-building. Only one entry in Mary's state papers demonstrates that Mary and Philip were jointly given books as a gift for their personal use. Dated 16 and 22 May, 1557, this entry explains how Nicholas Mameranus, poet laureate to the Emperor, presented Queen Mary with seven books.⁵⁶¹ Mameranus spent a few months in London, March to May 1557, as part of Philip's retinue.⁵⁶² The given books included a congratulatory poem about the royal nuptials, which was inscribed to the king and bound in crimson velvet; five psalms of David; a book of prayers collected by Mameranus, which Knighton and Warner suggest might be *Oratio dominica*; another book written by Mameranus which was a defense of confession against sectarians; a book containing lists pertaining to the court of the Holy Roman Emperor; another book by Mameranus about a man who was slandered over the sacrament of the eucharist; and, a book on kissing hands. In the book on kissing hands was a petition to Mary and Philip over coins, sermons, and public drinking.⁵⁶³ So, the books themselves were not even directed to Philip, only the petition inside one of the books. Mameranus implored the English king and queen to make small coins that would make cheap transactions easier. Mameranus also suggested that the king and queen should have their bishops make sermons on the gospels every Sunday and stop public

⁵⁶¹ C.S. Knighton, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Mary I*. Entry 596. See J. Christopher Warner, "A Gift of Books from the Emperor's Poet Laureate to Queen Mary I," *The Library*, 7th series, Vol. 11, No. 3 (September 2010), 345-349. In this article, Warner identifies each of the seven books given by Mameranus and their modern library holdings.

⁵⁶² Warner, "A Gift of Books," 345.

⁵⁶³ Knighton has identified this book as *Beso las manos et point dictionis gallicae usus. Cum carmine de leone et asino* (London: Thomas Marsh, 1557), with a copy at King's College, Cambridge. The petition is entry 597.

drinking because it was a nuisance. This confirms that Philip really was not thought to be a good patron or Mameranus would have given the books to both monarchs hoping to become clients of both. But when it came to issues of policy, Philip must have had a reputation for having some influence, or he would not have been so disliked.

Conclusion

While these manuscripts dedicated to Mary and Philip explore varying topics and themes, they are all examples of textual negotiation between Mary, Philip, and their subjects. The dedications by Henry Parker, Lord Morley, are unique examples of the most-sought after type of patronage relationships that Mary could have with dedicators. Morley annually presented Mary with dedications and Mary annually rewarded him for it. Others, such as Philip Gerrard's tract asking Mary to reform rents, represent a more traditional type of textual negotiation in which a dedicator blindly asked Mary for patronage for his cause, and ultimately received no response.

Importantly, these manuscript dedications demonstrate that there was still significant overlap in the creation and prestige of manuscripts and printed books. Mary received at least eighteen manuscript dedications during her lifetime, compared with thirty-three printed book dedications. Morley even specifically addressed his concerns of print devaluing the importance and specificity of handwritten, personal translations of Psalms and Scripture. However, as Julia Boffey has pointed out, in the first half of the sixteenth century readers continued to both read and commission manuscripts even when the same text was available in printed form. Books and manuscripts continued to be

used, read, owned, and bound together.⁵⁶⁴ What did differ between manuscripts and printed books was audience. Manuscript dedications were able to address Mary in a more personal way because they were meant to be read only by her. Printed book dedications were meant to be read by Mary and a public audience, so they often addressed more public concern, were mindful of public opinion, and sought to influence both Mary and her subjects.

The dedications to Philip, both those directed solely to Philip and those shared jointly with Mary, reinforce the revisionist idea that Philip actually did not exercise much power while King of England. For the most part, Philip was just left out of dedications to Mary because he was understood to be too close to the papacy and there was general xenophobic fear within England of Spanish control. All Philip's dedications tend to celebrate his marriage to Mary or their impending child, the only two areas that Englishmen thought suitable to praise Philip, and even then his marriage was only praised by a few. Ultimately, both his marriage and his childbearing with Mary turned out to be a failure (or at least regarded as a failure by their contemporaries).

Altogether, the manuscripts dedicated to Mary demonstrate that dedicators only dedicated to Mary in areas where they thought she held power: the reformation of the English church and influencing the virtue of women. These manuscripts can be assumed to have been in Mary's personal possession (unless otherwise noted) for at least brief periods of time, yet the topics and subject matter were not chosen by Mary. The

⁵⁶⁴ See Julia Boffey, *Manuscript and Print* and "From Manuscript to Print: Continuity and Change" for a discussion how manuscripts and books were used together in early modern England.

following chapter will explore books that Mary chose to own or at least keep, the books in Mary's personal library.

CHAPTER VI

BOOKS OWNED BY MARY

The previous four chapters have examined printed books dedicated to Lady Margaret Beaufort and the six consorts of Henry VIII and both the manuscript and printed dedications to Mary Tudor. This chapter moves away from dedications to the books that comprised Mary's personal library. The following is a brief explanation of the books that were part of Mary's personal collection, not including the dedicated books and manuscripts from the previous chapters which may have been in her personal collection as well.⁵⁶⁵ I do not claim that this chapter contains a comprehensive list, as many books have been lost over time and extant books may have changed owners and bindings over time so that they are no longer traceable to Mary. Also, I was not able to corroborate every book that other scholars have mentioned that Mary owned. This list will most likely be augmented as more books are discovered that she once owned. However, this chapter is the first and most comprehensive list of the all of the books in Mary's personal library that exists thus far.

My account below suggests that the books that can be identified as having been owned by Mary not only reflect her love of beautiful objects, but also her conception of her role as a humanist queen. To do so, I have broken this chapter into two sections.

⁵⁶⁵ See Appendix III. This appendix is a catalogue of Mary Tudor's books only as identified in this chapter.

First, I will explore the books in Mary's collection that were bound by the so-called King Edward and Queen Mary Binder as having the strongest possibility of having belonged to Mary. Second, I will explicate all other books that are known to have been given to Mary, those that she inherited, and those with bindings (not by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder) related to her. The books in Mary's personal library reflect that once Mary's formal education ended, so did most of her reading and ownership of humanist texts. Mary did not have nearly the interest in humanism and learning that her parents shared.⁵⁶⁶ Rather, the books that Mary collected and that were given to her were almost all religious in scope. I suggest that this pattern of ownership reflects Mary's acknowledgement that as queen, understanding humanist texts was not nearly as important as encouraging reading and reflection on religious texts that promoted Catholicism. This chapter argues that the books that Mary personally chose as her own and got bound with her own imprint were primarily religious, as part of her self-definition as a religious queen who was going to restore true religion. Her interest in classics, while mild compared to her humanist upbringing, reinforced her religious position, as good Catholics were supposed to have a classical education.

While Mary was very interested in creating her own personal library, she was not as interested in making substantial additions to the Royal Library as Edward IV and Henry VII had been.⁵⁶⁷ On 15 January 1556, John Dee sent "A Supplication to Queen

⁵⁶⁶ Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 6.

⁵⁶⁷ See Janet Backhouse, "Founders of the Royal Library: Edward IV and Henry VII as Collectors of Illuminated Manuscripts," in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Wolfebor, 1987), 23-41.

Mary” asking her for her permission to gather texts for a Royal Library. Wisely Dee linked the construction of a Royal Library with preservation of Catholicism, arguing that with the dissolution of religious houses many libraries had been disseminated and destroyed, but if quick work were made, many collections could be recovered and centralized. He devised a plan to recover and preserve these important collections, which would in turn build Mary a famous library. Mary’s role as queen would be reflected in a larger Royal Library.⁵⁶⁸

Dee followed his supplication with five articles explaining how he would create a Royal Library at no cost to Queen Mary or any damage to her subjects. The first article explains that the queen should issue a commission to search for old books (or “monuments” as he calls them), the commission will borrow the books, copy them, and then the originals will be returned to their owners. The second article suggests that Cardinal Pole and the Synod should make allowance to cover the expenses of locating the monuments and copying them, including the presses and materials needed to copy the books. The third article states that the commission should be dispatched with speed so that more books may not be lost or hidden, so that the Synod has good faith that the efforts of the commission will work, and that the expenses of the project will have a good estimate. The fourth article offers that a place should be designated to send the books before they are copied and put in the Royal Library. The final article asks permission to find books that are in foreign libraries and recover them. No action was taken based on his supplication.

⁵⁶⁸ See Gerald Suster, ed., *John Dee Essential Readings*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley, North Atlantic Books, 2003). The supplication is reprinted on pp. 16-19.

While Mary's lack of action suggests an uninterest in moving knowledge outward or her not wanting to be seen as a source of learning, I think that Mary had a specific reason for not answering Dee's supplication. As previously mentioned, Mary had a strategic plan for returning England to Catholicism, one which did not involve rushing into religious changes nor forcibly returning previously dissolved monastic property to the Catholic Church. If Mary were to have followed Dee's supplication and sent a commission to retrieve books previously owned by monasteries or other clergy members (even if only temporarily), it would have appeared that she was making a beginning effort to repossess church property, especially if Cardinal Pole and the Synod were the leaders of the acquisition process. Her subjects (as she rightfully expected) would not have been receptive to this process, fearing that if Mary asked for their monastic books, she may next ask for other monastic artifacts or even their lands. Therefore, Mary could not allow Dee to contribute to a Royal Library because it would have disrupted the method in which Mary wanted to return the English church to Catholicism. Yet, Mary accepted former monastic and religious books into her personal collection because this minor book acquisition was not threatening.

King Edward and Queen Mary Binder

One of the simplest ways to identify a book that was personally owned by Mary is through its binding. With the advent of the academic study of bookbinding at the beginning of the twentieth century, the King Edward Binder and the Queen Mary Binder were regarded as two separate men or houses who bound books for each respective

monarch.⁵⁶⁹ However, because of similar tool marks and practices it is now believed that there was only one shop which bound books for the royal family, and that shop is now known as the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder.⁵⁷⁰ The shop was given this name because it must have had some royal connection based on the amount of royal bindings it produced. This binder was active from approximately 1530 to 1558, and maybe even early into Elizabeth's reign.⁵⁷¹ The books that were bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder offer some of the strongest clues of books that were owned by Mary, as many have Mary's name, initials, or coat of arms stamped into the bindings.

There are fourteen extant books bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder with indications that they belonged to Mary.⁵⁷² Many other books bound by the

⁵⁶⁹ See G.D. Hobson, *Bindings in Cambridge Libraries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929).

⁵⁷⁰ Howard Nixon, "Early English gold-tooled bookbindings," in *Studi di Bibliografia e di Storia in Onore di Tammaro de Marinis*, 3 (Verona: 1964), 294.

⁵⁷¹ David McKitterick, ed., *The Trinity Apocalypse* (London: The British Library, 2005), 104.

⁵⁷² The Trinity Apocalypse was bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder and based on the coat of arms on the front cover, it could have belonged to either King Henry VIII, Edward VI, or Mary. David McKitterick suggests that it most likely did not belong to Henry VIII, so it was either bound for Edward or Mary, but he cannot confirm which royal had the book bound. As such, it will not be treated here as a book owned by Mary. McKitterick, 105. A copy of Plutarch's *Parallela* that was once in the private collection of His Excellency M. John Gennadius, a Greek minister at the Court of St James's, has been noted as having a brown binding bearing the arms of Queen Mary I. *Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition of Bookbindings* (London: Printed for the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1891), 64. However, an 1895 catalogue from Sotheby's on the sale of Gennadius's collection of rare books and manuscripts suggests that the binding simply has the royal arms of England on it and that this specific copy belonged to Henry VIII. *Catalogue of the Extensive and Valuable Library of Manuscripts & Printed Books of His Excellency Monsieur John Gennadius* (London: Gryden Press, 1895), Lot 2384. The Burlington catalogue also mentions a manuscript with a binding containing two stamps, one of the

same binder exist, but they were all bound for other people, mostly Edward VI. These fourteen books share a few commonalities. First of all, twelve of them are bound in the same brown leather binding which has actually remained fairly soft and smooth for the last five hundred years, while two are bound in white leather. Some have patches of newer binding or have new spines, but generally, they all share the same type of leather (probably calf). Secondly, each is decorated with similar tool marks in gold.⁵⁷³ Many have tool marks of Mary's initials or coat of arms. Thirdly, most of the bound books are printed books, not manuscripts, and almost all of them are religious books that were not printed in England. Finally, and what I find to be most important, is that not one book bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder has any indication beyond the binding itself that the book actually at one time belonged to Mary. The books contain neither marginalia nor even Mary's own signature.⁵⁷⁴ That these books are unmarred and the fact that Mary had at least fourteen books bound by this binder indicate that she took care of her books very well and that she preferred her books to have a sturdy binding so that they could be displayed and possibly even used by other women in her household.

royal arms and the badge of Queen Katherine of Aragon and Mary, and the other stamp of the Tudor badge. It was on loan by S. Sanders, esp. *Burlington*, 9. I cannot confirm if this binding indeed can be linked to Mary. Howard Nixon has also identified a book bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder with the arms and initials of Mary, "disposed of in the British Museum's disastrous duplicate sale of 1769 and promptly acquired by Andrew Gifford who was on the Museum's staff." The book was later sold at Sotheby's on 28 November 1961. Nixon, "Early English gold-tooled bookbindings," 297. I cannot confirm Nixon's findings because the book is now privately owned.

⁵⁷³ Nixon noted that the majority of gold-tooled bookbindings in the first half of the sixteenth century were either for royal libraries or presentation to the royal family. Nixon, "Early English gold-tooled bookbindings," 283.

⁵⁷⁴ William Sherman suggests that at least twenty percent of early modern books contain marginalia. Sherman, *Used Books*, 5.

The texts bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder for Mary tended to be on religious subject matter, ranging from works by St. Ambrose to homilies by Bishop Bonner of London. Two books, however, are not about religion: one is a print edition of the acts of Mary's first parliament and the other contains works by Herodotus and Thucydides. Mary's first parliament took place in October 1553. This first meeting of parliament was specifically called to confirm Mary's title as queen and to repeal Edward's religious settlement, thereby returning England to the religious settlement of her father. Important to Mary, but not necessarily important for her rule over England, was that the first parliament also passed a bill that declared the marriage of her parents' valid.⁵⁷⁵ The acts of this first Marian parliament were printed by John Cawood in 1554, and Mary had a copy of this meeting of parliament specifically bound for her, as her coat of arms and initials "M.R." indicate all over the binding of her copy.⁵⁷⁶ Mary left no marginalia in her copy, so she probably did not read it often. But, she must have wanted a copy because it was her first calling of parliament as queen. I suspect that she also wanted a decoratively bound copy because it contained the act that declared the marriage of her parents valid, something that she had always believed in, and it made a positive declaration of her position and pedigree.

Like Mary's bound copy of her first calling of parliament, her bound book containing excerpts from classical historians Herodotus and Thucydides must have been important to her because it is the only book besides that of her parliament not about

⁵⁷⁵ Loach, *Parliament*, 77-78.

⁵⁷⁶ British Library, Davis 87.

religion bound for her by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder.⁵⁷⁷ The excerpts of Herodotus and Thucydides are actually two separate books, each printed in Basel in 1540, and bound together. The binding has Mary's coat of arms in the middle of both the front and back covers, but no initials, so it must have been bound between 1553 and 1558. If these two books were printed in 1540 but not bound until at least 1553, Mary probably already owned them and commissioned her binder to bind them together for her. The pages of the books show no signs of use or wear, just browning from age around the edges. Also, there are no marginalia or marks of readership. She certainly did not read these two books as part of her lessons outlined by Vives, as Vives famously called Herodotus the father of lies instead of the father of history. But she must have taken some interest in them as well-known humanist texts.

As for the twelve other books belonging to Mary that were bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, each has slight variations, but it is clear that they were all bound by the same shop and at some point were in Mary's personal collection of books. For example, many of the bindings have Mary's coat of arms in the middle.⁵⁷⁸ The spines that have remained intact also usually contain a partial title as well as decorations of the Tudor rose and crowns.⁵⁷⁹ Generally, these bound books are all religious in subject matter, and only one has specific subject matter that relates directly to Mary.

⁵⁷⁷ British Library, C.66.f.2.

⁵⁷⁸ See British Library, C.65.gg.6; C.46.c.1.

⁵⁷⁹ See British Library, C.24.c.15; C.27.e.13; Lambeth Palace Library, H4654.(L5).

Only three books bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder for Mary were religious manuscripts. The first is a fifteenth-century Book of Hours bound in brown leather with gold inlay of a plain border and features Mary's arms and initials in the middle.⁵⁸⁰ Both the front and the back covers have been inlaid into a newer binding from the time in which it was held in the British Museum. A note on the flyleaf in what appears to be a nineteenth-century hand reads "Queen Mary's prayer book on vellum." The manuscript itself is written in black ink that is now largely faded to brown, with highlights in red, blue, and gold inks. It contains many illuminated capitals and colorful drawings of flowers. There is no indication of when it was bound, but it must have been between 1553 and 1558 since the cover bears insignia of Mary as queen. This manuscript is unusual for books belonging to Mary, in that six pages contain marginalia. None of the marginalia appears to have been written by Mary, and none of it indicates ownership. The doodles and drawings in the margins appear to come from two separate hands, one which illuminated the books with small drawings of flowers in pink, gold, and blue inks, while the other drew in many of the capital letters with blue and bright red inks. If this was Mary's prayer book she did not make any personal markings in it, but she must have read it frequently if part of the original binding had to be replaced when it was given to the British Museum.⁵⁸¹ Yet, as will be demonstrated below, Mary owned many prayer books.

⁵⁸⁰ British Library, Sloane MS 2565.

⁵⁸¹ I can find no record of who inherited Mary's books upon her death. Mary's will bequeathed all of her belongings to any children had by her and Philip. As she had no children, Mary's belongings could have been distributed among members of her household, given to Elizabeth, or even placed in chests and secured within the Tower.

A second manuscript bound for Mary by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder is also bound in brown leather with gold inlay, features a plain border, and has Mary's arms in the center flanked by two sets of "M.R." initials, all of which is surrounded by a circle.⁵⁸² On the front flyleaf is written "liber olim Regina Mariae" in a modern hand. This manuscript was the presentation copy of Miles Hogarde's *A treatise declaring howe Christe was banished out of this realm: And howe it hath pleased God to bryng Christ home againe by Mary our moost gracious Quene* that was printed in 1554 by Caly and mentioned in the previous chapter. It contains a total of twenty-four folios, of which the dedication to Mary appears on folios 2r-3r. Following the dedication to Mary is a preface to the reader. As for the dedication, it consists of eight stanzas each with six rhyming lines and is exactly as it appears in the printed version. There are no marginalia or indications that she read this manuscript by Hogarde, but Mary must have favored it so as to support, or at least not stop, its printed edition. Mary must have found the text so favorable that not only did she support its printed version, but also had the manuscript copy bound for herself, if Hogarde did not have it bound for her when he presented it to her. Hogarde's manuscript and later printed book are an example of both how manuscript and print continued to overlap in the sixteenth century and of a successful textual negotiation between Hogarde and Mary.

King's College Cambridge holds the third manuscript bound for Mary by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, and this manuscript was also dedicated to her.⁵⁸³

De Militia Christiana is an illustrated manuscript written in 1554 by Jodocus Harchius

⁵⁸² British Library, Harley MS 3444.

⁵⁸³ King's College, Cambridge MS 24.

(Josse de Harchies). The dedication to Mary occupies folios two through twelve.⁵⁸⁴ It is bound in brown leather with many decorative gold inlay marks, culminating in Mary's coat of arms and initials "M.R." in the center of both the front and back covers.⁵⁸⁵ The end flyleaf contains a watermark of an open hand above which is a star and which also has the initials "G.M." on the wrist.⁵⁸⁶ This book bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder is not the only book to have such a watermark. As far as I could detect, two others also had a similar mark, which Hobson identifies to be from northwest France.⁵⁸⁷ I surmise that this manuscript was bound and given to Mary as a presentation manuscript so that Harchius could have his book patronized into a printed edition. But this text never made it into print in England, and it is no surprise, as Harchius often wrote of compromises that needed to be made between Catholics and Protestants so that they could reconcile. Harchius's negotiation with Mary over this text resulted in Mary not patronizing his book, but in 1554 Harchius was able to get printed a book that praised and promoted Cardinal Pole, clearly a more acceptable topic.⁵⁸⁸

⁵⁸⁴ Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts other than Oriental in the Library of King's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), 42.

⁵⁸⁵ Hobson, *Bindings*, 76. Plate XXVI is the front cover of the book.

⁵⁸⁶ Hobson, *Bindings*, 76.

⁵⁸⁷ See BL, Davis 87; BL, C.65.gg.6; Lambeth Palace Library, H4654.(L5). BL, C.66.f.2 has a watermark of what appears to be a mug with flowers coming out of it.

⁵⁸⁸ Josse de Harchies, *Pro instauratione reipublicae angl proque; illustrissimi domini Reginaldi Poli. sanctae Romanae ecclesiae tituli sanctae mariae in cosmedim, diaconi cardinalis, sedis apostolicae legati a latere. Oratio ad prudentissimum senatum Angl. Authore Iodoco Harchio Montensi* (London: John Cawood, 1554). STC 12753.

As for the remainder of the printed books bound for Mary by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, two are currently located in Lambeth Palace Library. In a research guide of sources related to Queen Mary, Lambeth Palace Library identifies four books in its collection as having been owned by Mary.⁵⁸⁹ They include Ludolphus de Saxonia's *Vita Christi* printed in Paris in 1534,⁵⁹⁰ a Latin missal printed in Lyon in 1550,⁵⁹¹ Luigi Lippomano's *Vitarum sanctorum* printed in Venice in 1554,⁵⁹² and a Latin breviary printed in Lyon in 1556.⁵⁹³ None of the four books have any indication of ownership, such as marginalia or handwritten calendars or provenance. It is clear from the bindings that two of them were bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder and that two were not. The two that were not cannot be confirmed as having ever belonged to Mary.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁸⁹ Lambeth Palace Library Research Guide, Mary Tudor. http://www.lambethpalacelibrary.org/files/Mary_Tudor.pdf. Accessed 1 November 2013.

⁵⁹⁰ Lambeth Palace Library, F298.(L8).

⁵⁹¹ Lambeth Palace Library, H2015.(A2 1550).

⁵⁹² Lambeth Palace Library, H4654.(L5).

⁵⁹³ Lambeth Palace Library, H2000.Q8.

⁵⁹⁴ The two books not bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder are bound in red leather and have gold and black decorative inlays. H2000. Q8 and H2015.(A2 1550). Both were printed on the continent and contain religious subject matter, one being a Latin breviary and the other a Latin missal. The research guide suggests that they were presentation copies for Mary. However, it does not seem likely because there are places on each of the bindings where the binder/presenter could have made the bindings personal to Mary, such as adding her initials or coat of arms, but did not. Therefore, it cannot be confirmed that these two books ever belonged to Mary.

The other two books, however, besides being bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, also have Mary's coat of arms in the center, meaning that they were bound for Mary and not for Edward. *Vitarum sanctorum* can be identified as having belonged to Mary just by its binding of brown leather with gold inlay and both its front and back covers displaying the coat of arms of Mary in their centers. As for *Vita Christi*, it can be confirmed that Mary owned two copies during her lifetime. Around the time that Katherine of Aragon moved from Buckden to Kimbolton Castle (May 1534) she sent Mary a letter, and in the letter Katherine promised to send Mary two books. "I will send you two books in Latin: one shall be *De Vita Christi*, with the declaration of the Gospels; and the other the Epistles of Hierome, that he did write always to St. Paula and Eustochium; and in them I trust you shall see good things."⁵⁹⁵ In Mary's New Years gift list of 1557, it is reported that John Cawood gave Mary a book in "laten entitled vita Christi and a little boke of exhortation to young men" and received from Mary a gilt cruse of 11 ounces.⁵⁹⁶

The research guide relating to Mary Tudor at Lambeth Palace Library suggests that its copy of *Vita Christi* was the copy given to Mary by her mother, but it is more likely that it is the copy that John Cawood gave to her in 1557.⁵⁹⁷ When Katherine wrote to Mary sometime in early 1534 that she was going to send Mary a copy of *Vita Christi*,

⁵⁹⁵ British Library, Arundel MS 151, f. 195. The letter is in English. Here I have quoted the modern spelling as provided by the reprint of the letter in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, James Gairdner, ed., Vol. 6 (London, 1882), entry 1126.

⁵⁹⁶ Reprinted in Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 365. A cruse is a type of cup.

⁵⁹⁷ James Carley, *Books*, 110.

it probably would not have been a copy that was printed in Paris of that same year, but a copy that was printed earlier. Rather, Mary probably fondly remembered the *Vita Christi* given to her by her mother and something happened to her copy (it was taken from her or somehow damaged or destroyed). Cawood, her royal printer, must have found another copy which he then had bound and presented to her as a New Year's gift. That the bound version is from 1534 is either coincidence because that was the first edition Cawood could find and purchase or Cawood may have made an effort to find an edition from the exact year when Mary first came across the text. The binding of the Lambeth Palace Library copy is worn at the corners suggesting that Mary actively read this book. Whether Lambeth Palace Library's copy was given to Mary by her mother or her printer, it can be said with certainty that this book was in Mary's personal library.

Another source that identifies books owned by Queen Mary is the Binding Index provided by the British Library.⁵⁹⁸ Last updated in June 2013 by Philippa Marks, the Curator of Bindings at the British Library, this index identifies eight books with provenance of Mary I.⁵⁹⁹ The index, however, contains a disclaimer that not every binding has been confirmed to have belonged to each individual to whom it is attributed as some information originates from older records. Like Lambeth Palace Library's research guide for Mary Tudor, the Binding Index also identifies books which can no longer be considered to have belonged to Mary.⁶⁰⁰

⁵⁹⁸ Binding Index. http://www.bl.uk/reshelp/pdfs/bindings_index_a-z_2013.pdf. Accessed 1 November 2013.

⁵⁹⁹ British Library shelfmarks C.27.e.13; C.64.dd.11; C.66.d.17; C.66.f.2; C.24.c.15; C.46.c.1; 690.f.13; and C.65.gg.6.

Six of the books listed on the Binding Index, however, can be identified as having been bound for Mary by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder. One was bound for Mary before she became queen. British Library shelfmark C.66.d.17 is *Le Livre de novel reimprime faisant mention de sept paroles que nostre benoist saulueur & redepteur Jesuchrist dit en larbrede la croix*, and was printed in Paris in 1545. It is bound in the typical brown leather with gold inlay, but has no coat of arms on the cover. The letter “M” is stamped at least twenty times on each the front and back covers. The spine has alternating crowns and roses in the same pattern as many of the other spines done by the binder. The spine also bears the date 1545. The binding is very worn on the upper corners and cracked at the spine, making the book look much more heavily used than some of the other books bound for her. Yet, the pages are in good condition, with some even stuck together because of an “M” that was impressed many times onto the edges of

⁶⁰⁰ Two of the books listed have turned out not to have bindings identifiable to Mary. The first is C.64.dd.11. The book is in its original binding, but it is obviously not by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder. The front and back covers are red leather with a gold border, coat of arms, and initials “M.R.” However the coat of arms is that of Mary of Modena, wife of King James II. Also, the coat of arms is more ornate than that belonging to Mary Tudor and the crown above the coat of arms is the wrong crown to be that of Mary Tudor. More tellingly, the printed book inside the binding is *A Treatise of Policy and Religion*, printed by Thomas Farmer in 1696. Therefore, C.64.dd.11 should no longer be identified as having belonged to Queen Mary I. The second is shelfmark 690.f.13. It is bound in brown leather and contains no markings on either the front or back covers. The leather is in very bad condition; it is rough, rubbing off, and appears pitted. The spine has some gold markings and an abbreviated title. It bears some resemblance to the spines done by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, but the covers do not, as they are not nearly as soft or in as good condition. The printed book itself is *Duplex La vacrum in Coena Domini fidelibus exhibitum* by Fr. Franciscus Orlandus. It was printed in Florence in 1710. As the date of the book and the different binding show, there is no way that this book was made by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder or was ever even owned by Mary.

the pages. This binding is important because it is probably one of the first books bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, bound even before Edward became king.

As for the other five, C.66.f.2 has already been mentioned as Mary's bound copy of Herodotus and Thucydides. The other four are each devotional books, three of which were printed on the continent and the other in London. All four are bound in brown leather with gold inlays. *Expositio Beati Ambrosii Episcopi Super Apocalypsin* was printed in Paris in 1554.⁶⁰¹ The front and back covers are the same and each displays the arms of Queen Mary in the center but has no initials. *Epitome omnium operum divi avrelii Avgvstini, Episcopi Hipponensis* was printed in Cologne in 1549 (before Mary was queen), and was not bound until Mary was queen.⁶⁰² The front and back covers are highly decorated and in the center of each is the arms of Mary. To the left of the arms is an "M" and to the right of the arms is an "R." The spine does not have the crown and rose pattern as many of the books bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder have, but instead has the same floral pattern as the front and back covers, along with an abbreviated title and date of publication.

Shelfmark C.46.c.1 is actually two separate books that are bound together. Those books are *De la Grandevr de diev, et de la cognoissance qu'on peultauior de luy par ses oeuvres*, printed in Paris in 1557 and *De la Pvissance, sapience et bonte de diev*, printed in Paris in 1558. *De la Grandevr* was written by Pierre Du Val in 1553 and printed several times on the continent in the 1550s. It offers Du Val's interpretation of God and the cosmos. *De la Pvissance* was only printed once in 1558, and like *De la Grandevr*

⁶⁰¹ British Library C.65.gg.6.

⁶⁰² British Library C.24.c.15.

took the form of a poem. It does not have a credited author, but may have also been written by Du Val. The entire binding is in pretty poor condition, with damaged corners, the gold inlay rubbed off in some places, and the gold inlay almost entirely removed from the spine. Interestingly, the binding contains a decorative border with a coat of arms in the middle, but no initials or crown to indicate which monarch this was bound for (although underneath the coat of arms is some fancy scroll work which resembles an “M”). As the two books were printed in 1557 and 1558 and the binding contains no initials, this book could have either been bound for Mary or Elizabeth. This bound book was probably meant for Mary, but she may have died before it was completed for her. Without specific initials on the cover, the book then could have been given to Elizabeth.

The final book listed on the Binding Index is Bishop Bonner’s *A profitable and necessary doctrine, with certayne homelies adioyned thervnto set forth by the reuerende father in God, Edmonde byshop of London*, and it was printed in London in 1555 by John Cawood.⁶⁰³ In his homilies Bonner offered specific advice on religion and obedience to her congregation. Printed after Bonner’s homilies are prayers for Mary and Philip, including one asking for the safe return of Philip to England. This book is bound in brown leather with gold leafing.⁶⁰⁴ The front cover displays the arms of Mary, but no

⁶⁰³ British Library C.27.e.13.

⁶⁰⁴ G.D. Hobson identified British Library C.27.I.13 as a book printed in 1555 and bound by the Queen Mary Binder (before the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder was identified as the same shop). Hobson, *Bindings*, 78. However, the British Library does not have any book in its catalogue with that shelf number. There is a C.27.i.3, which is a book that was printed in Paris in 1556, but it is in binding dated 1695. Therefore, I suggest that this was a typographical error, and the book that Hobson identified was really C.27.e.13, which matches Hobson’s description. Hobson may have also misidentified Trinity College (Cambridge) Sel.d.55.4 as bound by the King Edward and 256

initials or title. The spine (now largely falling apart) contains a brief title, the print date, the initials “M.R.,” and an alternating rose and crown pattern, similar to the spine of Davis 87.

It makes sense that Mary owned a copy of Bonner’s book, as not only does the book contain homilies meant to help Catholic clergy prepare their own sermons, but it was also meant to be the official Catholic orthodoxy at that time. Bonner’s book closely resembled the *King’s Book* of 1543, thought to be Henry’s religious settlement that was closest to orthodox Catholicism.⁶⁰⁵ Mary must have owned a copy of Bonner’s book because it was part of the religious settlement that she was helping to re-establish alongside her bishops. She would have wanted easy access to the details of her renewed Catholic establishment. This also reflects that Mary chose to own books on religion, specifically books that defended Catholicism or were part of the medieval Catholic tradition. As with the *Vita Christi* and the first acts of Parliament, the fact that Mary owned Bonner’s book shows that Mary had bound and owned books that had personal meaning to her or that she was personally involved in producing. Moreover, Bonner’s

Queen Mary Binder and first owned by Mary. Hobson, *Bindings*, 76. However, a brief search of the library catalogues of Trinity College reveals that D.55.4 is a copy of Dante’s *La Divinia commeida* that was printed in 1889, so that is obviously not a book owned by Mary, and that Sel.d.55.4 is not a current classmark in the library. As Hobson’s study was done in 1929, it is possible that the book he mentioned has changed libraries or has been given a new call number. Therefore, this book, until located, cannot be confirmed as having belonged in Mary Tudor’s personal library. I have come across a reference to Trinity College, C.20.30, *An uniforme and catholyke prymer in Latin and English*, that was printed in 1555. This book may have been bound in white leather by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder with the initials “M.R.” imprinted on the binding, but I cannot confirm this reference.

⁶⁰⁵ Gina Alexander, “Bonner and the Marian Persecutions,” in *The English Reformation Revised*, ed. Christopher Haigh, Revised 2000 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 170.

book, as well as the other religious texts bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, demonstrate Mary's commitment to restoring the true religion and being equipped with texts that supported her position.

Only two books bound for Mary by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder were bound in white leather. M.M. Foot has suggested that those in white leather were more personal than those in brown calf leather, but that seems unlikely based upon the subject matter.⁶⁰⁶ White leather may have been a personal preference of Mary, as these books would have been more noticeable in her collection, yet the subject matter of the many of the books in brown leather was more personal to Mary. One, held by Merton College, Oxford, is a 1546 printed edition of Arnobius of Sicca's *Disputationum aduersus gentes libri VIII*.⁶⁰⁷ Arnobius was a Christian apologist whose seven books against the heathen were made popular by St. Jerome when he wrote about them. The binding appears to be from the 1540s, but was done no later than 1553 because only the initial "M" has been stamped into the center of the binding. The initial is surrounded by a flower and foliage design. Like all other books owned by Mary, this one has no marginalia or other signs of use.⁶⁰⁸

⁶⁰⁶ M.M. Foot, "Bookbinding 1400-1557," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Vol. III, eds. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 122. Foot has also suggested that the Greenwich Binder was actually more partial to white goat-skin leather bindings than was the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, 112.

⁶⁰⁷ Merton College, Oxford, 27.C.2.

⁶⁰⁸ I would like to thank Dr. Julia Walworth, a Fellow Librarian of Merton College, for sending me information on this book as well as looking through it for signs of readership.

Mary's ownership of a text by Arnobius of Sicca is significant for a three reasons. First, it would have been a safe Christian text for Mary to own, as it was bound for her sometime between 1546 and 1553 when ownership of overtly Catholics texts would have been dangerous. Secondly, the ownership of this book may have been a veiled commentary on the reformed religious changes being made in England; Mary was a good Catholic surrounded by reformed heathens. Third, in 1522 Erasmus translated a text by an Arnobius, and not realizing that there were two antique Christian writers of the same name, falsely attributed his book to Arnobius of Sicca. Around that time Katherine of Aragon had an established relationship with Erasmus and somehow Mary may have been familiar with "Arnobius" and interested in reading another of his texts. No matter how Mary came to have her copy of Arnobius, it must have been a safe text to own with subversive meaning for her.

The other book bound in white is now privately owned. Maggs Bros. Ltd., an antiquarian bookseller in London, issued a two-part catalogue entitled *Bookbinding in the British Isles* in 1996.⁶⁰⁹ In Part I of this catalogue, there was a book for sale that was bound in white doe skin by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder that has the initials "MR" in the center of the front cover.⁶¹⁰ There is no coat of arms, but there are four small lions passant and five fleur-de-lis on the cover. Also stamped into the binding twice are the initials "J.E." referring to John Ellis who owned the book in 1675, as inscription on the front endleaf reveals. The binding appears to be in very poor condition,

⁶⁰⁹ Maggs Bros. Ltd., *Bookbinding in the British Isles* (Over Wallop, Hampshire: B.A.S. Printers Limited, 1996).

⁶¹⁰ Maggs Bros. Ltd., 12-13. A photocopy of the font cover is on page 13.

but it was obviously bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder because of the tool marks. This book must have been bound for Mary sometime when she was queen. This particular book, *A brief and compendius table*, was translated into English by the reformer Walter Lynne and was printed by S. Mierdman in London in 1550.⁶¹¹ The subject matter is biblical history, albeit written by reformers, but it might still have been of interest to Mary to read the types of arguments which she would be educating the church of England to fight against.

Apart from Bonner's book, that of Mary's first Parliament and Lynne's translation, all of the other printed books that were bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder were printed in various places on the continent, such as Paris, Lyon, Basel, and Antwerp. These books tended to be entirely in Latin and religious in nature, apart from the Herodotus/Thucydides book. Even Arnobius of Sicca's text was an early defense of Christian theology. This demonstrates that while by the time of Mary's accession print within England was firmly established and largely completed by Englishmen, liturgical books were still too difficult for new presses to print, especially because they often involved two colors of ink and difficult layouts.⁶¹² As printers in England effectively lacked the tools to make decorative Catholic books during Mary's

⁶¹¹ Heinrich Bullinger, *A brief and compendiose table, in a maner of a concordance openyng the waye to the principall histories of the whole Bible, and the moste common articles grounded and comprehended in the newe Testament and olde, in maner as amply as doeth the great concordance of the Bible* (London: S. Mierdman, 1550). STC 17117.

⁶¹² Tamara Atkin and A.S.G. Edwards, "Printers, Publishers and Promoters to 1558," 27 - 44, at 36, and Alan Coates, "The Latin Trade in England and Abroad," 45-58, at 46, In *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476 – 1558*, eds. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014).

reign, they had to be imported.⁶¹³ Besides, the Catholic printers who remained in England during Mary's reign were busy printing books that legitimized Mary's reign and promoted Catholicism within England. The actual books that were needed for Mass were more easily printed on the continent at presses that were used to printing them. Mary's large collection of religious books bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder indicates that Mary not only frequently used liturgical books, but also had them decoratively bound for protection and preservation. Moreover, they were attractively bound because they also would have been on display and probably even passed around to be read by other ladies in her household.

Since none of the books bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder and owned by Queen Mary have any marginalia or written ownership marks by Mary, this suggests that she must have regarded her books as precious objects and understood their value both materially and educationally. Some do show significant wear around the edges, but many appear as though they simply sat on her shelves. This is particularly interesting, as she was given a humanist education, but her personally bound books were perhaps more objects to read infrequently rather than sources of knowledge to call upon. But in having a collection of highly decorated books in her chamber, available to be seen by others, especially the ladies of her household, Mary would have had a visible means of endorsing her own learning and authority. Unsurprisingly, her bound books with the most wear around the edges were her primers and psalters. This must reflect her priorities as queen. No longer was she as interested in continuing her humanist

⁶¹³ Andrew Pettegree, "Printing and the Reformation: the English exception," In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, eds. Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 178.

education, but now she had to concentrate on setting her own religious policies and being a good Christian wife by having a baby.

All Other Books in Mary's Possession

Mary owned numerous other books besides those bound by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder, but these, too, I had to piece together from many difference sources. Mary's will offers no clues as to books that she owned and bequeathed upon her death. The only bequests included are lands and monetary payments.⁶¹⁴ In his eighteenth-century copy, George Harbin made some omissions regarding many individual legacies to her women and servants, only noting that these legacies amounted to £3,400. Harbin gives no indication that these legacies were anything other than monetary payments. This means that Mary did not leave a personal account of books that she owned and passed down, especially as her will requested that all of her belongings be passed to any issue from her and Philip.

One avenue to determine other books owned by Mary is to look at the books given to her as New Year's gifts. Only her New Year's gift roll from 1557 is extant.⁶¹⁵ However, the gift list is not much more fruitful than the will. The gift list does mention

⁶¹⁴ Her original will no longer exists, but a copy of it was made by George Harbin in the eighteenth century. Harbin's transcript of Mary's will has since been reprinted. See *Privy Purse Expenses (FIX)*, clxxxv-ccv; J.M. Stone, *The History of Mary I., Queen of England, as found in the public records, despatches of ambassadors, in original private letters, and other contemporary documents* (London: Sands & co., 1901), 507-520); and Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 370-383.

⁶¹⁵ For this gift list I will be citing from the reprinted edition in Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 358-369.

approximately sixteen books given to Mary, but the descriptions of the books are so vague they are practically impossible to identify or trace. John Cawood's gift of two books to Mary has already been mentioned, and his gift can be traced to a specific extant book. Another printer, Reginald Wolfe (called Reyne in the gift list) also gave Mary a book, Georgius Agricola's *De re intellectual*, and received a thirteen-ounce gilt cruse in return. But his gift cannot be linked to a specific extant book, and may actually have been *De re Metallica*, Agricola's most influential book, as Agricola died in 1555 and *Metallica* was published posthumously in 1556.

Miles Hogarde gave Mary an unnamed book and received from her a five-ounce gilt salt cellar (simply called a salt in the gift list). Like Cawood's gift, Hogarde's gift to Mary can also be traced. It is not a printed book, as *The displaying of the Protestants* was his last printed book in 1556. Instead, this book is most likely the manuscript "A Mirroure of myserie," currently held by the Huntington Library, and also dedicated to Mary like many of his other books.⁶¹⁶ In the dedication to "Mirroure" Hogarde indicated that it was a New Year's gift, "As a token that the new yeare doth begyn / I presente to your grace..."⁶¹⁷ No other copy of this manuscript exists, so this was most likely the presentation copy.⁶¹⁸ Hogarde died in 1557 which could explain why the manuscript never made it to print. This would not have been the first presentation manuscript that Hogarde gave Mary as he previously gave her a presentation copy of *A treatise declaring*

⁶¹⁶ Huntington Library, HM 121.

⁶¹⁷ See C.W. Dutschke, *Guide to Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Huntington Library*, Vol. 1 (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1989), 154-155.

⁶¹⁸ Dutschke, *Guide*, 154.

*howe Christe was banished out of this realm: And howe it hath pleased God to bryng Christ home againe by Mary our moost gracious Quene, as I noted earlier.*⁶¹⁹

The remaining gifted books are listed by nothing more than vague descriptions, such as John Christopherson, Bishop elect of Chichester gave Mary a “book covered with red velvet,” Giles Beraldus gave Mary a book of the passion, and the secretary of the French ambassador gave Mary four books in French. Other gifted books included a “Spanish book covered with black velvet,” a book of prayers, some books of verses and ditties, and two instructional books on governance and war. Each man who gave Mary a book received a gift in turn, either a gilt cup, cruse, or salt, but some of the received gifts are no longer legible on the gift list roll. Interestingly, Mary did not give any New Year’s gifts of books, but only objects such as plates and cups. Perhaps, as Natalie Zemon Davis has suggested, Mary only gave traditional, expected New Year’s gifts as return for more impressive gifts that were given to her.⁶²⁰ Yet, Mary did give gifts of books when she was a princess. So her lack of gifts of books while queen confirms David Loades’s suspicion that Mary was not as interested in spreading humanism as were her parents, but more importantly, shows that she did not see her role as that of educator, but font of patronage and advocator for Catholicism instead.⁶²¹

There are a few other collections of books that belonged to Mary which also cannot be linked to extant books. James Carley has suggested that Mary saw Katherine

⁶¹⁹ British Library Harley MS 3444.

⁶²⁰ Natalie Zemon Davis suggests that “gift-giving was supposed to be a gracious, courteous, or friendly transaction, in which the obligation for return was not made explicit and gratitude was expected.” Davis, *The Gift*, 131.

⁶²¹ Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 6.

Parr as a spiritual mentor.⁶²² Thus, shortly after Mary became queen she retrieved many of Katherine's books from when Katherine lived at Sudeley Castle that were being held in the Tower and made them part of her own collection. The Sudeley Chest, the actual chest in which Katherine's possessions were placed in upon her death, was taken to the Tower and later despoiled by both Edward VI and Mary.⁶²³ The inventory of the chest is held in manuscript form in the British Library and has notations of the goods taken by Katherine's stepchildren.⁶²⁴ The Sudeley Chest contained twenty books and it appears as though sixteen or eighteen of them were delivered to Mary between August and September 1553.

On 20 August 1553 several books were taken from Katherine's chest and given to Mary including "a booke of golde enameled blacke garneshed with eighte and twentie small table rubies and one rocke rubie upon the claspe and on eche side of the bok a table diamounte," "a boke of the Newe Testamente in Englishe covered with purple vellat garneshed with silver and gilte," and "a Newe Testamente in Frenche."⁶²⁵ Five more books were delivered to Mary by the 20 August 1553 warrant: "two bookes covered with blewe vellat," "two bookes covered with crimson vellat", and "a booke covered with printed leather." Books taken by a warrant dated 20 September 1553 include "a booke of

⁶²² James Carley, *Books*, 142.

⁶²³ Susan E. James, *Kateryn Parr: The Making of a Queen* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 435.

⁶²⁴ British Library, Additional MS 46,348, ff. 205 – 209. The inventory has since been reprinted in two modern editions. See Susan E. James, *Kateryn Parr*, 435-442 and Carley, *Libraries*, 277-279.

⁶²⁵ James and Carley have slightly differing accounts of the Sudeley Chest inventory. Here, I have cited Carley, who kept the original spelling.

prayers covered with purple vellat and garnished with golde,” “a prymer in Inglishe covered with crimson vellat garnished with silver and gilte,” a couple books of prayers covered in velvet, two unidentified books covered in black velvet, and “two books covered with leather.” From the general descriptions of the books taken from Katherine Parr and delivered to Mary, it is practically impossible to identify if any of these books are extant. Carley has made some postulations regarding some of the books of psalms as perhaps being the book authored by Katherine Parr, but apart from his speculations, none of these books can be firmly identified. Yet, based upon the descriptions of these books, one thing is clear, these books were decoratively covered and bound with velvet, leather, and silver gilt, so they must have appealed to Mary both for their contents and their beauty.

One other book, not in Mary’s personal library, also points to the special relationship that Mary had with Katherine Parr. The library at Elton Hall owns a copy of *Psalmes or Prayers taken out of holye scripture*, a translation of Bishop John Fisher’s *Psalmi seu Precationes ex variis scripturae locis collectae*, which Janel Mueller argues was completed by Katherine Parr.⁶²⁶ As Mueller explains, the book was translated by Katherine Parr and then given to her husband, Henry VIII, who left inscriptions in his own hand alongside the text. After Henry’s death, the book further passed to Henry’s children, specifically Elizabeth, who also left inscriptions alongside the text. At some point, *Psalmes or Prayers* was bound with Thomas Cranmer’s *An exhortation vnto*

⁶²⁶ *Psalmes or Prayers taken out of holye scripture* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 25 April 1544) (STC 3002). John Fisher, *Psalmi seu Precationes ex variis scripturae locis collectae* (Cologne: 1525) and (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1544) (STC 2995). For all references to *Psalmes or Prayers*, see Janel Mueller, *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2011), 621-626.

prayer, which has an inscription from Princess Mary to Katherine Parr.⁶²⁷ Mueller suggests that these two texts were bound together based upon their connections with Katherine. Of relevance to this chapter is Mary's inscription to Katherine found on folios Ciiiv-Civr of Cranmer's book. Here, Mary wrote, "Madame I shall desyer your grace moste humblye to accepte thys rude hande and vnworthy whose harte and seruyce vnfaynedly you shall be sure of during my lyf contynually, Your must humble dowghter and seruante Marye." Mueller identifies the inscription as having been written close to the time of the book's publication and just after Katherine married Henry, so perhaps some time in 1545. There is no evidence that Mary ever owned this book or even gave it to Katherine Parr. Rather, Mary's inscription in Katherine's book was part of a larger practice of noble women writing in each other's books, as was tandem letter writing. Nevertheless, Mary's inscription in a book owned by Katherine Parr is important because it shows the good relationship between Mary and her step-mother. What is ironic about the inscription is that Mary wrote it in a book by Thomas Cranmer, a man whom Mary did not like because he presided over the annulment of her parents. But, his book was the first authorized vernacular service for the Church of England, so Mary showed conformity (or at least not open hostility) to her father's religious policy by writing in Katherine's copy of Cranmer's book.

⁶²⁷ Thomas Cranmer, *An Exhortation vnto prayer...to be read in euery church afore processyons. Also a letanie with suffrages to be said or song in the tyme of the said processyons* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 27 May 1544). STC 10622.

The Bodleian Library has two other books that have similar hand-written inscriptions by Mary.⁶²⁸ The first of these is a fifteenth-century manuscript, “Hore beate Marie Virginis secundum consuetudinem Anglie,” given to the Bodleian in 1615 by Richard Connock, a solicitor and auditor to Prince Henry of Wales.⁶²⁹ The manuscript is in Latin on parchment and probably originated in Holland. On folio 198v is Mary’s handwritten note to an unnamed lady-in-waiting. It reads,

Geate you such riches as when the shype is broken, may swyme away wythe the Master. For dyverse chances take away the goods of fortune; but the goods of the soule whyche bee only the trewe goods, nother fyer nor water can take away. Yf you take labour and payne to doo a vertuous thyng, the labour goeth away, and the vertue remayneth. Yf through pleasure you do any vicious thyng, the pleasure goeth away and the vice remayneth. Good Madame, for my sake remember thys. Your lovyng mystres, Marye Princesse.⁶³⁰

This inscription encourages the lady-in-waiting to value spiritual rather than material goods and to practice virtue instead of vice. It has been suggested that Mary personally

⁶²⁸ W. Salt Brassington has noted that Princess Mary often wrote inscriptions in books belonging to her friends. He also mentioned a “recent Tudor Exhibition” which had many books on display that contained such descriptions. W. Salt Brassington, *Historic Bindings in the Bodleian Library* (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Company, 1891), 52. It appears as though there was an Exhibition of the Royal House of Tudor at The New Gallery on Regent Street in 1890, one year before Brassington published his directory. The catalogue of the Tudor Exhibition reveals that the exhibition displayed thousands of Tudor-era items, including books, portraits, and physical remains of Mary. However, the catalogue never mentions any inscriptions written by Mary, so Brassington’s claim cannot be confirmed.

⁶²⁹ Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D. inf. 2.13. Previously MS 3083.

⁶³⁰ The inscription is reprinted in Brassington, 51-52 and William Dunn MacRay, *Annals of the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, 2nd edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), 52-53.

owned this book before giving it to her lady-in-waiting, but the inscription only indicates that Mary acquired this book so as to give it away.⁶³¹

The other inscription by Mary is written in a Latin and English book of prayers that was owned by Jane Wriothesley.⁶³² Like the other, it was written before Mary became queen, but is undated, so the exact date cannot be determined. On folio 45 Mary wrote: “Good Madame, I do desyer you most hartly to pray / That in prosperyte and adversyte I may / Have grace to keep the trewe way. / Your lovyng frend, to my...”⁶³³ The bottom of the folio has been cut off, so it no longer shows Mary’s signature. Neither of these books can be confirmed as having been owned by Mary, so she may have either purchased them or simply wrote in them as she did with Katherine Parr’s book. But, as all three inscriptions by Mary were made before she became queen, they are important because they show that as a princess she was much more interested in performing in the literary circles of other women at court, while as queen her interests were much more focused on the return of Catholicism.

James Carley has also identified books that belonged to Henry VIII that were delivered to Mary after she became queen. Coffers of Henry’s post-mortem belongings were placed in the secret jewel house in the Tower, the same location of the Sudeley Chest.⁶³⁴ One book that was in one of Henry’s coffers was transferred to Mary on 3

⁶³¹ Madan Falconer, H.H.E. Craster, and N. Denholm-Young, eds., *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, Vol. II, Part I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895 -1953), 586. Brassington, 51-52.

⁶³² Bodleian Library, Laud. MS Miscell. i.

⁶³³ MacRay, *Annals*, 54.

December 1554. A book “of golde enameled, clasped with a rubie, havinge on thone side a crosse of diamountes and vi other diamountes and thother side a flower de luce of diamontes and iiii rubies with a pendunte of white saphire and the armes of England, which booke is garnished with small emerodes and rubies hanging to a cheyne pillar fashion set with xv knottes, everie one conteyning iii rubies (one lacking) and a vyce to open a clock with one rubie and a dyamount.”⁶³⁵ The contents of the book are unknown, but its decoration again speaks to Mary’s preference for pretty books and objects. As Mary was an avid hunter, she also took possession of a coffer marked “S” containing “hawkes hoodes, belles, and bookes for hawkes...dosen also delivered to the quene per warraunt 22 Octobre 1556.”⁶³⁶ Mary most likely came into possession of these books on hawking, but it is not known how many or what they looked like, so they cannot be traced to specific volumes.

T.A. Birrell, another modern bibliophile, in his important lectures on the books of English monarchs, compiled a list of Queen Mary’s books.⁶³⁷ He, unlike most of the sources I have previously mentioned, gave brief descriptions of her books, but frustratingly neglected to list any libraries or shelfmarks where the books can be found. Most likely, the books listed by Birrell are held in the British Library. Birrell references many devotional books owned by Mary. He first describes a book bound in black with “Mary” stamped on the cover. It is a 1541 octavo edition of Dionysius Carthusianus’s

⁶³⁴ Carley, *Libraries*, 268.

⁶³⁵ As cited in Carley, *Libraries*, 268.

⁶³⁶ Carley, *Libraries*, 272. Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 119.

⁶³⁷ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 21-23.

work on the Epistles which was edited by Theodoric Loer in 1533. This edition was dedicated to Nicholas West, Bishop of Ely.⁶³⁸ Another devotional book in Mary's personal library was a book of Christ's words on the cross that was printed in French in Paris in 1545 and authored by Joannes Gagnaeus. The cover has an inlay of the letter "M."⁶³⁹ The third devotional book mentioned by Birrell is a 1545 edition of the *Margarita Evangelica*. According to Birrell, Mary's copy was a Latin translation by Nicolaus Eschius, which was an edition highly circulated among Catholics in the sixteenth century, particularly in women's religious houses.⁶⁴⁰ The last of the devotional books identified by Birrell is a Latin translation by A. van der Meer of the *Desiderius* of the monk Miguel Comalada, printed in Louvain in 1554.⁶⁴¹ Birrell notes that each of these four devotional books was scuffed at the corners as though they were highly used. His observation is similar to the observation that I made of the books bound for Mary that remain in the British Library. The religious books tend to look as though they were more heavily used as the bindings are in worse shape, which is to be expected as psalters and prayer books were meant to be used everyday. The condition of these volumes is evidence of devotion literally by the book.

⁶³⁸ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 21. I cannot find a book in the British Library catalogue that matches this description, though the book could be one held in another library in Great Britain.

⁶³⁹ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 21. I cannot find a book in the British Library catalogue that matches this description, yet there are several books by Gagnaeus in their holdings.

⁶⁴⁰ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 21-22. This may be British Library, C.72.a.1. This is a 1545 *Margarita Evangelica*, but the library catalogue gives no indication that this was ever owned by Mary.

⁶⁴¹ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 22. This is probably British Library, 847.c.13.(2.).

Birrell also claims that Mary owned “folios of St. Augustine in fine bindings and presentation copies of works by English churchmen such as Stephen Gardiner, Edmund Bonner, Cuthbert Tunstall and Alban Langdale.”⁶⁴² But, he gives no specific volumes for any of these authors, making it very difficult to trace them or even find them at all. The work by Edmund Bonner must be *A profitable and necessarye doctrine, with certayne homelies adioynded thervnto* from 1555 and mentioned earlier, because this edition is in the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder’s signature brown leather with gold inlay.⁶⁴³ The covers contain the arms of Mary, while only the spine displays her initials.

The folios of St. Augustine may be an early fifteenth-century edition of St. Augustine’s *Soliloquia*, yet not located in the British Library.⁶⁴⁴ Queen’s College, Cambridge has a copy of *Soliloquia*, and their particular manuscript is comprised of sixty-three vellum folios and bound in dark brown leather. Whether or not it is the book noted by Birrell, the Queen’s College manuscript can firmly be connected to Mary. On the folio 64 is written, “Thys bok ys my ladey maryes the kyenges davtter. jhs keppe and send the kyenge a pryenche. John huse the kyenges trev seruantt.”⁶⁴⁵ John Hussey must have given Mary this book when Henry was married to Anne Boleyn, as the inscription refers to Mary as lady and not princess and hopes that the king is able to father a prince.

⁶⁴² Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 22.

⁶⁴³ British Library, C.27.e.13.

⁶⁴⁴ Queen’s College, Cambridge, MS 13.

⁶⁴⁵ M.R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of Queens’ College Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905), 14-16.

Hussey was given the book by John Buller, as the first flyleaf bears an inscription of Buller's ownership, followed by an inscription which notes that Hussey was given the book by "Sir John."⁶⁴⁶ According to James McConica, John Hussey was a royal councilor and diplomat. In 1533 he became a chamberlain to Princess Mary. The next year, Hussey received the dedication of John Fewterer's *The myrrour or glasse of Christes passion*, printed by Redman. In 1536 his wife, Anne, was sent to the Tower for calling Mary "princess." Hussey's own loyalty to Henry VIII was also called into question, as in 1537 he was arrested for being involved in the Lincolnshire rising. That year he was tried and convicted.⁶⁴⁷

Birrell also mentions three books with Spanish connections that Mary owned, as well as a couple of books which were probably in Mary's library based on their subject matter.⁶⁴⁸ As for the Spanish books, Birrell gives no explanation as to why he believes these were part of Mary's library apart from Mary being interested in Spanish influences. The first of these is *Assertio Catholicae Fidei* by monk Peter de Soto, printed in Cologne in 1555.⁶⁴⁹ De Soto spent 1555 in London and Oxford and probably gave Mary a copy of the text.

The second Spanish text likely owned by Mary is *De iusta haereticorum punitione* by Spanish Observant Franciscan Alphonus a Castro, which was printed in

⁶⁴⁶ Hobson, *Bindings*, 14

⁶⁴⁷ McConica, *Humanists*, 132.

⁶⁴⁸ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 22-23.

⁶⁴⁹ Probably British Library, 478.a.5.

Salamanca in 1547.⁶⁵⁰ According to Birrell, Mary's copy had an ownership inscription by Bernardo a Fresneda, a Franciscan chaplain to Philip II who came to England in his entourage, as did Castro. *De iusta* was Castro's attempt to reconcile contemporary Catholic practices regarding heretics with canon law. In it, Castro argued that no sympathy or mercy should be shown to heretics (whom he defines as anyone who does not obey Catholic Church doctrine), but that heretics should be reprimanded in private so that they do not become publicly sympathetic figures.⁶⁵¹ Castro is usually credited as having advocated a more gentle approach to dealing with heretics instead of burning them, as he preached in a sermon at Philip and Mary's court in February 1555.⁶⁵² Castro's text is an important piece of Mary's library because it was probably given to her to influence her religious policies, yet it did not.

The third Spanish book that Birrell notes was owned by Mary was an account of Philip's travels in the Low Countries, only describing it as a book written in Spanish, printed in Antwerp in 1552 and bound by Christopher Plantin (c.1520-1589). Based on this description, this book must be Calvete de Estella's *El Felicissimo viaie d'el...Principe Don Phelippe...desde España à sus tierras de la baxa Alemaña: con la descripcion de todos los estados de Brabante y Flandes*. This book can also be identified as having belonged to Mary based on its binding. It is one of the only books in Mary's collection with a binding not by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder. Rather, it is

⁶⁵⁰ Probably British Library, 697.1.17.

⁶⁵¹ Edwards, *Mary I*, 261.

⁶⁵² Edwards, *Mary I*, 260.

bound in brown and green leather with gold inlay marks of a floral pattern.⁶⁵³ It was partially rebound in the nineteenth century. In the center of the front cover is an inlaid circle of vellum with Mary's coat of arms. The back cover has the same decoration as the front cover, but does not have the coat of arms. Plantin's work must have been pleasing to both Mary and Philip, as Philip later commissioned Plantin to print a King's Bible, made Plantin his own royal printer, and granted him the privilege to print all Catholic doctrinal books.

Birrell also surmises that Mary owned *Le fort inexpugnable de l'honneur du sexe feminine* by Francois de Billon and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda's *De Ritu Nuptiarum et Dispensatione*.⁶⁵⁴ The British Library has three copies of Billon's text. However, one copy has an early seventeenth-century French binding and was in the library of Louis XIII, so Mary's copy was probably one of the other two.⁶⁵⁵ Sepúlveda's text was first printed in Rome in 1531 and supported Katherine of Aragon's marriage to Henry VIII. Cawood reprinted the text in November 1553. Birrell suggests that Mary made Cawood print the book and probably owned a copy herself.⁶⁵⁶ Birrell's suggestion is probably correct because that November Parliament declared valid the marriage of Mary's mother and father. This text supported that point and gave Rome's position regarding the dispensation that allowed Henry and Katherine to marry. There is no doubt that Mary

⁶⁵³ British Library, C.47.i.4.

⁶⁵⁴ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 23.

⁶⁵⁵ British Library, G.10247 is that from Louis XIII's library. The other two are shelfmarks C.38.g.2 and 88.k.4.

⁶⁵⁶ The British Library has a copy, 697.f.25.(5.), but Mary could have owned any copy of this book.

would have wanted to print a book that supported their marriage, not only because it validated the marriage and asserted Mary's legitimacy, but also because it upheld Catholicism and the importance of the Church's point of view within England. Mary must have also owned a copy of that book alongside the acts of the Parliament that made the declaration. These books demonstrate that one of Mary's first objectives when she took the throne was to right the wrongs made by her father and brother.⁶⁵⁷

Even though some of the books that Birrell mentions cannot be corroborated, his identification of all of these books potentially owned by or supported by Mary, as well as the other English monarchs incorporated in his study, has been important in furthering the study of royal bibliography. While his study of Mary was not inclusive of all books owned by her, he identified some important patterns in her personal library that other books owned by her also support. Mary was very interested in books that supported her mother's position in the royal divorce. Mary heavily used her devotional books, not by writing in them with her own prayers and petitions, but by using them so frequently that the bindings wore at the corners and spines. And, Mary collected Catholic religious books that were printed on the continent. All of this points to Mary's desire to own texts that supported the return of Catholicism to England.

Mary's interest in continental religious books also included a few medieval manuscripts, which James Carley has argued "foreshadows the manner in which a variety of monastic manuscripts would be rescued (and sometimes hidden) by recusant collectors in the second half of the sixteenth century."⁶⁵⁸ One such manuscript was the famous

⁶⁵⁷ Loades, *Reign of Mary Tudor*, 56.

Psalter of Queen Ingeburg. The psalter was created in either the late-twelfth or early-thirteenth century in northeastern France. It contains 150 psalms and texts from the Bible, as well as a calendar of Saints days. It was owned by Queen Ingeborg, wife of Philip Augustus, and is a famous example of personal medieval devotional books. The psalter was only in England for about one hundred years before it returned to its native France. Allegedly, it was part of Philip's wedding gift to Mary, was put in the library at St. James's palace, and then later removed from the library, as noted by librarian Patrick Young.⁶⁵⁹ According to Carley, Young was the official Keeper of the King's Libraries. In 1649 he was no longer keeper, but was asked to inventory the royal collection. On 20 November 1650, Young discovered that the royal collection was largely intact, but was missing some very rare books, including the psalter.⁶⁶⁰ The psalter is now held in the Musée Condé in Chantilly, France.⁶⁶¹ The Ingeborg Psalter is often cited and studied for its beautiful illustrations, but practically never for its possession by Mary in England.

Another medieval manuscript has an inscription suggesting that it was a gift to Mary. Sometime when Mary was queen, she was given a late-thirteenth century psalter with a calendar on vellum.⁶⁶² The manuscript was probably made in Bruges or Ghent and

⁶⁵⁸ Carley, "Writings," 50.

⁶⁵⁹ George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, eds., *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections in the British Museum*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921), xvii.

⁶⁶⁰ Carley, *Books*, 149.

⁶⁶¹ Musée Condé, MS 1695.

⁶⁶² British Library, Royal MS 2 B.III.

consists of many coarse illuminations.⁶⁶³ The illuminations and coloring are very similar to those of British Library, Sloane MS 2565, the fifteenth century Book of Hours bound with Mary's arms and initials. According to Deirdre Jackson, at the beginning of the sixteenth century the psalter was owned by a scholar at the University of Cambridge, who is the author of the marginalia in the text. Next, it was owned by Rafe Pryne, who wrote the inscription to Mary. On the flyleaf is written "God saue the most vertuous and nobull Quene Marys gras and send her to injoye the croune of Eynghlande longe tyme and spas, her enimys to confunde and hutterly to deface, and to folo her godly procedynges God geue us gras, as euery subyecte ys bounde for her gras to praye that god maye preserve her body from all daungers both nyght and daye. God save the Quene. Be me your humbull and poore orytur Rafe Pryne, grocer of Loundon wishyng your gras prosperus helthe." It is not known how the book came into Pryne's possession, or if in fact it was he who gave it to Mary.⁶⁶⁴ But, his inscription does make it seem like it was a gift to her, as his inscription resembles a dedicatory poem. The final line of the inscription, in which Pryne takes credit for the verse, would not have been necessary if Pryne were keeping the psalter in his own collection of books and suggests that Pryne wanted Mary to know and remember that it was he who gave it to her.

Baldwin Smith, a customs officer, also gave Mary a gift of a medieval manuscript psalter.⁶⁶⁵ Famously, Smith intercepted the book in October 1553 before it was removed

⁶⁶³ Warner and Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, Vol. 1, 39.

⁶⁶⁴ Deirdre Jackson, "Psalter," In *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination*, Scot McKendrick, John Lowden and Kathleen Doyle, eds. (London: The British Library, 2011), 267.

from England. Smith wrote his name and an account of his retrieval of the psalter on folio 319v, and then presented the psalter to Queen Mary. Mary apparently cherished the psalter so much that she had it rebound and may have even used it in her personal devotions. The psalter still has the binding commissioned by Mary, of which both covers are wrapped in red velvet and contain an embroidered gold pomegranate along with clasps engraved with a portcullis, fleur-de-lis, a lion, and a dragon (the emblems of the house of Tudor). Prior to Smith recovering the psalter, it was owned by Henry Manners, second earl of Rutland, who was actually a devout evangelical and arrested shortly after Mary came to the throne. He left an inscription on folio 84 of his ownership, which has since been partially erased. Not much is known of the psalter before Rutland's ownership apart from that it was created in England sometime at the beginning of the fourteenth century, most likely for a royal patron because of its size and detail. Its beauty and detail have made it one of the most famous psalters in the collection at the British Library, especially because it is one of the most extensively illustrated psalters ever produced and it is thought to have been illustrated only by one scribe.

The final medieval Catholic manuscript in Mary's personal collection is a book of hours that was created for the Butler family, specifically for Thomas Butler, seventh earl of Ormond. Bound in new green velvet, the book also has silver-gilt pieces on the center and corners of the front and back covers.⁶⁶⁵ The center piece is delicately etched with the initials "M.R.," most likely for Queen Mary. The manuscript contains a calendar with dates relating to the Butler family, including the dates of death of many family members.

⁶⁶⁵ British Library, Royal MS 2 B.VII.

⁶⁶⁶ British Library, Royal MS 2 B.XV

The creation date of the manuscript is unknown, but if made for the seventh earl, then it must have been written between 1426 and 1515, probably between 1495 and 1510. There is no indication of when it came into Mary's possession, but probably did so via Katherine of Aragon, to whom Butler was Lord Chamberlain from 1509 to 1512. Ironically, Butler was the great-grandfather of Anne Boleyn. The manuscript has no marginalia, apart from additions to the calendar, and the pages are in good condition. Mary must have treated the manuscript well, but also used it frequently for the original binding to have to be replaced with the modern green velvet and just the gilt pieces to remain intact.

These four medieval Catholic manuscripts show that not only was Mary an important font of patronage whom men gave to in return for favor, but also that Mary was considered a safe repository for medieval Catholic manuscripts. If Mary owned these books, there was less chance that they would be destroyed by protestants or taken to the continent, especially as was the case with the psalter retrieved by Smith. Even if the books ended up in the royal collection or in one of the libraries at one of Mary's many palaces, as did the Psalter of Queen Ingeburg, it still would have been safe from being destroyed. Certainly the royal library would not have been ransacked for recusant Catholic texts, no matter who the monarch. Yet, these manuscripts, as do many of the books in Mary's personal collection, demonstrate that Mary did differentiate her personal library books from those of the royal library, based on the great care that she took of them and her desire to collect mostly Catholic texts instead of many types of texts that would have bolstered the importance of the royal collection.

Not only were monastic manuscripts rescued after the Dissolution, as Carley has suggested, but also some printed books with monastic connections later ended up in the collections of recusant Catholics. Pierpoint Morgan Library holds a copy of William Bonde's *Pylgrimage of Perfection* that was printed by Richard Pynson in 1526, in which Mary wrote her name, "Marye the quene/Ave Maria."⁶⁶⁷ Bonde was a brother of the Bridgettine house at Syon Abbey. This specific copy appears to have first been owned by Henry VIII, as it contains his signature. Edward Seymour, Lord Protector Somerset, is the next recorded owner of the book. Based on his inscription, "from my Royale maistere," it seems as though Edward VI gave it to him. From Seymour, the book entered Mary's hands, who probably obtained it through the sequestration of Seymour's goods.⁶⁶⁸

One final book associated with the personal library of Mary is a Book of Hours of the Virgin that was printed by Robert Granjon in Lyon in 1558.⁶⁶⁹ Granjon printed the book in *caractère de civilité*, a typeface that he invented which resembled handwriting. The book is covered in red velvet, with extra velvet so that it could be attached to a belt or girdle. On the front cover is "MARIA" in silver letters. There is a crown above the "r," and flanking the "r" is a silver Tudor rose and a silver pomegranate. The back cover features "REGINA" in silver letters and Mary's coat of arms in the middle.⁶⁷⁰ The text

⁶⁶⁷ Pierpoint Morgan Library, W 14 B.

⁶⁶⁸ Carley, *Books*, 144-145.

⁶⁶⁹ *Horae in Laudem Beatissime Virginis Mariae ad Usus Romanum* (Lyon: Robert Granjon, 1558). This particular copy is held by Stonyhurst College.

was printed sometime in early 1558, before Mary's death in November, as evidenced by a table of feasts which lists the date for Easter that year. According to Jan Graffius, it has been assumed that Mary Tudor used this book until her death, at which time it was passed to Elizabeth, who then gave it to her cousin, Mary, Queen of Scots. This prayer book is known to have been owned by Mary, Queen of Scots, and Stonyhurst tradition holds that Mary had this book with her on the scaffold. Graffius suggests that since Mary, Queen of Scots considered herself to be Queen of England that it is unlikely that Elizabeth graciously passed this prayer book on to Mary Stuart. Rather, the book probably never left Lyon and was given to Mary Stuart because of her connection to the English throne.⁶⁷¹ Thus, I suggest that this book was never in Mary Tudor's library, but was meant to be.

This group of books, those with bindings (not by the King Edward and Queen Mary Binder) signifying that they were probably part of Mary's personal library as well as others that Mary was given or inherited, suggests some intriguing battles over books. As queen, Mary was often given gifts of books, but she never gave gifts of books. She must have enjoyed receiving such presents, but thought that gilt objects and monetary payments were more appropriate for her to give. Mary was also the recipient, or rather took, many books that were in the collections of her father and Katherine Parr. These items were placed in the Tower, but Mary had them removed so that she could use them. More to the point, are the bound devotional books found in Mary's collection. These

⁶⁷⁰ I would like to thank Mrs. Jan Graffius at Stonyhurst for providing me color images of the covers.

⁶⁷¹ See Jan Graffius, "The Stuart Relics in the Stonyhurst Collections," *Recusant History*, 31 (Oct., 2012), 147–69.

books include an array of medieval manuscripts that were given to Mary because they were Catholic devotional texts and their previous owners did not want them to be destroyed, as so many other medieval devotional works had been. The books in Mary's collection, then, were given to her or owned by her because they were contentious for their religious, and some times even political, subject matter, and by having them in Mary's personal library (and maybe later the Royal Library) was the best method to protect them.

Conclusion

As this overview of Mary's personal library has shown, Mary owned a large number of books besides those that were part of the residential royal libraries that were started by Edward IV and greatly enhanced by Henry VII. Many books in her personal collection were bound specifically for her. Others in her library were books given to her to elicit patronage. Many collections of books also came into her possession through inheritance and New Year's gifts. She owned sundry devotional books, but must not have had a favorite Book of Hours or Psalter because many of hers were heavily used, and she probably had even more than those that are extant. Moreover, the number of handsome manuscripts and bindings that she owned shows that Mary valued her books not only for their contents, but also as beautiful objects. However, it is not known what happened to Mary's personal library collection; her will gives no indication of who inherited her belongings, and in any event, Elizabeth did not follow any of the provisions in Mary's will.

Mary's personal library, however, is a previously underused element of discovering the type of woman and the type of queen that Mary envisioned herself to be. I suggest that Mary's personal library, both books that she chose to own and those that were given to her, reflect that Mary defined herself as a well-educated, religious queen whose duty was to restore Catholicism to England. Mary's primary objective when she became queen was to rebuild Catholicism, and owning (and reading or consulting) religious texts of various forms and topics helped her to facilitate religious change. The few humanist books in Mary's personal collection show that she had an interest in humanist texts based upon her education but that she was also aware that as a noble Catholic woman she was to have a classical education. Importantly, Mary's personal collection of books also suggests that Mary understood her books to be only hers and not part of the royal collection, even if they were used by other women in her household.

While it may be practically impossible to identify every book that was once in Mary's library, the value of cataloguing her personal library is that it shows more work can be done regarding Mary's personal inventories. In gaining a fuller picture of Mary as both a queen and woman, it will be possible to more closely reach the actual character of Mary rather than the "Bloody Mary" caricature that she still has not quite shed.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

To conclude this study, I would like to return to the assertion of David Loades first mentioned in the introduction. Loades suggests that Mary “received innumerable dedications of works of Catholic devotion or polemic; but they tell us nothing beyond the fact that she was famously orthodox, and reputed to be remarkably learned for a woman.”⁶⁷² It is my hope that this work has proven that David Loades was too hasty in that dismissal. Of course the dedications endorsed her orthodoxy and education, but more importantly, they illuminated the spheres in which her male dedicators expected Mary to have power, specifically religion, education, and obedience, but not statecraft. Moreover, they also demonstrated how Mary was able publicly to negotiate with her dedicators, either through patronage or endorsement of a book. Therefore, this dissertation argues that book dedications to Mary were an arena in which Mary negotiated patronage, politics, religion, and gender roles with her dedicators. Printed book and manuscript dedications were at the juncture between the actual interests (and reading abilities) of Lady Margaret Beaufort, the six consorts of Henry VIII, and Mary Tudor and the beliefs and hopes of those who wrote and printed them on what was suitable for royalty and how royal ladies might be persuaded in certain directions.

⁶⁷² Loades, “The Personal Religion of Mary,” 19-20.

Dedications, and the negotiations that accompanied them, reveal both contemporary perceptions of how statecraft, religion, and gender were and political maneuvering attempting to influence how they ought to be.

It is often pointed out by scholars that just because a book had a dedication to a royal lady does not mean that she patronized the dedicator or that she actually read the accompanying book, and it is quite telling when there is evidence that Mary and her royal predecessors did not read the dedicated books. However, I suggest that dedications can be understood as negotiations between patrons and clients and that some evidence can be found to support readership and payment. For example, Mary rewarded Henry Parker, Lord Morley, yearly for dedicated manuscripts that he gave her as New Year's gifts and there is evidence that Mary supported the printing of texts by Miles Hogarde that he first gave to her as presentation manuscripts. Even when evidence of patronage is not apparent, dedications should be studied and considered important because the person making the dedication thought that the book should be read because it could help and instruct the recipient. Dedications also illuminate what kinds of books the intended recipients were believed to read and what kinds of books that dedicators thought they needed to read. Therefore, this dissertation suggests that dedications are revealing of perceptions of Mary, other royal ladies, and King Philip and can be used to extract social and political meaning from texts.

Not only do dedications reveal the types of books that Mary was interested in and those that dedicators thought she should read, they also expose how dedicators thought books should be read and used for the betterment of Mary, her household, and

her subjects. Texts that were dedicated to Mary as a princess had an agenda of education and were directed to her so as to instruct her in both humanism and virtue. Printed books dedicated to Mary when she was queen sought to negotiate religious policies with Mary while continuing to instruct her and her subjects in virtue, obedience, and classical literature and philosophy. Manuscript dedications to Mary were personal and indicated developed personal relationships, yet still desired to guide the queen in areas in which dedicators expected she held power, specifically the return of the true religion.

In addition to this study suggesting that printed book and manuscript dedications reveal a process of textual negotiation, it has also suggested a few other important themes regarding book dedications, the first of which is the commercial value of book dedications. Printers dedicated books, usually only as a brief mention in a colophon, to Lady Margaret Beaufort so as to have her name endorse the new practice of print. This practice was so successful that dedicators continued the practice with the six wives of Henry VIII. Yet, Lady Margaret was highly involved in the new practice of print and graciously supported early printers such as Pynson and de Worde. Dedications to the six consorts also added commercial value to a book, but were much more elaborate and had the dual function of soliciting patronage from the queen, her husband, or both. Dedications to Mary were also expected to increase readership and saleability, particularly as dedicators often explicitly asked Mary to support a text so that it would be read by her ladies and her subjects. Therefore, royal endorsement via dedications made a book more significant.⁶⁷³

⁶⁷³ Birrell, *English Monarchs*, 23.

Related to book dedications supporting the new efforts and print and saleability of books is another important theme that this dissertation has raised: the intersection of manuscript and print in the early-sixteenth century. The first half of the sixteenth century saw significant overlap of the prestige of and desire for manuscripts and printed books, as Mary received both until her death. In fact, she received at least eighteen dedicated manuscripts in her lifetime compared with thirty-three printed book dedications. Yet, I suggest that there was a difference in intentionality between manuscripts and printed books dedicated to Mary. Printed books were produced *en masse* and were meant for both Mary and public readership. Manuscripts dedicated to Mary, however, were meant for a sole audience of Mary. These dedications could be more personal and were much more likely to elicit a response from Mary, whether it be payment or patronage. For manuscripts, dedicators may have appealed to Mary so as to have their manuscripts become printed books, or they may have dedicated to Mary just because they had a personal bond. No matter what, manuscript dedications were more personal, even if they had an agenda.

Even though dedicated manuscripts had a select audience and were more personal than printed book dedications, all dedications to Mary sought to educate her in some way. Of course the desire for patronage was ever-present, but dedicators always provided instruction covertly veiled as praise so as to influence Mary. When she was a princess, Mary received eight printed book dedications, and in these dedicators not only instructed Mary in foreign languages and classics, as did Duwes and Vives, but also in religion and virtue so as to prepare her for a path of queenship, most likely as the queen consort of

another country. Dedicators even wrote textbooks specifically for Mary's education, as well as treatises on how to live according to Scripture. However, as a princess, Mary was never truly able to negotiate with her dedicators. As queen, Mary did plenty of negotiating, especially as it pertained to how dedicators sought to instruct her and how Mary intended to instruct her subjects. Dedicators attempted to influence Mary's efforts in obtaining obedience from her subjects, continuing her childhood education in classical literature and philosophy (as humanism was always present in her dedications), and in returning Catholicism to England.

It was actually the return of the true religion that dominated the discussions in dedications to Mary and influenced the collection of her own personal library. Dedications to Mary make two things clear: one, that she was expected to return England to the Catholic Church, and two, that Henrician Catholicism was the preferred religious settlement of Mary's subjects. The books dedicated to Mary on religion never mentioned the papacy, but only a return to the true church, suggesting that Mary's England desired the Catholicism as established by the Henrician settlement of 1547. As England had not been under the influence of the pope for over twenty years by the time Mary took the throne, there was no real desire to go back under his control, but instead to only have conservative doctrine that observed all seven sacraments and allowed people to celebrate Mass. It is with this point that I have challenged another of Loades' assertions that Catholics were active in printing, "but only with a modicum of government patronage and support."⁶⁷⁴ While Mary did not support every Catholic book and writer, she did negotiate with many over the return of Catholicism and took England's well-being into

⁶⁷⁴ Loades, *Reign of Mary Tudor*, 112.

consideration when she chose not to emphasize the return of the papacy. Even Mary's own library demonstrated her self-image as a queen destined to return England to the true religion.

Statecraft, unsurprisingly, was not an area where Mary's dedicators felt the need to offer her instruction. It was assumed that Mary was not competent in statecraft, as a woman, and she was not expected to be. Therefore, dedications often mentioned that Mary had wise council who made political decisions. Interestingly, English dedications to Mary and Philip or only to Philip often shared the same sentiment. They are significant because they enforce the revisionist idea that Philip held relatively little power while in England. The lack of dedications to him show that he was understood to have no patronage power. In his short time in England, Philip was not a viable political or literary influence.

Importantly, this dissertation is revisionist as well, particularly within book history and Marian studies. My study contributes to the new historiography concerning how women, specifically royal women, were involved in book creation, production, and dissemination, through the relatively underused sources of dedications. As Helen Smith has recently argued, dedications reveal that women were considered important by authors, printers, and dedicators, even if exact relationships cannot always be determined. Dedications are also evidence that women were more heavily involved in literary activities, besides translations, than has previously been acknowledged.

My study also contributes to the current revisionist approach being taken in Marian studies. Revisionist studies of Mary, particularly biographies and church

histories, now consider Mary's reign in its own right, no longer as the brief stopping period before Elizabeth could bring England into the Golden Age. My study also builds upon William Wizenan's suggestion that men dedicated to Mary to publicly declare to their readers that they were involved in the revival of Catholicism within England. I, too, have examined the books dedicated to and owned by Mary as sources that explain how Mary chose to handle religious reform and how her subjects thought she ought to deal with religious reform. No longer can we accept Foxe's picture of Marian literature as non-influential polemic, as Foxe depicted the poems by William Forrest. Dedications reveal the social concerns of having Mary as the first ruling queen regnant.

Finally, this dissertation offers the first comprehensive catalogues of manuscripts dedicated to Mary and all books known to have been in Mary's personal library. Other scholars, such as Birrell, have put together selected lists, but I have compiled all known books associated with Mary Tudor for the first time. Her library included books that she purchased, had bound, or were given to her as gifts. It consisted of mostly religious and devotional works, particularly Catholic books and manuscripts that were rescued from destroyed monastic collections. Many were highly illustrated and illuminated, and many others were gorgeously bound, suggesting that Mary was interested in books not only for their words, but also for their beauty.

By creating a catalogue of Mary's books, this dissertation will allow scholars to rethink the roles that writers expected Mary to perform. However, this dissertation has left open many avenues of research into Marian literature for other scholars. Primarily, the debate surrounding the Marian use of the printing press has yet to be settled, and this

dissertation is not in the position to determine if print in England flourished or failed under Mary or if Catholics or Protestants more effectively used the presses. Also, scholars may want to more closely examine the men who dedicated to Mary to discover who else they dedicated to, the approximate success of their printed works (if applicable), and just what influence these books had over public practice. More work may also be done on the Royal Library, the fate of Mary's personal book collection, and in-depth analyses of manuscripts cited here of which little is presently known. Clearly, Henrician Catholicism was the preferred Catholicism of Marian England, and scholars can now use sources such as dedications to help determine the influence of Marian literature on recusant Catholics during Elizabeth's reign.

WORKS CITED

Primary

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS Cherry 36, MS Wood empt. 2, MS 431, MS Auct. D. infra 2.13, Laud. MS Miscell. I, Auct. Y 2.1

British Library

Additional MS 33772, Royal 2 A XVIII, C.66 d.6, Davis 87, C.66.f.2, Royal MS 2 B.III, Royal MS 2 B.VII, Arundel 151, Additional MS 4638, ff.205-209, Royal MS 2 B.XV, Sloane MS 3565, C.24.c.15, C.65.gg.6, C.27.e.13, Harley MS 3444, C.64.dd.11, C.66.d.17, C.46.c.1. 690.f.13, C.47.i.4, Cotton Vesp. F xiii, Additional MS 4712, Royal MS 18 A.XV, Royal MS 2 D. XXVIII, Royal MS 17 A.XXX, Royal MS 18 A. LX, Royal MS 17 C.XII, Royal MS 18 A.XV, Royal MS 17 C.XVI, Royal MS 17 A.XLVI, Additional MS 12060, Harley MS 1703, Royal MS 17B.XL, Royal MS 7 D.IV, Royal MS 8 A.XVI, Royal MS 12 D.V, Royal MS 16 E.XXVII, Royal MS 13 B.X, Royal MS 15 B.XIII, Royal MS 12 A. XI, Royal MS 12 A.XLIX, Royal MS 12 A.XX, Cotton MS Titus C VII, C.72.a.1,847.c.13.(2.), 478.a.5, 697.1.17, G.10247, C.38.g.2, 88.k.4, 697.f.25.(5.), Harley MS 1860

Cambridge University Library

MS Dd.VI.56

Huntington Library

HM 121

King's College, Cambridge

MS 24

Lambeth Palace Library

H2000.Q8, H2015.(A2 1550), F.298.(L2), H4654.(L5), MS 2001

Musée Condé

MS 1695

New College, Oxford
BT3.145.20

Pierpoint Morgan Library
W 14 B

Queen's College, Cambridge
MS 13

St John's College, Cambridge
N.24

Trinity College, Cambridge
D.55.4

Westminster Abbey
MS 39

Yale University Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library
BV4831 .H5 1494+

Angell, John. *The agreement of the holye fathers, and Doctors of the churche, vpon the cheifest articles of Christian religioun as appeareth on the nexte syde folowinge, very necessary for all curates.* London: William Harford, 1555. STC 634.

Becon, Thomas. *The pomaunder of prayer.* London: John Day, 1561. STC 1746.

Bernard, S. *A compendius and moche frutefulle treatyse of well liuyng, and contaynyng the hole sume and effect of al virtue.* Trans. by Thomas Paynell. London: Thomas Petyt, 1545. STC 1908.

Blanchardyn and Eglantine. Westminster: William Caxton, 1490. STC 3124.

Bible. Trans. by Miles Coverdale. Cologne: E. Cervicornus and J. Soter, 1535. STC 2064.

Boorde, Andrew. *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge.* Edited and Introduction by F.J. Furnivall. London: Early English Text Society, 1870.

Borde, Andrew. *The first boke of the introduction of knowledge. The whych dothe teach a man to speake part of all maner of languages, and to knowe the vsage and fashion of al maner of countreys. And for to know the moste part of all maner of coynes and money, the whych is currant in euery region Made by Andrew Borde, a Physycke Doctor. Dedyicated to the righy honorable and gracious lady Mary*

doughter of our souerayne lorde king Henry the eyght. London: William Copeland, 1555?. STC 3383.

Bullinger, Heinrich. *A brief and compendiose table, in a maner of a concordance openyng the waye to the principall histories of the whole Bible, and the moste common articles grounded and comprehended in the newe Testament and olde, in maner as amply as doeth the great concordance of the Bible.* London: S. Mierdman, 1550. STC 17117.

Bush, Paule. *Here begynneth a lytell treatyse in Englysshe, called the extripacion of ignorancy: and it treateth and speketh of the ignorance of people, shewyng them howe they are bounde to feare god, to loue god, and to honour their prince. Which treatise is lately compiled by sir Paule Busshe preest, and bonhome of Edyndon; and dedicate vnto the yong and most hie renomed lady Mary, princes doughter vnto the noble progenytour, our worthy souerayne kyng Henry the eight, kyng of Englande and of Fraunce, and the defender of ye christenfaith.* London: Richarde Pynson, 1526?. STC 4186.

Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary, 4 vols. London: Public Record Office, 1970.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Mary I. C.S. Knighton, ed. London, Public Record Office, 1998.

Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Mary, 1553-1558, William B. Turnbull, ed. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1861.

Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice. Edited by Rawdon Brown et al. 38 vols. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1864-1947.

Cancellor, James. *The Pathe of Obedience, righte necessarye for all the king and Quenes maiesties louing Subiectes, to reade, learne, and use their due obediences, to the hyghe powers accordyng to thys godly treatise compiled by James Cancellor, one of the Quenes Maiesties moste honourable Chapell.* London: John Wayland, 1553. STC 4564.

Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine, c. 1489, From Lord Spencer's Unique Imperfect Copy, Completed by the Original French and the Second English Version of 1595. Leon Kellner, ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1890.

Christopherson, John. *An exhortation to all menne to take hede and beware of rebellion: wherein are set forth the causes, that commonlye moue men to rebellion, and that no cause is there, that ought to moue any man there vnto, with a discourse of the*

miserable effectes, that ensue therof, and of the wretched ende, that all rebelles comme to, moeste necessary to be redde in this seditiouse and troublesome tyme. London: John Cawood, 1554. STC 5207.

Coldewel, George. *Boetius de consolation philosophiae. The boke of Boetius, called the comforte of philosophye, or wysedome, moche necessary for all men to read and know, wherein suche as be in aduersitie, shall fynde muche consolation and comforte, and suche as be in great worldly prosperitie may knowe the vanitie and frailtie therof, and consequently fynde eternall felycytie.* London: John Cawood, 1556. STC 3201.

Constable, John. *Ioannis Constablii Londinensis et artium professoris epigrammata.* London: Richard Pynson, 1520. STC 5639.

Cope, Anthony. *A godly meditacion vpon. xx. select and chosen Psalmes of the prophet Dauid as wel necessary to al them that are desirous to haue ye darke wordes of the prophet declared and made playn: as also fruitfull to suche as delyte in the contemplatio[n] of the spiritual meanyng of them.* London: For John Daye, 1547. STC 5717.

Cranmer, Thomas. *The copy of certain lettres sent to the Quene, and also to doctour Martin and doctour Storye, by the most reuerende father in God, Thomas Cranmer Archebishop of Cantorburye from prison in Oxeforde.* Emden: Egidius van der evre, 1556.

Cranmer, Thomas. *An Exhortation vnto prayer...to be read in euery church afore processyons. Also a letanie with suffrages to be said or song in the tyme of the said processyons.* London: Thomas Berthelet, 27 May 1544. STC 10622.

Dowling, Maria, ed. "William Latymer's Chronickille of Anne Bulleyne." *Camden Miscellany*, xxx (1990).

Duwes, Giles. *An introductory for to lerne to rede, to pronounce, and to speake Frenche trewly, compyled for the right high, excellent, and the most vertuous lady, the lady Mary of Englande, doughter to our most gracious souerayn lorde kyng Henry the eight.* London: Thomas Godfray, 1533. STC 7377.

Ellis, Henry. *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History.* Vol. II. First Series. London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard. 1825.

Elyot, Sir Thomas. *Defence of Good Women.* London: Thomas Berthelet, 1540. STC 7657.5.

- Elyot, Sir Thomas. *Defence of Good Women*. Reprinted by Diane Bornstein in *The Feminist Controversy of the Renaissance*. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1980.
- Elyot, Sir Thomas. *Defence of Good Women*. In Edwin Johnston Howard, ed. *Sir Thomas Elyot's The Defence of Good Women*. Oxford, OH: The Anchor Press, 1940.
- Erasmus. *The dialoge called Funus (1534) & A very pleasaunt & fruitful Diologe called The Epicure (1545)*. Ed. Robert Allen. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press for the Newberry Library, 1969.
- Erasmus. *The first tome or volume of the paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the newe testament*. London: Edward Whitechurch, 1548. STC 2854.
- Erasmus. *Institution of Christian Marriage*, trans. by Michael Heath, in Josh O'Malley and Louis Perraud, eds., *Collected Works of Erasmus: Spiritualia and Pastoralia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 203- 438.
- Fisher, John. *The English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester*. Ed. by John E.B. Mayor. London: Early English Text Society, 1876.
- Fisher, John. *Psalmi seu Precationes ex variis scripturae locis collectae*. Cologne: 1525 and London: Thomas Berthelet, 1544. STC 2995.
- Fisher, John. *This Sermon folowyng was compyled [and] sayd in the cathedral chyrche of saynt Poule within ye cyte of London by the right reuerende fasder in god John bysshop of Rochester, the body beyng present of the most famouse prynce kyng Henry the. vij.* London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 10900.
- Fisher, John. *Treatise concernynge the fruytfull saynges of Dauyd the kyng*. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1508. STC 10902.
- Forrest, William. *The History of Grisild the Second: A Narrative, In verse, of the Divorce of Queen Katharine of Aragon*. Ed. by W.D. MacRay. London: Chiswick Press, 1875.
- Harchies, Josse de. *Pro instauratione reipublicae angl proque; illustrisimi domini Reginaldi Poli. sanctae Romanae ecclesiae tituli sanctae mariae in cosmedim, diaconi cardinalis, sedis apostolicae legati a latere. Oratio ad prudentissimum senatum Angl. Authore Iodoco Harchio Montensi*. London: John Cawood, 1554. STC 12753.
- Hawes, Stephen. *The conuersyon of swearers*. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 12943.

Here begyneth ye lyf of Saynt Ursula after ye cronycles of englonde. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 24541.3.

Hereford Breviary. Rouen: Inghelbert Hague, 1505. STC 15793.

The Hereford Breviary Edited From the Rouen Edition of 1505 with Collation of Manuscripts. Walter Howard Frere. ed. Vol. 1. London: 1904.

Hilton, Walter. *Scala perfectionis.* Westminster: Wynkyn de Worde, 1494. STC 14042.

Hogarde, Miles. *The assault of the sacrament of the altar containyng aswell sixe seueral assaultes made from tyme to tyme against the sayd blessed sacrament: as also the names & opinions of all the heretical captaines of the same assaultes.* London: Robert Caly, 1554. STC 13556.

Hogarde, Miles. *The displaying of the Protestants, and sondry their practises, with a description of diuers their abuses of late frequented.* London: Robert Caly, 1556. STC 13558.

Hogarde, Miles. *A mirrour of loue, which such light doth giue, that all men may learne, how to loue and liue.* London: Robert Caly, 1555. STC 13559.

Hogarde, Miles. *A treatise declaring howe Christe was banished out of this realm: And howe it hath pleased God to bryng Christ home againe by Mary our moost gracious Quene.* London: Robert Caly, 1554. STC 13560.5.

Horae in Laudem Beatissime Virginis Mariae ad Usum Romanum (Lyon: Robert Granjon, 1558).

Hughes, Paul L. and James F. Larkin. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. 11. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Gerrard, Philip. *A godly inuectiue in the defence of the Gospel.* London: Richard Grafton, 1547. STC 11797.

Gerson, John. *Imitatio Christi.* Trans. by William Atkinson. London: Richard Pynson, 1504. STC 23955.

Goreti, Leonard, *Oratio Leonhardi Goretii Equitis Poloni de matrimonio serenissimi ac potentissimi, serenissimae potentissimaeque Dei gratia Regis ac Reginae Angliae, Hispaniae & Ad populum principesque Angliae.* London: William Powell, 1554. STC 12090.

O Jhesu endless swetnes of louying soules. Westminster: William Caxton, 1491. STC 20195.

Junius, Hadrianus. *Philippeis, sev, in nyptias divi Philippi, avg. pii, max & heroine Mariae avg.* London: Thomas Berthelet, 1554. STC 14861.

Knox, John. *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrvovs regiment of women.* Geneva: J. Poullain and A. Rebul, 1558. STC 15070.

Lambert, Franz. *The summe of christianitie gatheryd out almoste of al placis of scripture, by that noble and famouse clerke Francis Lambert of Auynyon. And translatyd, and put in to prynte in Englyshe, by Tristram Reuel.* London: Robert Redman, 1536. STC 15179.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Ed. J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R.H. Brodie. In 22 volumes. London, 1862-1932.

Linacre, Thomas. *Rudimenta grammatices Thomae Linacri diligenter castigata denuo.* London: Richard Pynson, 1525?. STC 15636.

Longe paruula. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 23164.

Mameranus, Nicholas. *Beso las manos et point dictionis gallicae usus. Cum carmine de leone et asino.* London: Thomas Marsh, 1557. STC 17228.

Marshall, William. *The forme and maner of subue[n]tion or helping for pore people deuysed and practysed i[n] the cytie of Hypres in Flaunders, whiche forme is auctorised by the Emperour, [and] approued by the facultie of diuinitie in Paris.* London: Thomas Godfray, 1535. STC 26119.

Martin, Thomas. *A Traictise Declaring and Plainly Prouyng, that the pretended marriage of Priests, and professed persones, is no mariage, but altogether vnlawful, and in all ages, and al countreies of Christendome, bothe forbidden, and also punyshed.* London: Robert Caly, 1554. STC 17517.

Martyr, Peter, of Angleria. *The decades of the newe worlde or west India conteynyng the nauigations and conquests of the Spanyardes, with the particular description of the moste ryche and large lands and ilands lately founde in the west ocean perteynyng to the inheritaunce of the kinges of Spayne,* Richard Eden, trans. London: William Powell, 1555. STC 645.

Mayer, Thomas F., ed. *The Correspondence of Reginald Pole.* 4 vols. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

More, Thomas. *The Works of Sir Thomas More*. William Rastell, ed. London: John Cawood, John Waly, and Richard Tottell, 1557. STC 18076.

Nychodemus gospel. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 18566.

Nicolai, Gilbert. *Tractatus de tribus ordinibus beatissime virginis dei genitricis Marie*. London: Richard Pynson?, 1515. STC unknown.

North, Thomas. *The Diall of Princes*. London: John Wayland, 1557. STC 12427.

Parker, Matthew. *A defence of priestes mariages stablysshed by the imperiall lawes of the realme of Englande, agaynst a ciuilian, namyng hym selfe Thomas Martin doctour of the ciuile lawes, goyng about to disproue the saide mariages, lawfull by the eternall worde of God, by the hygh court of parliament, only forbydden by forayne lawes and canons of the Pope, coloured with the visour of the Church*. London : John Kingston for Richarde Jugge, 1567. STC 17518.

The p[ar]lyament of deuylles. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 19305.

Paynell, Thomas. *Certaine Godly and Deuout Prayers*. London: John Cawood, 1558. STC 24318.

Paynell, Thomas. *The piththy and moost notable sayinges of al scripture, gathered by Thomas Paynell: after the manner of common places, very necessary for al those that delite in the consolacions of the scriptures*. London: Thomas Gaultier at the expense of Robert Toye, 1550. STC 19494.

Paynell, Thomas. *Twelue Sermons of Saynt Augustine*. London: John Cawood, 1553. STC 923.

Phaer, Thomas. *The seuen first bookes of the Eneidos of Virgill*. London: John Kingston for Richard Jugge, 1558. STC 24799.

Plutarch. *Quyete of Mynde*. Trans. by Thomas Wyatt. London: Richard Pynson, 1528. STC 20058.5.

Ponet, John. *An Apologie Fully Aunsvveringe by Scriptures and Aunceant Doctors, a Blasphemose Book Gatherid by D. Steph. Gardiner, Nou Lord Chauncelar and D. Smyth of Oxford, and other Papists, as by Ther Books Appeare, and of Late Set Furth Vnder the Name of Thomas Martin Doctor of the Ciuile Lawes as of Himself he Saieth, Against the Godly Mariadge of Priests*. Zurich: Christoph Froschaue, 1555.

- Ponet, John. *A Defence for Mariage of Priestes*. London: Reynold Wolff, 1549. STC 20176.
- Privy Purse Expenses of the Princess Mary, daughter of King Henry VIII, afterwards Queen Mary*. Ed. Frederic Madden. London: W. Pickering: 1831.
- Proctor, John. *The fal of the late Arrian*. London: William Powell, 1549. STC 20406.
- Proctor, John. *The historie of wyates rebellion*. London: John Caly, 1554. STC 20407.
- Proctor, John. *The waie home to Christ and truth leadinge from Antichrist and errour, made and set furth in the Latine tongue, by that famous and great clearke Vincent, Frenche man borne, aboue .xi. hundred yeres paste, for the comfote of all true Christian men, against the most pernicious and detestable crafte of heretickes, whiche in his tyme by all subtell wayes, deuised to obscure and deface the doctrine and religion of the vniuersall church*. London: Robert Caly, 1554. STC 24754.
- Psalmes or Prayers taken out of holye scripture* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 25 April 1544). STC 3002.
- Recorde, Robert. *The castle of knowledge*. London: Reginald Wolfe, 1556. STC 20796.
- Redman, John. *A compendius treatise called the complaint of Grace*. London: Robert Caly, 1554. STC 20826.
- Roeslin, Eucharius. *The byrth of mankynde, newly translated out of Laten into Englysshe. In the which is entreated of all suche thynges the which chaunce to women in theyr labor, and all suche infyrmitees whiche happen vnto the infantes after they be delyuered. And also at the latter ende or in the thyrde or last boke is entreated of the conception of mankynde, and howe manye wayes it may be letted or furtheryd, with diuers other fruytefull thynges, as doth appere in the table before the booke*. London: Thomas Raynald, 1540. STC 21153.
- Ruscelli, Girolamo. *Le Imprese Illustri*. Venice: Francesco Rampazetto, 1566.
- Saliceto, William de. *Salute corporis*. London: Richard Faques, 1509. STC 12512.
- Sarum Breviary*. London: Richard Pynson, 1507. STC 15806a.
- Sebastian, Brant. *The Shyppe of Fooles*. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. STC 3547.
- Seton, John. *Pangyrici in Victoriam*. London: Reginald Wolf, 1553. STC 22258.

- A Skeltonicall salvation, or condigne gratvlation, and ivst vexation of the Spanish nation that in a bravado, spent many a crvsado, in setting forth an armado England to Invado.* Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1589. STC 22619.
- Slotan, Johann. *De retinenda fide orthodoxa et catholica adversus haereses et sectas, et praecipue Lutheranam.* Coloniae: Ioannes Novesianus, 1555.
- Smith, Richard. *A bouclier of the catholike fayth of Christes church, conteynyng diuers matters now of late called into controuersy, by the newe gospellers.* London: Richard Tottell, 1554. STC 22816.
- A supplicacyon to the quenes maiestie.* London: John Cawood, 1555.
- Taylor, John. *The needles excellency a new booke wherin are diuers admirable works wrought with the needle. Newly inuented and cut in copper for the pleasure and profit of the industrious.* London: Printed for James Boler and sold at the sign of the Marigold in Paul's Churchyard, 1634. STC 23776.
- A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers in London, 1554-1640.* Volume I, Ed. by Edward Arber and Charles Robert Rivington. London: Stationers' Company, 1875-1877, 35.
- A trve and perfecte description of a straunge Monstar borne in the Citty of Rome in Italy in the yeare of our salvation, 1585. Vnder which is described both the originall and triumphant state of the Holy League, and also the sodain and desperate fall thereof in the year 1588. With certain verses exhortatory to the King of Spayn, that hee would withdraw his persecuting hand from the Church of Christ.* London: John Wolfe, 1590. STC 15107.
- Villa Sancta, Alphonsus de. *De libero arbitrio aduersus Melanchtonem authore fratre Alphonso a Villa sancte minorita regularis obseruationis.* London: Richard Pynson, 1523. STC 24728.
- Villa Sancta, Alphonsus de. *Problema indulgentiarum quo Lutheri errata dissoluuntur, et theologoru[m] de eisde opinio hactenus apud eruditos uulgata astruitur.* London: Richard Pynson, 1523. STC 24729.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *The Instruction of a Christen Woman.* Virginia Walcott Beauchamp, Elizabeth H. Hageman, and Margaret Mikesell, eds. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *Introductio ad Sapientiam, Satellitium sive Symbola, Epistolae duae de Ratione Studii Puerilis.* Louvain: Peter Martens 1524.

- Vives, Juan Luis. *Introductio ad sapientiam; Satellitium sive Symbola; Epistolae duae de Ratione Studii Puerilis*. Antwerp: Merten de Keyser, 1530.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *Opera Omnia*. Vol. VII, 1788, Reprinted. London: The Gregg Press Limited, 1964.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *A Very Frutefull and Pleasant Boke Called the Instruction of a Christen Woman*. Trans. Richard Hyrde. London: Thomas Berthelet, ca. 1529. STC 24857.
- Watson, Foster, ed. *Vives and the Renascence Education of Women*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912. [Excerpts from the *Instruction*, 29-136.] [Excerpts from *Defence*, 211-239]
- Weever, John. *Ancient funeral monuments within the vnited monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland, and the islands adjacent with the dissolued monasteries therein contained: their founders, and what eminent persons haue beene in the same interred. As also the death and burial of certaine of the bloud royall; the nobilitie and gentry of these kingdomes entombed in forraine nations*. London: Printed by Thomas Harper, 1631. STC 25223.
- White, John. *Diacosio-martyrion, id est ducentorum virorum testimonium, de veritate corporis, et sanguinis Christi, in evcharistia, ante triennium aduersus Petrum matryem*. London: Robert Caly, 1553. STC 25388.
- Wood, Mary Anne Everett, ed. *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies of Great Britain, From the Commencement of the Twelfth Century to the Close of Reign of Queen Mary*. 3 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1846.

Secondary

- Alexander, Gina. "Bonner and the Marian Persecutions," in *The English Reformation Revised*, ed. Christopher Haigh. Revised 2000. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 157-175.
- Allison, A.F. *English Translations from the Spanish and Portugese to the Year 1700*. Kent: Dawson & Sons Ltd., 1974.
- Ames, Joseph. *Typographical Antiquities or The History of Printing in England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Edited by Thomas Frognall Dibdin (1810-1819). First published 1749. In three volumes. Hildeshiem: Georg Olms Verlagbuchhandlung, 1969.

- Atkin, Tamara and A.S.G. Edwards, "Printers, Publishers and Promoters to 1558." In *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476 – 1558*, eds. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014, 27-44.
- Attreed, Lorraine and Alexander Winkler, "Faith and Forgiveness: Lessons in Statecraft for Queen Mary Tudor," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 36 (2005), 971-989.
- Axon, William E.A. "The Lady Margaret Beaufort as a Lover of Literature." *The Library*, 2nd Series 9 (1907), 34-41.
- Backhouse, Janet. "Founders of the Royal Library: Edward IV and Henry VII as Collectors of Illuminated Manuscripts," in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Wolfenb., 1987, 23-41.
- Backhouse, Janet. "Illuminated Manuscripts associated with Henry VII and Members of his Immediate Family." In *The Reign of Henry VII: Proceedings of the 1993 Harlaxton Symposium*. Benjamin Thompson, ed. Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1995, 175-187.
- Bailey, A.S. "A Royal Patroness of Learning: Margaret Beaufort, Mother of Henry VII, of England." *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 19 (1917), 612-645.
- Baranda Leturio, Nieves. "Women's Reading Habits: Book Dedications to Female Patrons in Early Modern Spain," in *Women's Literacy in Early Modern Spain and the New World*, eds. Anne J. Cruz and Rosilie Hernández. Surrey: Ashgate, 19-39.
- Bartlett, Anne Clark. "Translation, Self-Representation, and Statecraft: Lady Margaret Beaufort and Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine (1489)." *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22 (Feb. 2006), 53-66.
- Bernard, G.W. *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Bernard, G.W. "Anne Boleyn's Religion," *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993), 1-20.
- Betteridge, Thomas. *Literature and Politics in the English Reformation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Betteridge, Thomas. *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Betty, J.H. "Paul Bush, the first bishop of Bristol." *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 106 (1988), 169-172.

- Bill, E.G.W. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 1907-2340*. Oxford: 1976.
- Birrell, T.A. *English Monarchs and Their Books: from Henry VII to Charles II*. London: The British Library, 1987.
- Bjorklund, Nancy. "A Godly Wyfe is a Helper': Matthew Parker and the Defense of Clerical Marriage." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 34, No. 2 (Summer, 2003), 347-365.
- Boffey, Julia. "From Manuscript to Print: Continuity and Change," In *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476 – 1558*. Eds. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014, 13-26.
- Boffey, Julia. *Manuscript and Print in London, c. 1475-1530*. London: The British Library, 2012.
- Brassington, W. Salt. *Historic Bindings in the Bodleian Library*. London: Sampson Low, Marston and Company, 1891.
- Brown, Cynthia. *The Queen's Library: Image-Making at the Court of Anne of Brittany, 1477-1514*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Brown, Cynthia, ed., *The Cultural and Political Legacy of Anne de Bretagne: Negotiating Convention in Books and Documents*. Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2010.
- Brown, Mary Elizabeth. *Dedications: An Anthology of the Forms Used From the Earliest Days of Book-Making to the Present Time*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1913.
- Bryson, Alan. "Order and Disorder: John Proctor's History of Wyatt's Rebellion (1554)" In *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603*. Eds. Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 323-336.
- Buchtel, John. "Book Dedications and the Death of a Patron: The Memorial Engraving in Chapman's Homer." *Book History* 7 (2004), 1-29.
- Buchtel, John. "Book Dedications in Early Modern England: Francis Bacon, George Chapman, and the Literary Patronage of Henry, Prince of Wales." Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 2004.
- Buchtel, John. "'To the Most High and Excellent Prince': Dedicating Books to Henry, Prince of Wales," in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. Timothy V. Wilks. London: Holberton, 2008, 104-133.

Buckley, George T. "Who was 'The late Arrian'?" *Modern Language Note* 49 (1934), 500-503.

Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition of Bookbindings. London: Printed for the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1891.

Carley, James. *The Books of King Henry VIII and His Wives*. London: The British Library, 2004.

Carley, James. *The Libraries of King Henry VIII*. London: The British Library, 2000.

Carley, James P. "The Writings of Henry Parker, Lord Morley: A Bibliographic Survey." In James P. Carley and Marie Axton, eds. "*Triumphs of English*": *Henry Parker, Lord Morley Translator to the Tudor Court*. London: The British Library, 2000, 27-68.

Carley, James P. and Marie Axton, eds. "*Triumphs of English*": *Henry Parker, Lord Morley Translator to the Tudor Court*. London: The British Library, 2000.

Carlson, David R. "Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991), 253-279.

A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge. In five volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1855-56.

Catalogue of the Extensive and Valuable Library of Manuscripts & Printed Books of His Excellency Monsieur John Gennadius. London: Gryden Press, 1895.

Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Coates, Alan. "The Latin Trade in England and Abroad." In *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476 – 1558*, eds. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014, 45-58.

Cooper, C.H. *Memoir of Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1874.

Cressy, David. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Croft, P.J. *Lady Margaret, Elizabeth of York, and Wynkyn de Worde*. London: Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., 1958.

- Crotch, W.J.B. *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton*. London: Early English Text Society, 1928.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- Dowling, Maria. "Anne Boleyn as Patron," In *Henry VIII: A European Court in England*, edited by David Starkey. London: Collins and Brown Limited, 1991, 107-111.
- Dowling, Maria. "Humanist Support for Catherine of Aragon." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984), 46-55.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. Dover, NH: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Dowling, Maria. "A Woman's Place? Learning and the wives of Henry VIII." *History Today* 41 (June 1991): 38-42.
- Driver, Martha. *The Image in Print: Book Illustration in Late Medieval England and Its Sources*. London: The British Library, 2004.
- Duff, E. Gordon. *A Century of the English Book Trade*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1905.
- Duff, E. Gordon. *The Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders of Westminster and London from 1476 to 1535*. New York: Arno Press, 1977.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Faiths of Fire: Catholic England under Mary Tudor*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Marking the Hours: English People and Their Prayers 1240-1570*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Duffy, Eamon and David Loades, eds. *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Duncan, Sarah. *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Dunn, Kevin. *Pretexes of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Dutschke, C.W. *Guide to Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Huntington Library*, In two volumes. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1989.

- Edwards, A.S.G. and Carol M. Meale. "The Marketing of Printed Books in Late Medieval England." *The Library* VI (1993), 95-124.
- Edwards, John. *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth and Adrian Johns. "AHR Forum: How Revolutionary Was the Print Revolution? 'An Unacknowledged Revolution Revisited' and 'How to Acknowledge a Revolution'." *American Historical Review* 107 (2002), 84-128.
- Erler, Mary C. *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Falconer, Madan, H.H.E. Craster, and N. Denholm-Young, eds. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. In seven volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895 -1953.
- Foot, M.M. "Bookbinding 1400-1557," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Vol. III, eds. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 109-127.
- Gebert, Clara. *An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933.
- George Buchanan: Glasgow Quartercentenary Studies 1906*. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907.
- Goodrich, Jaime. "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clark Basset's Translation of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History." *English Literary Renaissance* 40 (2010), 301-328.
- Goodrich, Jaime. "Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas: The Politics of Pious Translation at the Henrician Court," *ANQ* 24, (2011), 11-22.
- Graffius, Jan. "The Stuart Relics in the Stonyhurst Collections." *Recusant History*, 31 (Oct., 2012), 147-69.
- Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- Hackel, Heidi Brayman. *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Halsted, Caroline A. *Life of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, Mother of Henry VII*. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1839.
- Hobson, G.D. *Bindings in Cambridge Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- Hoffman, Martha K. *Raised to Rule: Educating Royalty at the Court of the Spanish Hapsburgs, 1601-1634*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.
- Hosington, Brenda M. "Lady Margaret Beaufort's Translations as Mirrors of Practical Piety," in Micheline White, ed., *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2011, 185-203.
- Houliston, Victor. "Her Majesty, who is Now in Heaven: Mary Tudor and the Elizabethan Catholics." In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 37-48.
- Hull, Suzanne. *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475-1640*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1982.
- Hull, Suzanne. *Women According to Men: The World of Tudor-Stuart Women*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1996.
- Ives, E.W. *The Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: 'the most happy'*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004.
- Jackson, Deirdre. "Psalter," In *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination*, Scot McKendrick, John Lowden and Kathleen Doyle, eds. London: The British Library, 2011.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College Cambridge*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts other than Oriental in the Library of King's College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of Queens' College Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.

- James, Montague Rhodes. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913.
- James, Susan E. *Kateryn Parr: The Making of a Queen*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Johnson, John Noble. *The Life of Thomas Linacre*. London: Edward Lumley, 1835.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Jones, Michael K., and Malcolm G. Underwood. *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jones, Whitney R.D. *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1563*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Jordan, Constance. "Feminism and the Humanists: The Case for Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defense of Good Women*." In *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Margaret Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy Vickers, 242-258. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Keiser, George R. "The Mystics and the Early Printers: The Economics of Devotionalism." In *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England*, Exeter Symposium IV, Papers Read at Dartington Hall, July 1987. Ed. by Marion Glasscoe. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987, 9-26.
- Kettering, Sharon. *Patronage in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Kews, Paulina. "The Exclusion Crisis of 1553 and the Elizabethan Succession," In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Ed. by Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 49-61.
- King, John N., "The Account of a Marian Bookseller, 1553-4," *British Library Journal* 13 (Spring 1987), 33-57.

- King, John N., "The Book Trade Under Edward VI and Mary I," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume III, 1400-1557*, eds. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 164-178.
- King, John N., ed. *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Kleist, Aaron J. "Matthew Parker, Old English, and the Defense of Priestly Marriage." In *Anglo-Saxon Books and Their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss's Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*. Eds. Thomas N. Hall and Donald Scragg. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2008, 106-135.
- Krug, Rebecca. *Reading Families: Women's Literate Practice in Late Medieval England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Lally, Steven. *The Aeneid of Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne: A Critical edition introducing Renaissance Metrical Typography*. New York: Garland Publishing, inc., 1987.
- Langman, Pete, ed., *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2011.
- Lehmberg, Stanford. *Sir Thomas Elyot: Tudor Humanist*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1960.
- Lerer, Seth. "Medieval Literature and Early Modern Readers: Cambridge University Library Sel. 5.51-5.63." *The Papers of the Bibliographic Society of America* 97 (2003), 311-332.
- Lerer, Seth. "Paul Bush and the Chaucer Tradition." *Medium Aevum* 73 (2004), 103-109.
- Licence, Amy. *Elizabeth of York: The Forgotten Tudor Queen*. Gloucestershire: Amberly, 2013.
- Loach, Jennifer. "The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press." *The English Historical Review* 101 (January 1986), 135-148.
- Loach, Jennifer. *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Loach, Jennifer and Robert Tittler, eds., *The Mid-Tudor Polity, c.1540-1560*. London: The Macmillan Press, 1980.
- Loades, D.M. "The Press Under the Early Tudors: A Study in Censorship and Seditious." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society* 4 (1964), 29-50.

- Loades, David. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989. Revised 1992.
- Loades, David. *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545-1565*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992.
- Loades, David. "The Personal Religion of Mary," in Eamon Duffy and David Loades, eds., *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 1-29.
- Loades, David. "Philip II and the government of England." In *Law and Government Under the Tudors*. Eds. Claire Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 177-194.
- Loades, David. *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, & Religion in England, 1553-58*. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1991.
- Loades, David. *Two Tudor Conspiracies*. 2nd ed. Bangor, Wales: Headstart History, 1992.
- Lowry, M.J.C. "Caxton, St Winifred, and the Lady Margaret Beaufort." *The Library*, 6th Series 5 (1983), 101-117.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. London: The Penguin Press, 1999.
- MacRay, William Dunn. *Annals of the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.
- Maggs Bros. Ltd., *Bookbinding in the British Isles*. Over Wallop, Hampshire: B.A.S. Printers Limited, 1996.
- Maltby, William S. *The Black Legend in England: The development of anti-Spanish sentiment, 1558-1660*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1971.
- Marshall, Peter. *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Marshall, Peter. "Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the semantics of schism," In *Catholics and the "Protestant nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. Ethan Shagan. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005, 22-48.
- Martin, J.W. "The Marian Regime's Failure to Understand the Importance of Printing." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 44 (Autumn 1981), 231-247.
- Martin, J.W. "Miles Hogarde: Artisan and Aspiring Author in Sixteenth-Century England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 34 (1981), 359-383.

- Mattingly, Garrett. *Catherine of Aragon*. New York: 1941.
- Matusiak, John. "Mid-Tudor England: Years of Trauma and Survival," *History Review* 52 (2005), 31-36.
- McConica, James. *English Humanists and Reformation Politics Under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- McIntosh, Jeri. "Princess Mary as the de facto Prince(ss) of Wales, 1525." *Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange*, University of Tennessee Knoxville, 2010.
- McIntosh, J.L. *From Heads of Household to Heads of State: The Preaccession Households of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, 1516 to 1558*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- McKitterick, David, ed. *The Trinity Apocalypse*. London: The British Library, 2005.
- Moore, Helen. "Gathering Fruit: The 'Profitable' Translations of Thomas Paynell." In *Tudor Translation*. Ed. Fred Schurink. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 39-57.
- Mueller, Janel. *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2011.
- Nall, Catherine. "Margaret Beaufort's Books: a New Discovery." *Journal of the Early Book Society* 16 (2013), 213-220.
- Nixon, Howard. "Early English gold-tooled bookbindings," in *Studi di Bibliografia e di Storia in Onore di Tammara de Marinis*, 4 vols, Verona: 1964, 283-308.
- Nixon, Howard M. and Mirjan M. Foot, eds. *The History of Decorated Bookbinding in England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Okerlund, Arlene Naylor. *Elizabeth of York*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Painter, George. *William Caxton: A Quincentenary Biography of England's First Printer*. London: Chatto and Wyndus, 1976.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *The Book in the Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

- Pettegree, Andrew. "Printing and the Reformation: the English exception." In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, eds. Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 157-179.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Pollnitz, Aysha. "Christian Woman or Sovereign Queens? The Schooling of Mary and Elizabeth, In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 127-142.
- Pollnitz, Aysha. "Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII: Princess Mary, Katherine Parr and the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011, 123-137.
- Powell, Susan. "Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Books." *The Library* 6 (1998), 197-240.
- Powell, Susan. "Lady Margaret Beaufort: 'Of singuler wysedome ferre passynge the comyn rate of women,'" in *The Brown Book: A Commemorative Edition for the 500th Anniversary of the Death of Lady Margaret Beaufort*. Oxford: Lady Margaret Hall, 2009.
- Reed, Arthur W. "The Regulation of the Book Trade Before the Proclamation of 1538," *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* XV (1920), 157-184.
- Rhodes, Dennis E. "Don Fernando Colon and His London Book Purchaes, June 1522," in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 52 (1958), 231-248.
- Richards, Judith. *Mary Tudor*. London and New York: Routeledge, 2008.
- Rosenwein, Barbara. *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunities in Early Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Routh, E.M.G. *A Memoir of Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond & Derby, Mother of Henry VII*. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Ryrie, Alec. "Paths Not Taken in the British Reformations." *The Historical Journal* 52 (2009), 1-22.
- St. Clair, William and Irmgard Maassen, eds. *Conduct Literature for Women, 1500-1640*. Vol. 2. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2000.

- Sargent, Michael G. "Walter Hilton's "Scale of Perfection": The London Manuscript Group Reconsidered," *Medium Aevum* 52 (1983), 189-216.
- Schutte, Valerie. "'To the Illustrious Queen': Katherine of Aragon and Early Modern Book Dedications," in *Women during the English Reformations: Renegotiating Gender and Religious Identity*, Julie A. Chappell and Kaley A. Kramer, eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, Forthcoming 2014.
- Scott, Kathleen L. *Later Gothic Manuscripts 1390-1490*, 2 vols. London: Harvey Miller, 1996.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Sherman, William. *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Shrank, Cathy. *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Smith, Helen. *"Grossly Material Things": Women and Books Production in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Starkey, David. "An Attendant Lord? Henry Parker, Lord Morley." In James P. Carley and Marie Axton, eds. 'Triumphs of English': Henry Parker, Lord Morley Translator to the Tudor Court. London: The British Library, 2000, 1-25.
- Starkey, David. *Six Wives: The Queens of Henry VIII*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003.
- Stone, J.M. *The History of Mary I., Queen of England, as found in the public records, despatches of ambassadors, in original private letters, and other contemporary documents*. London: Sands & co., 1901.
- Summit, Jennifer. "William Caxton, Margaret Beaufort, and the Romance of Female Patronage," in *Women, the Book and the Worldly: Selected Proceedings of the St Hilda's Conference, 1993*. Volume II. Ed. by Lesley Smith and Jane H.M. Taylor. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1995, 151-165.
- Suster, Gerald, ed. *John Dee Essential Readings*. 2nd ed. Berkeley, North Atlantic Books, 2003.
- Taylor, Andrew. "'Ad Omne Virtutum Genus'? Mary between Piety, Pedagogy, and Praise in Early Tudor Humanism," In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*,

- eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 103-122.
- Thomson, D.F.S. "Linacre's Latin Grammars" in *Essays on the Life and Work of Thomas Linacre, c. 1460-1524*. Eds. Francis Maddison, Margaret Pelling, and Charles Webster. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977, 24-35.
- Thompson, Patricia. "Sir Thomas Wyatt: Classical Philosophy and English Humanism." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 25, No. 2 (February 1962), 79-96.
- Vosevich, Kathi. "The Education of a Prince(ss): Tutoring the Tudors, In *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Tudor and Stuart Britain*, eds. Mary E. Burke, Jane Donawerth, Linda L. Dove, and Karen Nelson. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2000, 61-76.
- Walker, Greg. "Dialogue, resistance and accommodation: conservative literary responses to the Henrician Reformation." In *The Education of a Christian Society: Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands*. Eds. N. Scott Amos, Andrew Pettegree, and Henk van Nierop. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999, 89-111.
- Walker, Greg. *Persuasive Fictions: Faction, Faith and Political Culture in the Reign of Henry VIII*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996.
- Walker, Greg. *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "'A very Deborah?' The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch," In *The Myth of Elizabeth*, eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, 143 - 168.
- Wang, Yu-Chiao. "Caxton's Romances and Their Early Tudor Readers." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67, No. 2 (2004), 173-188.
- Warner, George F. and Julius P. Gilson, eds. *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections in the British Museum*. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Warner, J. Christopher. "A Gift of Books from the Emperor's Poet Laureate to Queen Mary I," *The Library*, 7th series, Vol. 11, No. 3 (September 2010), 345-349.
- Warner, J. Christopher. *Henry VIII's Divorce: Literature and the Politics of the Printing Press*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998.

- Weir, Alison. *Elizabeth of York: A Tudor Queen and Her World*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2013.
- Wheatley, Henry Benjamin. *The Dedication of a Book to Patron and Friend*. A.C. Armstrong, 1887.
- Whitelock, Anna. *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2010.
- Whitelock, Anna. *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen*. New York: Random House, 2009.
- Williams, Jr., Franklin B. *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Versus in English Books Before 1641*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1962.
- Wizeman, SJ, William. *The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor's Church*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Wood, Tara. "“To the most godlye, virtuos, and myghte Princess Elizabeth’: Identity and Gender in the Dedications to Elizabeth I.” Phd. diss., Arizona State University, 2008.
- Wooding, Lucy. "The Marian Restoration and the language of Catholic Reform." In *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: The Achievement of Friar Bartolomé Carranza*. Eds. John Edwards and Ronald Truman. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005, 49-64.
- Wooding, Lucy. *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Worden, Blair. *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Wright, Herbert G. *Forty-six Lives*. London: Early English Text Society, 1943.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INGHELBERT HAGUE'S DEDICATION TO THE *HEREFORD BREVIARY* GIVEN TO LADY MARGARET BEAUFORT

Inghelbertus haghe: illustrissime viraginis: domine Margarethe: comitis Richemonten. et derbeii. atque inuictissimi et longe serenissimi Anglie regis henrici septimi / sanctissime parentis: cliens et dedititius herfordensis eccie prepositis et clero Salutem dicit Nandoquiden viri pstatissimi: et Christiane religionis obseruantissimi, dñi et herforden. ecclesie cleri ad mandata generosissime atque clarissime principis domine Margarethe: dim [dominum] margaritarum decore et valore prestantioris sepe a vobis et fere quotidiana afflagitatione petita: secumdum usum vestrum breviaria: q porti foris vulgo vocantur: et missalia: i honstssimis characteribus: et summa castigatione in Rothomagensi empouo magno certe impendio et solitudine ecomprimeda curauit: rogaras: imo exoratas velim paternitates vestras ut has lucubrationes atque impensas nostras: iusto examine pesitare dignemini essiciantis que: ne sprs amplissima: quam in excellentissime domine ac patrone nostre presidio collocaturus: nosfallat. Quod fi (ut spero et cofido) facietis ad maiora vobis curanda obligabit. Tatum vos exoratos volui. Valete sanctitatis columina. Exofficina rothomagen. Cum illic agerem ad Jdus Julias Anno salutis nostre Millesimoquingentesimo quinto

APPENDIX B

ENGLISH EDITIONS OF JUAN LUIS VIVES'S *THE INSTRUCTION OF A
CHRISTEN WOMAN*

Year	Dedication Included	Katherine of Aragon
1524	Vives	Queen
1529	Vives and Hyrde	Queen
1531	Vives and Hyrde	Queen
1541	ViveS	Princess
1547	Vives	Princess
1557	Vives	Princess
1567	Vives	Princess
1585	Vives	Princess
1592	Vives	Queen

APPENDIX C
BOOKS IN MARY'S LIBRARY

Abbreviated Title	Location	Shelfmark/Classmark
Acts of Parliament	British Library	Davis 87
Herodotus/Thucydides	British Library	C.66.f.2
Bonner's Homilies	British Library	C.27.e.13
Book of Hours	British Library	Sloane MS 2565
A treatise declaring howe	British Library	Harley MS 3444
Christe was banished		
De Militia Christiana	King's College, Cam	MS 24
Vitarum Sanctorum	Lambeth Palace Library	H4654.(L5)
Vita Christi	Lambeth Palace Library	F298.(L8)
Le Livre de novel	British Library	C.66.d.17
Expositio Beati Ambrosii	British Library	C.65.gg.6
Epitome...Avgvstini	British Library	C.24.c.15
De la Grandevr &	British Library	C.46.c.1
De la Pvissance		
Aduersus gentes	Merton College, Ox	27.C.2

A brief and compendius table	Privately Owned	N/A
“A Mirroure of myserie”	Huntington Library	HM 121
El Felicissimo viaei	British Library	C.47.i.4
Psalter of Queen Ingeburg	Musée Condé	MS 1695
St Augustine’s Soliloquia	Queen’s College, Cam	MS 13
Psalter	British Library	Royal MS 2 B.III
Psalter	British Library	Royal MS 2 B.VII
Book of Hours	British Library	Royal MS 2 B.XV
Pylgrimage of Perfection	Pierpoint Morgan Library	W 14 B
Book of Hours	Stonyhurst College Library	N/A

*Sundry miscellaneous unidentifiable books were also mentioned within the chapter.