

A Catholic Woman and a Catholic Queen: The Personal Religiosity of Mary Tudor

by

Meghan Newman, B.J., B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of History

Carleton University
Ottawa Ontario
3 August 2021
© copyright
2021, Meghan Newman

ABSTRACT

This thesis provides a detailed analysis of the identifiable aspects of Mary Tudor's personal religious beliefs and practices from childhood to the end of her reign. It carefully examines a variety of evidence including translations done by Mary, book and manuscript dedications written by and to Mary, correspondence, first-hand accounts, Mary's privy purse expenses, her will, and Marian acts and proclamations. This analysis puts Mary's personal religiosity in conversation with her religious policy as queen. Mary demonstrated pious dedication to the Mass and other traditionally Catholic liturgical elements and nearly unwavering dedication to Rome and the papacy. During her reign Mary and her government promoted a religious policy that was consistent with core aspects of Mary's personal religiosity. This thesis concludes that Mary was not only theologically Catholic and dedicated to the traditional liturgical rites, like her father Henry VIII, but also dedicated to England's ecclesiastical relationship with Rome.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to start by thanking my supervisors, Dr. Micheline White and Dr. David Dean, for their expertise, insight, patience, and encouragement throughout this process. This thesis has gone through numerous iterations and I am incredibly grateful for their support in getting me to this final version. Next, I would like to thank my wonderful parents and sister for their unwavering support and care over the past two years. Thank you for all of the love, meals, late night cups of tea, company, and for listening to me rant about rosaries. I would also like to thank my D&D group, but perhaps more accurately, my master's friends without whom I could not have made it through grad school. I am grateful to have met and learned from and with each one of you. Thank you as well to all of my friends and family who have been there for me through this project and have listened to my venting, shared my breakthroughs, and reminded me that I could do this. Finally, I would like to thank Albus. Thank you for being the best study buddy a person could ask for and for never failing to be there for me through the most difficult moments of research; your pawprints are all over this one little boy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
NOTE CONCERNING SPELLING	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: A Pious Princess	12
CHAPTER TWO: A Catholic Queen	44
CHAPTER THREE: Mary's Religious Policy Priorities as Queen	75
CONCLUSION	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	112

NOTE CONCERNING SPELLING

All quotations from and citations of contemporary sources, both printed and manuscript, retain original punctuation, capitalization, and spelling, where the characters are available. Spellings of names and titles have been modernized and standardized outside of direct quotations.

INTRODUCTION

Mary Tudor, later Queen Mary I, was born in 1516 and was the only surviving child of Henry VIII and his first wife, Katherine of Aragon.¹ Mary had a relatively peaceful and stable childhood as heir presumptive to the English throne. She received a traditional Catholic humanist education that also included medieval courtly elements.² Her education was largely orchestrated by her mother and included a princely plan of study generated by Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives.³ Her parents were both Catholic humanists who valued education, tradition, and the sacraments. Her life changed dramatically in the 1530s when Henry's desire to divorce her mother eventually drove him towards those advocating for a religious reformation in England.⁴ Despite a fervent effort by Cardinal Thomas Wolsey on Henry's behalf, Pope Clement VII proved unwilling to grant his request for an annulment, even when presented with Henry's argument that the marriage was invalid because Katherine was his brother's widow.⁵ Given that Henry and Katherine's marriage lasted 24 years before Henry's desire for a divorce surfaced, it seems unlikely that the true root of Henry's concerns were purely theological. When the pope refused to grant the annulment, Henry opted to break from Rome, declare himself England's head of church, and proceed with the annulment without papal sanction or involvement.⁶

This decision had a variety of life-altering repercussions for Mary. Perhaps most obviously, it brought her legitimacy and right to the throne into question. But beyond that, it

¹ Ann Weikel, "Mary I," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sept 2004, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18245>.

² Weikel, "Mary I," 3.

³ Valerie Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications: Royal Women, Power, and Persuasion* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 21; Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 202-3.

⁴ John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 23-4.

⁵ Melita Thomas, *The King's Pearl: Henry VIII and His Daughter Mary* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Amberley, 2017), 136, 149.

⁶ Thomas, *The King's Pearl*, 149.

forced Mary to choose between disobeying her father or rejecting her mother, the pope, and the religion that she had been devoted to all her life. Chapter One will discuss in detail the struggle of conscience that Mary endured as a result of her father's insistence that she sign the articles of the Act of Supremacy. Mary resisted for months, but finally, in fear for her life, signed the articles submitting to Henry's authority as king. This meant she was forced to reject papal authority and recognize Henry as the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and acknowledge that her parents' marriage was illegitimate and that she was not the heir presumptive.⁷ This undoubtedly traumatic early event arguably set the stage for Mary's fervent, public Catholicism throughout the rest of her life, as well as her efforts to maintain traditional Catholic rites and a relationship with Rome even when such things were perhaps not the most advisable personally or politically. It is significant to note that while Henry wished to terminate England's relationship with Rome and be the head of his own church, he was still theologically Catholic and remained devoted to traditional Catholic rites and sacraments, including the mass and transubstantiation.⁸ Mary's theological alignment with Henry may explain why after the struggle over the Act of Supremacy, she remained religiously cooperative until his death in 1547. However, as Chapter One will also demonstrate, Mary's willingness to be cooperative diminished rapidly when her Protestant half-brother Edward VI took the throne. Throughout Edward's reign he and his Council had repeated altercations with Mary, largely over the topics of religion and Mary's refusal to give up the Catholic Mass.⁹

⁷ Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*, 48.

⁸ Alan Jacobs, *The Book of Common Prayer: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 18-21.

⁹ See much of *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 10, 1550-1552*, ed. Royall Tyler, (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1914), *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol10>.

After Edward's death, Mary took the throne in August 1553 at the age of 37. It quickly became clear that Mary intended to not only return England to the traditional Catholic rites used during Henry's reign, but also to reconcile England with Rome and reinstate the pope as the religious head of England. Her early parliaments worked to reverse Edward's religious policy and restore traditional Catholic rites. By the end of 1554 she had also successfully reconciled England with Rome and received papal absolution for the English people's sin of schism.¹⁰ Mary's commitment to Catholicism was further reinforced by her decision to marry the Catholic Philip II of Spain, deepening England's relationship with both Spain and the Catholic Holy Roman Empire. The latter half of her reign has largely been characterized by the revival of old heresy laws and the subsequent burning of nearly 300 Protestants.¹¹ While this was certainly an aspect of Mary's religious policy, and arguably a reflection of her personal beliefs on some level, it alone does not account for the depth, magnitude, or specificity of Mary's religiosity. During her time as queen she continued to lean on the core elements of her faith, and in many ways centred her reign around her Catholic beliefs.

Sixteenth century Catholicism has often been portrayed as unpopular, corrupt, and the inevitable precursor to the intellectual and spiritual foundations of the Reformation, and England's transition to a Protestant nation in the latter half of the sixteenth century. However, recent scholarship by authors such as Eamon Duffy and Alexandra Walsham has pushed back against this idea.¹² They have demonstrated that not only was Catholicism more intellectually

¹⁰ *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.4 (London: Dawson's of Pall Mall, 1963), 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8 246.

¹¹ Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 7.

¹² See for example Duffy, *Fires of Faith*; Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain: Catholic Christendom 1300-1700* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2014).

robust than previously believed, but that the return to Catholicism was welcomed by much of the population during Mary's reign. Surprisingly, though, they have had little to say about the role of female religiosity, including Mary's, in sustaining Catholicism in the mid-Tudor years. Duffy and Loades, along with other scholars such as John Edwards have offered convincing accounts of religious policy and public-facing Catholicism during Mary's reign.¹³ For the most part these works draw on official sources such as proclamations, state papers, parish records, etc. to generate a fulsome image of religion and Catholicism before and during Mary's reign. Yet Mary's personal religious experience is surely a dimension worth considering. For the most part, recent scholarship uses Mary's reign as a timeframe to study English Catholicism, rather than studying Mary as an individual with nuanced religious ideals and motivations.¹⁴ In omitting an assessment of Mary's religiosity as queen, and by failing to account for the impact of Mary's personal devotion, their analysis is somewhat impoverished.

This thesis focuses on the specific and identifiable aspects of Mary's personal religious beliefs and practices during her time as both princess and queen. There has been some scholarly disagreement in the past few decades regarding the nature of Mary's Catholicism and whether she preferred the English, Henrician Catholicism of her father, or Roman Catholicism with the pope as the head of the English Church. There are some scholars, such as Loades, who have depicted Mary as a staunch Roman Catholic, wanting a full return to Rome and willing to do everything to make that happen.¹⁵ Loades has also made the argument that scholars know that

¹³ See for example *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy, (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006); David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-58* 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1991); Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*.

¹⁴ Of the three, Edwards does the most to convey Mary's personal beliefs and situation, but his work still lacks an in-depth review of Mary's own views and practices.

¹⁵ David Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006); Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*.

Mary was Catholic, but that there is not clarity about exactly what that meant, nor ample evidence of her personal piety.¹⁶ While Loades is correct in noting that Mary left less direct, textual evidence than many of her contemporaries, he has overlooked evidence in a variety of sources including the Calendar of State Papers Spanish and dedications both to and from Mary. This thesis examines many of these sources more closely in order piece together Mary's religious views, practices, and pious reputation more broadly. Valerie Schutte has explored some of these overlooked sources and has provided a number of compelling arguments surrounding textual examples of Mary's Catholicism. Of particular interest in Schutte's book is her commentary on a largely unexamined dedication from Mary to Katherine Parr in Parr's copy of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's 1544 *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany*.¹⁷ While Schutte briefly discusses this dedication and the context of its location, she does not explore the content of the *Exhortation* and *Litany* themselves, and these will be analyzed in Chapter One. Schutte's work uncovers the historical value of other book and manuscript dedications, particularly among women, thereby documenting a source base that had been largely untapped. Among those who had previously discussed dedications to Mary and Mary's own translations are Jaime Goodrich and Aysha Pollnitz. Both scholars have offered compelling arguments for how Mary's limited extant textual activities can be used to uncover details about her religious beliefs and reputation.¹⁸ Their research points overwhelmingly to Mary being Catholic both in the

¹⁶ Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, 19-20.

¹⁷ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 131-2.

¹⁸ See for example Jaime Goodrich, *Faithful Translators: Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2013); Jaime Goodrich, "Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas: The Politics of Pious Translation at the Henrician Court." *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews: Women Devotional Writers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* 24, no. 1-2 (March 28, 2011); Jaime Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* [with text]," *English Literary Renaissance* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 2010); Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*; Aysha Pollnitz, "Religion and Translation at the Court of

traditional, liturgical sense, but also, perhaps more subtly, in relation to papal supremacy.

Pollnitz has nuanced this by arguing that,

The central objective of Mary's reign was to return [the] church to Rome... In fact, Mary's close study of Erasmus' *Paraphrases on John* may have encouraged her to think carefully about the sort of church she would cultivate in England, should she succeed her brother. Not only had Mary grown up reading Vives and Erasmus, but she also favoured churchmen such as Cardinal Pole, who viewed the Council of Trent as an opportunity for Catholic renewal as well as persecutory counter-reformation in Europe.¹⁹

This thesis takes the important work done by Pollnitz and Goodrich and puts it in conversation with other evidence of Mary's religiosity and later religious policies.

Other sources suggest that Mary's practices were more aligned with Henrician Catholicism than continental Counter-Reformation ideology. This evidence comes largely from the latter years of Mary's reign. Judith Richards has pointed out that Mary resisted the full return of church property and lands and "in the final stages of her reign she excluded all papal communications from her realm."²⁰ Richards makes a valid point here and it is worth remembering that Mary's early enthusiasm for Rome did not necessarily carry through once the political realities of reigning became more complex. Charles Beem has argued that Mary was a thoroughly Henrician Catholic, to the point of being a "lightning rod among English Catholics."²¹ While Mary was certainly a source of hope and focus among English Catholics, Beem's assessment of Mary's beliefs is perhaps oversimplified. It is certainly true that Mary shared her father's dedication to the traditional Catholic religious rites, most notably the Mass.

Henry VIII," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

¹⁹ Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, 239.

²⁰ Judith Richards, "Examples and Admonitions: What Mary demonstrated for Elizabeth," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 38.

²¹ Charles Beem, "Princess of Wales? Mary Tudor and the History of English Heirs to the Throne," in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*, eds. Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 25.

Unlike other areas of Mary's personal religiosity, her relationship with and use of the Mass has been well explored by historians. It is seen as the centerpiece of both her personal religiosity as well as the Marian restoration more broadly.²² The fact remains, however, that while she and her father shared a comparable Catholic theology, once crowned Mary was quick to reject Henry's title of Supreme Head of the Church and reconcile with Rome.

Both Richards and Sarah Duncan have contributed important scholarship on the role of gender in Mary's accession and reign.²³ As England's first queen regnant, Mary represented a significant shift from the accepted contemporary political and religious norms solely by being in a position where she, as a woman, ruled over men. This was a serious inversion of accepted social and political norms in mid-sixteenth century England. When considered in conjunction with the fact that Mary was a vocal Roman Catholic in a Henrician Catholic, and an Edwardian Protestant, England it becomes clear that she faced some unique challenges in her accession and reign. Mary's gender was an inextricable part of her experience as princess and queen, and also played a role in her religious upbringing and methods of religious expression. This thesis does not focus on gender per se, but does provide an analysis of Mary's experience as both a Catholic woman and a Catholic queen.

Daniel Page's dissertation, "Uniform and Catholic: Church music in the reign of Mary Tudor" provides a thorough and compelling overview of Mary's Chapel Royal and the way that the Marian regime used church music as a key component in the Catholic restoration.²⁴ Page

²² Lucy Wooding, "The Marian Restoration and the Mass," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, 229.

²³ See for example Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen*, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Judith M. Richards, "Gender Difference and Tudor Monarchy: The Significance of Queen Mary I." *Parergon* 21, no. 2 (2004): 27–46; Judith M. Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene?': Gendering Tudor Monarchy." *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (December 1, 1997): 895–924; Richards, "Examples and Admonitions," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*.

²⁴ Daniel Page, *Uniform and Catholic: Church Music in the Reign of Mary Tudor* PhD Dissertation (Brandeis University, 1996).

identifies a number of significant links between Marian Church music and the Marian restoration more broadly. Chapter Two will examine some of these musical elements in conversation with other areas of Mary's personal religiosity as queen, with additional support from authors such as Magnus Williamson and Joshua L. Gore.²⁵ Page's work is the most extensive research on Marian church music to date. However, it focuses more on the broader Marian restoration's use of church music, rather than Mary's personal involvement. This thesis' deeper analysis of some aspects of Mary's involvement in church music enriches the current understanding of Marian Catholicism.

Mary's parliaments, proclamations, and policies have all received a good deal of scholarly attention from historians, in works that mostly predated work done on gender and women's writing and translation. Loades, Jennifer Loach, Michael Graves, Frederic Youngs, Paul L. Hughes, and James F. Larkin have all provided indispensable analyses of the politics and laws during Mary's reign, but largely focus on the legal and parliamentary processes and have little to say about Mary's role and influence.²⁶ Chapter Three will explore how Mary's personal religiosity may have provided context and motivation for many of the policies that were enacted while she was queen. It also seeks to provide evidence of Mary's direct involvement in some of this legislation in order to assess her personal religious priorities.

In the category of more fulsome biographies, Edwards, Melita Thomas, and Linda Porter all make compelling contributions. Edwards' *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* draws on a

²⁵ Magnus Williamson, "Queen Mary!, Tallis's O sacrum convivium and a Latin Litany", *Early Music* 44.2 (2016): 251-70; Joshua L. Gore, "The Compositions of Thomas Tallis: How the English Reformation Informed His Style," *Musical Offerings*: Vol. 11 : No. 2 , Article 1 (2020).

²⁶ See for example Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*; Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); Michael A.R. Graves, *The House of Lords in the Parliaments of Edward VI and Mary I: an Institutional Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Frederic Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); Paul Hughes and James Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations II 1553-1587* (London: Yale University Press, 1969).

wide variety of source material and provides a rich overview of key religious moments in Mary's life, including her struggle of conscience over signing the Act of Supremacy, her decision surrounding Edward's funeral, and her parliaments' measures to restore Catholicism. Edwards' work, like Loades', clearly links Mary to Roman Catholicism. Thomas offers a thoughtful picture of Mary's life prior to her father's death in 1546. Her book, *The King's Pearl: Henry VIII and his Daughter Mary* (2017) emphasizes Mary's education, as well as the influence of her Catholic humanist mother. The historiography more broadly offers good insight into Mary's education, particularly with regards to Vives' education plans and her exposure to writing by church fathers and contemporary humanists such as Erasmus. While not the topic of this thesis, there is arguably more work to be done uncovering the influence that Katherine of Aragon had on her daughter's beliefs. Katherine herself was known to be pious, bordering at times on monastic fervour, and there is interesting work to be done in exploring how that translated to the specifics of Mary's own piety. Porter's popular history, *The Myth of "Bloody Mary": A Biography of Queen Mary I of England* (2008), is a compelling account and while it offers some interesting insight into Mary's religiosity, it lacks evidential rigour. Nevertheless, her book offers one of the most unequivocal evaluations of Mary as not only a liturgical Catholic, but also a Catholic dedicated to Rome and the overthrow of Reformers.²⁷ For a fulsome overview of Mary's biographers through the ages, *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (2011) offers a helpful synthesis of the Marian historiography from her lifetime to the present. William Wizenan's chapter "The Religious Policy of Mary Tudor" offers insights useful for this thesis,

²⁷ Linda Porter, *The First Queen of England: The Myth of "Bloody Mary"* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008), 158.

although he is less concerned with exploring the linkages between Mary's personal beliefs and Marian policy.

While the existing body of secondary scholarship has identified and drawn on an impressive range of private and public primary sources with regards to Mary and her reign, few have sought to explore these to uncover the relationship between Mary as a Catholic woman and princess, and Mary as a Catholic queen. This thesis argues that tracing the resonances and dissonances in Mary's personal religiosity from her childhood through to the end of her queenship, informs our understanding of Marian religious policy. It demonstrates that Mary was a well-educated princess who favoured the Catholic humanism that her parents nurtured in her in her early life. It shows how these early influences impacted Mary's crisis of conscience and defence of Catholicism in the 1530s and 40s when both her father and brother implemented policies that contradicted the traditional religion of her youth. It analyzes evidence of Mary's religious activities and argues that even in moments of outward surrender, Mary remained firmly theologically Catholic. While there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate Mary's direct involvement in all areas of religious policy while queen, there are sufficient grounds to argue that Mary's personal religious priorities and experiences provided important context and motivation for the religious priorities of her government.

One of the clearest and most direct expressions of Mary's own beliefs and religious desires for England comes from one of her earliest proclamations as queen. It reads, "Her majesty...cannot now hide that religion which God and the world knoweth she hath professed from her infancy hitherto, which as her majesty is minded to observe and maintain for herself by God's grace during her time, so doth her highness much desire and would be glad the same were

of all her subjects quietly and charitably embraced.”²⁸ Here Mary is directly linking herself with Catholicism as the true faith, and reiterating that true faith as essential for the wellbeing of her people and the realm. Here, she is openly declaring that for her entire life, even when there were moments when she may have appeared outwardly to have wavered, in her heart she was had always been a devoted Catholic. This thesis will explore what, exactly, this meant for Mary in terms of both belief and practice. For her, as for many others, Catholicism was ancient and undeniable. It was the faith of her father and other royal predecessors. It was the faith her devout mother followed and instilled in her through example and education. It was a faith that emphasized traditional practices like the Mass, the Sacrament, and the patronage of religious houses. It was also a faith that, in Mary’s case, was based in Rome and necessarily required acknowledgement of papal supremacy.

²⁸ Hughes and Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations II*, 5.

CHAPTER ONE

A Pious Princess

Mary Tudor's reputation as a Catholic is well known and widely acknowledged. Mary's religious policies and the Marian church have received much attention in recent years and are often linked to aspects of her personal religious devotion or what might be called her religiosity. Much of the analysis both of her religious policies and religiosity focuses on discerning her level of dedication to Rome and the papacy. There is some excellent scholarship discussing whether Mary wanted a full return to Rome, or whether she wanted the English brand of Catholicism favoured by Henry VIII.¹ This chapter steps away from that discussion and instead homes in on what exactly is known about Mary's personal piety and religiosity before her accession. It also aims to refute claims by some scholars that there is a lack of evidence concerning Mary's personal piety.² While Mary was not a prolific writer, it is still possible to use the sources available to create a fair idea of her religiosity. Setting aside arguments about specific confessionalism, this chapter will assess the available sources to see what religious activities Mary participated in as a princess.

During Mary's childhood and in the centuries since there has been almost universal consensus surrounding the idea of Mary's steadfast personal piety. While there are those who

¹ See for example *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006); Valerie Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications: Royal Women, Power, and Persuasion* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-58*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1991); Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman eds., *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Linda Porter, *The First Queen of England: The Myth of "Bloody Mary"* (London: St. Martin's Press, 2008); Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

² David Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. Eamon Duffy and David Loades (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 19-20. This point is similarly rebutted by Schutte in *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*.

criticized Mary for her Catholicism, her policies, or her gender, even her critics have still largely been in agreement about her devoutness. The first section of this chapter will discuss Mary's steadfast personal piety, particularly in the context of her resistance to her father's Act of Supremacy. Next, it will analyze Mary's relationship with the rosary and its significance to her as well as its symbolism to others. Third, it will briefly touch on Mary's early interactions with England's abbeys and monasteries, as these are significant to her later relationships with each as queen. Next this chapter will analyze three writing and translation projects of Mary's, starting with the earliest.

First, it will explore the religious significance of Mary's 1527 translation of St. Thomas Aquinas' prayer, both in terms of the prayer itself and the religious climate in which the translation took place. Following that it will look at a seldom mentioned dedication that Mary wrote in Katherine Parr's copy of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany* in 1544. This text is an unusual choice for Mary to associate herself with and this section will explore how both Mary's relationship with Parr as well as how the text itself may have influenced her inscription. Finally, this chapter will review Mary's most discussed translation, that of the *Paraphrases on John* as part of Katherine Parr's project to translate Erasmus' *Paraphrases* into English. This section will explore the possible motivations behind Mary's choice to participate in the project, as well as what religious views the work itself demonstrates.

The chapter will then turn to Mary's dedication to the mass, which is often touted as the core of both her personal beliefs and religious policy. The final section of this chapter will demonstrate through both contemporary accounts as well as Mary's own actions that her pious reputation was well deserved, but that there were also instances in her early life where

pragmatism won out over steadfastness. In combination, all of these textual, material, and behavioural examples provide a clearer and more neutral view of Mary's religiosity, outside of any attempt to label her specific brand of Catholicism.

One of Mary's clearest demonstrations not only of piety, but also Catholicism, was her strong resistance to signing articles pertaining to the Royal Supremacy presented by her father in 1534. As early as January 1535, Mary was already nervous of increasing pressure to sign the articles "acknowledging the king as 'Supreme Head under Christ' of the Church in England, disavowing the Bishop of Rome's authority; and finally acknowledging her parents' marriage as incestuous and unlawful."³ In a letter by Imperial Ambassador Eustace Chapuys dated January 1, 1535, he writes that:

The Princess has been warned that the King, her father, in virtue of the rigorous statute lately made against all those refusing to take the oath on the occasion of his new marriage, is about to summon her, immediately after these festivals, to renounce her title, and swear to the said statute, bidding her on pain of death no longer to take, or allow any one to give her, the title of "Princess," or call Madame, her mother, "Queen." *But I take it that even if she should be sent to the Tower, or put to death, with which she is frequently threatened, the Princess will never change her purpose.*⁴

Here Chapuys is quite literally saying that it seems as though Mary would have been willing to die rather than take the oath of succession. While Chapuys' characterization here makes it sound as though Mary's resistance is centred on her unwillingness to give up her titles and status, Mary's own letters make it clear that her religious beliefs are also at the core of her resistance. In a letter dated July 15, 1536, Chapuys describes the threats and torment that Mary endured at the hands of Henry's men:

³ Melita Thomas, *The King's Pearl: Henry VIII and His Daughter Mary* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Amberley, 2017), 202.

⁴ Eustace Chapuys to the Emperor, "Spain: January 1535, 1-5," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 5 Part 1, 1534-1535*, ed. Pascual de Gayangos (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886), 354-372. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol5/no1/pp354-372>.

One of them said that since she was such an unnatural daughter as to disobey completely the King's injunctions, he could hardly believe... that she was the King's own bastard daughter. Were she his or any other man's daughter, he would beat her to death, or strike her head against the wall until he made it as soft as a boiled apple; in short that she was a traitress, and would be punished as such. Many other threats of the same sort did the said deputies utter on the occasion."⁵

Despite the very real threat to her safety and well-being, Mary had still refused to cooperate, which demonstrates the enormous significance that this decision held to her. True, her life was at stake, but her salvation was at stake if she agreed. Over the following weeks it became increasingly clear to Mary that "she herself was indeed, as much of Europe already feared, in mortal danger."⁶ Cromwell replied to Mary again and "enclosed the formulations which she had to sign, and on 22 June 1536, a day which would haunt her for the rest of her life, she did so. She put her name 'Marye', separately to three articles."⁷

In a letter to Henry afterwards she writes, "Eftsones therefore most humbly prostrate before your noble feet your most obedient subject and humble child, that hath not only repented her offences hitherto, but also decried simply from henceforth and wholly, next to almighty God, to put my state, continuance, and living in your gracious mercy."⁸ Here Mary is reluctantly expressing her obedience to Henry, While she initially fought doing so, this letter demonstrates that eventually she felt forced to acknowledge that Henry was second only to God, placing him above the pope. Part of the reason why Mary was so reluctant to sign these articles was because inwardly she rejected the idea of Henry as the head of the Church, which demonstrates that

⁵ Eustace Chapuys to the Emperor, "Spain: July 1536, 1-5," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 5 Part 2, 1536-1538*, ed. Pascual de Gayangos (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1888), 170-187. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol5/no2/pp170-187>.

⁶ John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 48.

⁷ Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*, 48.

⁸ Thomas Hearne, *Sylloge epistolarum*, in Titus Livius, *Vita Henrici Quinit* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1716), 124.

Rome and the papacy did matter to Mary before her accession. In another letter from a similar date, this time to Cromwell, Mary writes, “that I be not moved to agree to any further entry in this matter than I have done. For I assure you by the faith, that I owe to God, I have done the uttermost, that my conscience will suffer me; and I do neither desire nor intend to do less than I have done. But if I be put to any more... my said conscience will in no ways suffer me to consent thereunto.”⁹ While Mary’s unwillingness to give up her title and accept that her parents’ marriage was unlawful certainly played a role, her repeated appeals to her conscience in this letter certainly implies that the religious connotations of her surrender also weighed heavily on her. This inner turmoil and reluctance to succumb, despite increasingly severe tactics demonstrates that Mary valued the role of the papacy in Catholicism and that this was an element of faith that mattered to her. It is clear from letters sent by Chapuys following Mary’s capitulation that signing these articles took a heavy emotional toll on Mary. In a letter from early July 1536 he writes that, “After signing the paper as above said, the Princess fell suddenly into a state of despondency and sorrow; but I have since removed all her conscientious scruples by assuring her that not only will the Pope not condemn her action, but will highly approve of it under the circumstances.”¹⁰ Chapuys had a close personal relationship with Mary, so the fact that his first instinct was to reassure Mary about the religious aspect of her capitulation demonstrates that this element weighed particularly heavily on her. It is therefore clear that Mary valued the role of the papacy in her faith, and that this facet of Catholicism was significant to her. This shows that while there are certain aspects of Henry’s later religious policy that Mary found

⁹ Hearne, *Sylloge epistolarum*, 125.

¹⁰ Eustace Chapuys to the Emperor, *CSPSp* V ii, 170-187.

tolerable, her initial reaction to being forced to reject the papacy was vehemently and decidedly negative.

Mary's relationship with and use of the rosary is not as simple as some sources would imply, nor is it characterized by a clear and prominent narrative. David Loades has remarked that she used the rosary strategically to demonstrate her religious position to her brother, King Edward VI, but that not much can be read into this.¹¹ Sarah Duncan has also commented on Mary's use of the rosary in an act of defiance towards Edward, but has done more to demonstrate the effect to which Mary used the rosary in this public display. The last and arguably most significant evidence of Mary's relationship with the rosary comes from the writing of Henry Machyn, an English chronicler and merchant who lived from 1496-98 to 1563.¹² Machyn's diary begins in 1550 and offers a glimpse into Mary's life prior to her accession. Significantly, he provides an account of Mary using the rosary in a public display of religious defiance directed towards her Protestant half-brother King Edward VI. After the celebration of mass was outlawed through the 1549 Act of Conformity, Mary continued to hear it in her household, and her relationship with the mass will be discussed in greater detail in the next section. As a result of Mary's refusal to stop hearing the mass, a frustrated Edward summoned her to court by letter in late January 1551, and she arrived in March.¹³ The exchange in the letters makes it clear that the half siblings held decidedly different opinions on the Catholic mass, as well as who held the authority to alter such religious practices. Mary displayed her view prominently through her

¹¹ David Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 19-20.

¹² Ian Mortimer, "Machyn [Machin], Henry (1496/1498–1563), chronicler merchant," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (23 Sep. 2004) <https://www-oxforddnb-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-17531>.

¹³ Edward to Mary, "Spain: January 1551, 26-31," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 10, 1550-1552*, ed. Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1914), 203-219. *British History Online*, accessed December 12, 2020, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol10/pp203-219>.

entrance into London in March which Machyn described, “The xv day the Lady Mary rode through London unto St. John's, her place, with fifty knights and gentlemen in velvet coats and chains of gold afore] her, and after her iiij [score gentlemen and ladies, every] one havynge a peyre of bedes [of black.”¹⁴ These beads were certainly rosaries, and Mary was using them in a very tactical public display. As Duncan wrote, “The prominent display by numerous supporters of “bedes of black,” or rosary beads, the use of which had been condemned, made this a deliberate act of ceremonial defiance on Mary’s part, a political as well as religious statement.”¹⁵ The use of rosaries was one of many traditionally Catholic practices that Edward and his government were quick to outlaw when he took the throne in 1547. In July 1547 Edward’s government issued a proclamation titled “Injunctions for Religious Reform; Ordering Homilies to Be Read from the Pulpit.” Before his first parliament had taken place, Edward used these religious injunctions as a way to push England towards reform. One of the injunctions stipulated that:

Works devised by man’s phantasies, besides Scripture, as wandering to pilgrimages, offering of money, candles, or tapers to relics or images, or kissing and licking of the same, *praying upon beads*, or such like superstition, have not only no promise of reward in Scripture for doing them, but contrarywise, great threats and maledictions of God, for that they be things tending to idolatry and superstition, which of all other offenses God almighty doth most detest and abhor, for that the same diminish His honor and glory.¹⁶

This association of using the rosary (and other common Catholic religious practices) with “superstition” is both significant and intentional, as this was an argument frequently used by

¹⁴ Henry Machyn, "Diary: 1551," in *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550-1563*, ed. J G Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1848), 3-13. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/camden-record-soc/vol42/pp3-13>.

¹⁵ Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England’s First Queen*, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 8.

¹⁶ Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations Volume II: The Early Tudors (1485-1553)*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964), 394.

Reformers to discredit Catholic practices and theology. The fact that Mary so openly used the rosary in a bold act of public defiance shows a purposeful disdain and disregard for the religious injunctions passed by her brother. In addition to disregarding Edward's injunctions, this display also sends the message that at her core, Mary rejected the beliefs set out in the passage above. She used a well-known and easily recognizable Catholic symbol as a way to show her internal beliefs. While this is only one recorded instance, it does demonstrate Mary's willingness to use traditionally Catholic forms of religiosity. It is also unlikely that Mary would have chosen this display of rosaries if the rosary was not a religious object that she personally used or identified with, meaning that the numerous rosaries in her possession were almost certainly not going untouched. In addition to sending a message about her own personal beliefs, this example shows that despite the injunction claiming that God "detest[s]" rosaries, Mary was able to show how common and traditional they were for Christians. This is particularly significant in the elite gift-giving culture of the Tudor era, as Mary and many members of her household likely gave and received rosaries as gifts. This display was a calculated decision that Mary made in order to convey her personal beliefs in a public and recognizable setting.

Beyond Machyn's account, Mary's use of and relationship to the rosary is less clear. While some scholars, including Maria Hayward, suggest that Mary frequently wore or carried a rosary, there is not clear evidence supporting this.¹⁷ What is known about Mary and the rosary comes largely from her inventory of jewels and privy purse expenses. These documents list several "pairs of bedes" which was a term commonly used to refer to rosaries, particularly when

¹⁷ Maria Hayward, "Dressed to Impress," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 87.

listed in conjunction with a pendant or other religious items such as crucifixes.¹⁸ Furthermore, the materials of these pairs of beads, agate, lapis lazuli, coral, garnet, gold, make sense given that many of them appear to have been part of the royal jewel inventory, where expensive materials were common.¹⁹ In keeping with this understanding, Melita Thomas has concluded with justification that these entries can be seen as referring to rosaries.²⁰ This means that at various points in her life Mary owned anywhere from a few to a dozen rosaries and was given them as gifts or inherited them from those close to her including her father and two of her stepmothers, Jane Seymour and Katherine Parr.²¹ This exchange of expensive and beautiful rosaries between noble women can be tied into broader patterns of courtly gift-giving culture. This type of gift-exchange was often very public and by giving and receiving rosaries Mary could be easily associated with this physical symbol of Catholicism. In addition to these rosaries Mary also owned a number of jeweled crosses and other jewelry with distinct religious themes and associations.²²

The reason why Mary's relationship with the rosary is significant is because of its increasing associations with Catholicism throughout the English Reformation. While there are

¹⁸ Frederic Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary, daughter of King Henry the Eighth, afterwards Queen Mary: with a memoir of the princess, and notes* (London: W. Pickering, 1831), e.g. 180, 197; John Desmond Miller, *Beads and Prayers: The Rosary in History and Devotion* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2002), 3-4; Nathan D. Mitchell, *The Mystery of the Rosary: Marian Devotion and the Reinvention of Catholicism* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 6.

¹⁹ Miller, *Beads and Prayers*, 105; Mitchell, *The Mystery of the Rosary* 67.

²⁰ Thomas, *The King's Pearl*, 228.

²¹ It is worth nothing that a number of the pieces recorded in Mary's inventory are likely part of the queen's inventory of jewels that she owned intermittently between some stepmothers, and then re-inherited after her accession. For gifts from Henry see Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, 182. For rosaries she may have inherited from Jane Seymour see Thomas, *The King's Pearl*, 228. While there is no direct record in Mary's privy purse expenses of her having received these seven rosaries, they are in her possession come 1542 and it makes sense that she received them after Jane's death. Thomas does not provide a source for the inventory of Jane's jewels that she refers to. For rosaries that Mary inherited after Parr's death see Janel Mueller, *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 633.

²² Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, 175-7, 183-4.

notable evangelicals, including Katherine Parr, who certainly owned rosaries, though likely ceased to use them after embracing reformed ideas, Mary's use of the rosary in the 1551 entry was explicitly Catholic and an unquestionably confessional statement. Certainly during the later reign of Elizabeth, but also during Edward's reign, as seen in the Protestant injunctions, rosaries were a symbol of Catholicism. Alexandra Walsham explains that, "Along with medallions, crucifixes and *agni dei*, the rosary fell into the technical category of the sacramental...Seminary priests might stress that they should be used as an aid to inner contemplation, but laypeople often treated them 'superstitiously' as direct gateways to the sacred."²³ This association with the 'superstitious' is an unmistakable link to the physicality of Catholicism that Protestants disagreed with.²⁴ Through her use of the rosary here, Mary was openly aligning herself with publicly understood notions of Catholicism, which is telling in terms of her personal beliefs. Through her interactions with the rosary and other religious jewelry, both as owner and public wearer Mary demonstrated that there was a physical and Catholic tone to her personal religious beliefs.

While not a major part of Mary's religiosity, it is worth mentioning her interactions with monasteries as a princess. As Alexandra Walsham has pointed out, "Individuals in pre-Reformation catholicism were presented with a great deal of choice in their religious acts. Catholicism offered a menu of options, as people were encouraged to select particular saints for their own personal devotion, and to seek saintly aid by going on pilgrimage, fasting, or lighting candles before an image."²⁵ This religious environment is the one that Mary would have grown up in, as well as one that many of her early familial and religious influences would have

²³ Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain: Catholic Christendom 1300-1700* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2014), 377.

²⁴ For more on attempts to restore the physicality of Catholicism in Mary's reign see Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 4.

²⁵ Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, 41.

participated in. The record does not show that Mary had extensive interest in monasteries or shrines as princess, preferring to focus her attention on Christian humanist education and the mass.²⁶ However there is evidence in her privy purse expenses of relationships with a number of abbeys and monasteries. Her expenses show that she made a payment to the abbess of Syon's servant, a payment to a servant from Syon who delivered her a pudding, and a payment to a servant from Syon bringing a gift.²⁷ These entries show a reciprocal relationship between Mary and the abbey in terms of payments and gift-giving. This demonstrates that the abbey saw Mary as an individual interested in Syon, and that Mary saw this relationship as one worth supporting financially, albeit in small amounts. Her expenses show similar exchanges (one or two recorded exchanges during her time as princess) with the abbesses of both Berking and Nelstowe, the abbot of Stratford, and the friars of Chemingsford and Greenwich.²⁸ All of these would have been subject to the dissolution of the monasteries between 1530 and 1540. However, a number of them made reappearances once Mary became queen, demonstrating the value she saw in these relationships and organizations.²⁹

When Mary was a child, her mother, Katherine of Aragon, commissioned Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives to create a plan of study for the princess.³⁰ In addition to some of his own writings, "Vives suggested that Mary read classical moralists (Cicero, Seneca), church fathers (Jerome, Augustine), contemporary humanists (Erasmus, More), and Christian poets (Prudentius)."³¹ Vives himself was a Catholic humanist with ties to prominent Catholic

²⁶ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 77.

²⁷ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, 29, 48, 57.

²⁸ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, 10-3, 48.

²⁹ Mary Erler, *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 29.

³⁰ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 21.

³¹ Jaime Goodrich, *Faithful Translators: Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2013), 73.

theologians such as Thomas More.³² One of the primary educational texts commissioned by Katherine for Mary was Vives' *The Instruction of a Christen Woman*. Much of this book, and Mary's other education, focused on chastity, virtue, and courtly activities, none of which were specifically Catholic values. While Mary herself grew up to be famously pious and unquestionably virginal until marriage, these attributes could be seen as generically religious. Mary clearly demonstrated a firmly Catholic flavour to her piety, but piety and chastity themselves are not solely Catholic values, and therefore Mary's specific theological beliefs are difficult to link more closely to Vives.

Mary was not one for marginalia and left minimal writing outside of letters and select translations.³³ However, the writing that she did leave behind gives insight into her religious beliefs as a princess. Both Aysha Pollnitz and Jaime Goodrich have examined a short and early translation by Mary, her English translation of a prayer by Saint Thomas Aquinas in 1527.³⁴ The translation appears in "a medieval illuminated book of hours that contains the signatures of Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII, and Katherine of Aragon."³⁵ It is worth noting that Mary and Katherine of Aragon's names were later scratched out, presumably after Henry's first divorce.³⁶ This project was an interesting choice for young Mary given that it featured an author not included in her educational plans, as well as the fact that it was a translation from Latin to English, which Vives did not recommend.³⁷ However, Goodrich writes that, "Mary's

³² Juan Luis Vives, *The Instruction of a Christen Woman* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 6.

³³ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 128.

³⁴ Jaime Goodrich, "Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas: The Politics of Pious Translation at the Henrician Court," *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews: Women Devotional Writers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* 24, no. 1-2 (March 28, 2011): 11. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0895769X.2011.540501>.

³⁵ Goodrich, "Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas," 14. Found in BL MS 17012.

³⁶ Description of the manuscript, including the erasures can be found in the BL listing for MS 17012.

³⁷ Goodrich, "Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas," 12.

presentation of her translation could therefore have easily been viewed as exhibiting the Christian humanism of her mother as well as the courtly display of her father... Furthermore, besides being known as a Catholic saint and famous scholastic philosopher, Aquinas had by this time become stereotypically associated with medieval Catholicism.”³⁸ It is possible that this translation may be the earliest extant example of Mary undertaking a project to please or honour a parental figure, while also promoting her own beliefs and religious agency. It is clear from other projects that this motivation was one that moved her later in life, so it is not impossible that a display of filial duty was the driving force behind this translation. Pollnitz has remarked that, “This traditional prayer remained popular in Tudor England; it would be included in primers authorised by each Tudor monarch regardless of their confessional allegiances.”³⁹ While at the time Mary would have had no way of knowing about the prayer’s future longevity, it is likely that she translated because it was already popular and fairly widely accepted. The text of the prayer itself emphasizes some traditionally feminine aspects of piety such as purity and obedience.⁴⁰ It also includes the passage, “and that I may reioyse yn no thinge but in this whiche mouith me to the / nor be sory for nothing but for those whiche drawith me frome the / Desiring to please no body nor fering to displese anny besides the: Lorde.”⁴¹ While this section likely held no particular significance for Mary at the time of the translation, it is interesting that less than a decade later, she would be put into the impossible decision of being asked to deny the supremacy of the pope in favour of her earthly father, Henry VIII. It is unknown whether Mary ever

³⁸ Goodrich, “Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas,” 13-15.

³⁹ Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 233-4.

⁴⁰ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxxiii.

⁴¹ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxxiii. Thank you also to Jaime Goodrich for providing her transcription of Mary’s translation of the prayer.

revisited or made use of this prayer after translating it but given the prayer's enduring popularity is seems likely. Specifics aside, this ideal of ultimate devotion to God was clearly one that Mary strove to embody, and which characterized many of her religious decisions throughout life.

In addition to her two translation projects, that of the Aquinas prayer and of Erasmus' *Paraphrases*, Mary also wrote three extant dedications in books owned by others at court.⁴² The most interesting of these dedications, and also the most relevant to Mary's religious beliefs and priorities, is her inscription to Katherine Parr, her fifth and final step-mother, in Parr's copy of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's 1544 *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 processions*. This book had two parts: the *Exhortation* which was a sermon meant to be read first, and second, the *Litany* itself.⁴³ As modernized and transcribed in Janel Mueller's edition the inscription reads, "Madame, I shall desire your grace most humbly to accept this rude hand and unworthy, whose heart and service unfeignedly you shall be sure of, during my life continually. Your most humble daughter and servant, Mary."⁴⁴ As both Mueller and Valerie Schutte remark, the inscription itself provides little information beyond Mary's affection for Parr. Schutte notes that "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."⁴⁵ Given the content of the book and Mary's personal history with Cranmer, it is unsurprising that Mary did not own a copy. As demonstrated through Schutte's

⁴² Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 131-2. Schutte notes that the two similar inscriptions are: one to an unnamed lady in waiting in a fifteenth century manuscript, "Hore beate Marie Virginis secundum consuetudinem Anglie," and the other is written in a Latin and English book of prayers owned by Jane Wriothesley.

⁴³ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 131-2; Mary's inscription to Parr is found in the edition of Cranmer's *Exhortation and Litany* in the Elton Hall Collection.

⁴⁴ Janel Mueller, ed. *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 625.

⁴⁵ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 131-2.

research, books that Mary paid for or received as gifts tended to reflect her reputation as a Catholic princess.⁴⁶ The choice of this book as a location for Mary's inscription raises a number of questions because, as Schutte has remarked, "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' marriage. 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 Parr's copy of Cranmer's book."⁴⁷ It seems unlikely, given what is known about Mary and contemporary book inscriptions more broadly, that Mary was unaware of the political and religious statement she was making by writing in Cranmer's *Exhortation and Litany*.

Thomas has argued that beyond simply demonstrating Mary's public conformity with her father's religious regime, the inscription also provides deeper insight into Mary's own privately held religious beliefs. She writes, "Mary's loving and respectful message in Cranmer's *Litany* suggests that the stereotype of Mary as wedded to the ancient forms of Catholicism, with no flexibility in her approach, may not give a true picture of her feelings...So long as the changes to religion did not undermine the Mass, Mary seemed able to accept her father's religious innovations."⁴⁸ This interpretation seems reasonable, given what we know about Mary's other religious practices as princess. There were a number of instances in her life prior to her accession where she made decisions or undertook projects that would not be considered strictly Catholic, namely, signing the articles of Supremacy, albeit with great reluctance, participating in the Erasmus translation project, and even her close intellectual relationship with Katherine Parr. As Loades has observed, "All of which suggests that Mary fitted quite comfortably into the circle

⁴⁶ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 1-2.

⁴⁷ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 132.

⁴⁸ Thomas, *The King's Pearl*, 267.

around her father's last queen, and that there was nothing in either her intellectual tastes or devotional practice that set her apart as a rebel or a misfit. The explanation for this is probably that the core of her piety was the Mass, and in that she resembled Henry himself."⁴⁹ In an effort to avoid repeating arguments about Mary as a Henrician as opposed to a Roman Catholic, a closer review of the *Exhortation* and *Litany* themselves is required in order to better understand what exactly Mary may have been endorsing through her inscription to Parr.

At the simplest level, Mary's inscription endorses the vernacular church service in England. It is important to note, however, that Cranmer's *Litany* is still a largely Catholic service being read in English. This is an important distinction, as it is clear from Mary's actions during Edward's later reign that her willingness to accept or endorse changes to the essence of the Mass itself was non-existent. Despite the schism with Rome, the mass remained legal throughout Henry's reign, and royal enforcement of Catholic religious rites was legislated through the 1539 Act of Six Articles, which remained in place until Henry's death.⁵⁰ This means that *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany* (1544) was published in a religious environment that was distinctly English but also theologically Catholic at the highest level. Given that Mary had already publicly conformed to the Royal Supremacy nearly a decade earlier, she had little to gain from public displays of non-conformity. In many ways, Cranmer's *Litany* can be viewed as a simplified, condensed version of the existing liturgy, stripped of the "unnecessary" and time-consuming elements such as "the introductory antiphons, verse... doxology... [and] the penitential psalms, [until] only the Litany and suffrages were left."⁵¹ A closer analysis of the

⁴⁹ Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, 13-14.

⁵⁰ *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.3 (London: Dawson's of Pall Mall, 1963), 31 Henry VIII c. 14 739.

⁵¹ Roger Bowers, "The Vernacular Litany of 1544 in the Reign of Henry VIII," in *Authority and Consent in Tudor England* eds. C.S.L. Davies, G.W. Bernard, and S.J. Gunn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 159.

Exhortation and *Litany* themselves confirms that aside from being in English, they are largely based in Catholic theology, and include a number of significant references to specifically Catholic elements including the real presence and alms.

Cranmer's *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany* makes two references to angels. In the first he writes, "We ought to praie, that his blessed will maie be fulfilled here in this world amongst us his mortal creatures, as it is of his immortall angels, and of all the holy company of the heavenly spirits."⁵² Here the reference to angels is fairly benign and refers largely to their existence rather than any intercessory role they may play for Christians. In his second reference he writes, "Lette us praie, that it maie please almyghtie god, lord of hostes, in whose hands is onely wealthe and victorie, mercifully to assist hym [Henry], sending his holy angell, to bee his successor, keper, & defender from all his adversaries and from all euyls."⁵³ This passage gives angels a significantly more active role and portrays them as both a defender of god as well as a pseudo-intermediary between God and the people. More specifically, in this passage the people are being asked to pray so that God will send an angel to protect Henry in the war. While angels are not solely Catholic in nature, they are an aspect of theology that many Reformers, as well as some Catholics, questioned. Alexandra Walsham writes that unlike saints and other traditionally Catholic beliefs, "Protestants were unable to eject [angels] from their mental universe completely. Sanctioned by Scripture and deeply rooted in early Christian tradition, reformed theology was obliged to find room for them. Nevertheless, Luther, Calvin, and their disciples in England did deliberately distance themselves from elements of medieval devotion to these

⁵² Thomas Cranmer, *An Exhortation unto Prayer. . . Also a Litany with Suffrages to be said or sung in the time of the said processions* (London: Berthelet, 27 May, 1544) RSTC 10620, image 3.

⁵³ Cranmer, *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany*, image 5-6.

heavenly intermediaries.”⁵⁴ Given that angels are not strictly Catholic, it is not necessarily meaningful that Cranmer included them in the *Exhortation*. However, in conjunction with other aspects, it does point towards the fact that the *Exhortation* itself was theologically traditional, and therefore something that Mary may have supported in content if not form.

The *Exhortation* is also significant due to its reference to transubstantiation, an element which was fundamental to the Catholic understanding of the eucharist.⁵⁵ The belief in transubstantiation, the idea that the bread and the wine are literally turned into, rather than symbolically representing, the body and blood of Christ, is a hallmark of Catholicism and was refuted by Reformers including Lutherans.⁵⁶ In this section Cranmer is elaborating on a petition from the Our Father. In the *Exhortation* when referring to the bread and wine Cranmer writes, “The true conservation of our heavenly fathers holy and blessid commandementis, the lively bread of the blessed body of our saviour Jesu Christe, the holy and sacrate cuppe of the precious and blessed bludde, whiche was shed for us upon the Crosse, to purchase us pardon and forgyvenes of our synnes.”⁵⁷ Here Cranmer’s wording certainly implies that the bread and wine are the literal body and blood of Christ, which was in keeping with Henry’s personal beliefs on the subject and therefore unsurprising given that this was a royal publication.⁵⁸ To offer a point of contrast regarding the language surrounding the bread and wine, here is the wording provided in the section “The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion Commonly Called the Masse” of the 1549 Protestant Book of Common Prayer, “S. Paule...exorteth all persones diligently to trie and examine themselves, before they presume to eate of that breade, and drinke of that cup:

⁵⁴ Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, 213-4.

⁵⁵ On transubstantiation see Jacobs, *The Book of Common Prayer*, 18-21.

⁵⁶ Robert Paul Seesengood, *Paul: A Brief History* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 149.

⁵⁷ Cranmer, *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany*, image 3.

⁵⁸ Jacobs, *The Book of Common Prayer*, 18-21.

for as the benefite is great, if with a truly penitent heart, and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament; (for then we spiritually eate the fleshe of Christ, and drinke his bloude, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, wee bee made one with Christ, and Christ with us;).”⁵⁹ This specification about “spiritually” eating the flesh of Christ is an addition by Cranmer, and reflects a lack of belief in transubstantiation. The difference between the two passages demonstrates that the 1544 *Exhortation* reflects a more traditional Catholic view and is therefore in line with Mary’s personal beliefs in the true presence which become more apparent later in her life.⁶⁰

The last important reference in the *Exhortation* is Cranmer’s mention of alms. In traditional Catholicism alms were widely used as an act of charity as well as a way to help ensure one’s place in heaven or hasten one’s exit from purgatory.⁶¹ In the *Exhortation* Cranmer writes, “Let us also furnish it with almes dede, and with the workes of mercie and charitie. For praier is good and acceptable unto god, when it is accompanied with almose dedes, & with the workes of mercy.”⁶² Here Cranmer invokes the notion that religious alms are both a legitimate and necessary means of appealing to god and obtaining salvation. This reference would likely have appealed to Mary as it is clear from her privy purse expenses that she frequently gave alms in various forms.⁶³ Here there is a direct linkage between a well-established aspect of Mary’s personal religious behaviour, and the message being provided in Cranmer’s *Exhortation*. When looked at in conjunction with the passages concerning, angels, and transubstantiation, it is clear

⁵⁹ Church of England, *the Booke of the Common Prayer and Administracion of the Sacramentes, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church* (London: Grafton, 1549; STC 16274), Diii.

⁶⁰ See section on Mary and the Sacrament in Chapter 2; Porter, *The First Queen of England*, 237, 281-2; William Wizeman, “The Religious Policy of Mary I,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 167.

⁶¹ Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 354-5.

⁶² Cranmer, *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany*, image 10.

⁶³ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, e.g. 13, 36, 38, 43, 55.

that while it is written in the vernacular, Cranmer's *Exhortation* is informed by Catholic theology. Given Mary's dedication to these various aspects of religious theology, it does not seem entirely implausible that her inscription was not only an act of affection towards Parr, but also an endorsement of the text itself.

It is, however, also important to note that there were certainly aspects of the *Exhortation* and *Litany* that Mary would not have agreed with or wanted to endorse. While the *Exhortation* might be viewed as an abbreviated, simplified, vernacular service, "the litany was a radically adapted version of its predecessor...the principal casualty of [which]... was the invocation of saints."⁶⁴ This change would likely not have met with Mary's approval. There is minimal evidence about Mary's specific feelings about saints prior to her accession, but as the next chapter will discuss, the Chapel Royal did quickly replace Cranmer's *Litany* with the traditional Catholic Sarum Litany (with the invocations to the saints) at the beginning of her reign, which indicates that it was a part of the rite that was significant to her.

In addition to her father, mother, and last step-mother, throughout her time as princess, Mary had a number of religious and scholastic influences and relationships at court. One of these influences was Erasmus Desiderius, a humanist scholar who lived from 1467 to 1536.⁶⁵ Mary and Erasmus did not have a personal relationship, but it is clear that Erasmus had an influence on Mary's education and religious beliefs. While Erasmus may not have been Mary's largest education or theological influence, there is considerable evidence of Mary's interactions with his work. Vives, in his educational plan for Mary, recommended works by Erasmus including his

⁶⁴ Bowers, "The Vernacular Litany," 159-60.

⁶⁵ James McConica, "Erasmus, Desiderius (c. 1467–1536), humanist scholar and reformer," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004. <https://www-oxforddnb-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-39358>.

Paraphrases on the New Testament, his *Education of a Christian Prince*, and his letters on Jerome.⁶⁶ This demonstrates that from an early age Mary was not only familiar with Erasmus, but acquainted with his work in the context of a thoroughly humanist and Catholic education.

This early exposure to the work of Erasmus provides reasonable context for Mary's choice to engage in Katherine Parr's project to translate his *Paraphrases on the New Testament* into English in 1545.⁶⁷ In particular, Mary was asked to translate Erasmus's *Paraphrases* on the book of John. Given Mary's previous interaction with Erasmus as a Catholic humanist, as well as her close and amicable relationship with Parr, this translation is perhaps not as contentious as some scholars have suggested. This was a lengthy project and while Mary worked on her section until 1545, the translation in its entirety was not printed until 1548. It is worth mentioning that Erasmus while held some Reformist views, including his support of the vernacular Bible, he remained theologically Catholic and shared Mary's dedication to the mass and rejection of justification through faith alone.⁶⁸ Some scholars, such as Thomas, have provided compelling arguments for how Mary used the *Paraphrases* to reinforce her religious stance, rather than being an unhappy participant in a Reformist project. She writes that, "It has been suggested that Katherine asked Mary to do the translation as a way of encouraging her down the road of reform, and that Mary took refuge in illness as a way of avoiding it. However, we know that Mary had no objection to the Bible in English in principle...[and the translation] was finished by Francis Malet, chaplain first to Katherine, then to Mary herself. That they shared a chaplain suggests Mary and Katherine's views on religion had not diversified markedly by this point."⁶⁹ This

⁶⁶ Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, 231.

⁶⁷ Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, 236.

⁶⁸ See for example Gregory D. Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

⁶⁹ Thomas, *The King's Pearl*, 268.

analysis demonstrates a few key points, namely that neither Erasmus' *Paraphrases*, nor their vernacular counterpart were objectionable to Mary, as well as the fact that Mary may not have perceived Parr as the Reformer she is often viewed as today. It is clear from a letter written by Parr that she views Mary as the primary translator of the book of John, but given that the translation was at the very least completed by Mallet, Parr's own chaplain, it seems unsurprising that she is pleased with the work. In the letter, translated from Latin by Mueller, Parr writes:

I have heard, the last touch has now been put by Mallet on Erasmus's work *On John* (which he saw through translation) ... And further [ask], that you signify whether you wish it to go out most happily into the light under your name, or whether rather by an unknown author. To which work really, in my opinion, you will be seen to do an injury, if you refuse the book to be transmitted to posterity on the authority of your name: for the most accurate translating of which you have undertaken so many labors for the highest good of the commonwealth; and more than these (as is well enough known) you would have undertaken, if the health of your body had permitted.⁷⁰

Given that Parr refers to Mallet's contribution to the translation as "the last touch," it is clear that she felt that Mary was responsible for a substantial portion of the translation. She also praises Mary's hard work, as well as the quality of the translation, which could simply be a nicety or a pleasantry, but could also be read as Parr's sincere endorsement of Mary's work and her authorial choices as translator. This is significant because as discussed below, other scholars have noted distinctly Catholic interpretations throughout Mary's translation, suggesting that Parr's beliefs at this point may not have been wildly different than Mary's own. Lastly, the fact that Parr asked Mary whether or not she would like her name on the translation is noteworthy, because when the translation was published, Mary was prominently named in the preface to *On John*. This means that Mary had an opportunity to remain anonymous, but instead chose to

⁷⁰ Mueller, *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*, 88.

openly proclaim her involvement in the project which indicates that she was a willing rather than reluctant participant.

Through her participation in the Erasmus translation, Mary had the opportunity to please not only Parr, but also to honour her Catholic humanist roots. Goodrich writes that, “Catherine of Aragon had probably sent Erasmus’s edition of Jerome to Mary, and she commissioned Erasmus to write the *Christiani matrimonii institutio* (1526). By agreeing to translate Erasmus’s *Paraphrase on John*, Mary pleased Katherine Parr and honoured her mother’s learned devotion, simultaneously acknowledging her dependent position at court as well as maintaining her identity as Catherine of Aragon’s daughter.”⁷¹ Without projecting too much sentimentality into the past, it is not unreasonable to assume that Mary might associate the *Paraphrases* with her late mother and see this project as an opportunity to reinforce the traditional piety that she had been taught as a young princess. The project was also one that fell in line with the contemporary religious environment set by her father the king. In the mid-1540s when this translation was taking place, Henry’s religious policy was conservative and theologically Catholic, while still being divided from Rome. Pollnitz writes that, “In an apparent about-face, the 1543 ‘Act for the advancement of true religion’ also prohibited the common sort from reading vernacular scripture. Yet Henry and Cranmer had not retreated from the propagation of the *verbum Dei*; they simply filtered God’s word through authorized, interpretive guides...Erasmus’ *Paraphrases* were well suited to this religious climate.”⁷² Similar to Mary’s inscription in Parr’s copy of Cranmer’s English *Exhortation* and *Litany*, her participation in the Erasmus translation project may

⁷¹ Goodrich, *Faithful Translators*, 75.

⁷² Aysha Pollnitz, “Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 127.

demonstrate Mary's support of, or at least willingness to publicly endorse, Henry's specific brand of Catholicism.

Beyond the fact that the act of participating in the translation arguably aligns with what is known about Mary's religious beliefs, both Pollnitz and Goodrich have argued that some of Mary's authorial choices as translator indicate distinctly conservative beliefs. Goodrich has identified numerous incidences throughout the translation where Mary has chosen to highlight a more traditional aspect of the text such as emphasizing the role of the Virgin Mary, emphasizing the role of the pope and papal supremacy, opting to use the word "penance" rather than "repentance," and "align[ing] Erasmus's text with Roman Catholic doctrine on the Mass."⁷³ Pollnitz has made similar observations and writes that, "The princess' translation of the *Paraphrase on John* endorsed ideas ...include[ing] the importance of faith and charity, the power of grace, the word of God, and the sacrament and sacrifice embodied in the mass which bound the faithful in an eternal 'cove-naunte'."⁷⁴ These examples could demonstrate that Mary did not see Erasmus' *Paraphrases* as wholly conservative, and that she therefore needed to make these changes in order to align the text more closely with her personal beliefs. However, it could also demonstrate that she felt her interpretations to be in line with those of Erasmus and that her translations were simply the most accurate way to convey his message. Regardless, the translation demonstrates that these traditionally Catholic elements were theologically important to Mary, which gives insight into her beliefs pre-accession.

The Mass is commonly touted as being the core of Mary's personal religious beliefs and practices, and there is ample evidence supporting this in her life prior to her accession. While this

⁷³ Goodrich, *Faithful Translators*, 84-6. I have opted to rely on Goodrich and Pollnitz's analysis here as I do not know Latin and therefore cannot comment on authorial decisions made by Mary in the translation.

⁷⁴ Pollnitz, "Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII," 135.

chapter demonstrates that there were numerous facets to Mary's expressions of religious belief, the historical record does indicate that the mass was of unique importance to her. This is both interesting, and perhaps frustrating for scholars studying Mary, as the Mass is one facet of Catholicism that was fundamental to both Roman Catholics as well as the Church of England under Henry VIII. Nevertheless, Mary's devotion to the Mass is still worthy of analysis in order to identify and understand the aspects of faith that mattered most deeply to her. One important factor in Mary's devotion to the Mass is the fact that for the first seventeen years of her life, Catholicism was the established faith in England, practiced and recognized by all but the most zealous early Reformers. From her birth until Henry's break with Rome, both of her parents as well as all of her religious influences in terms of services, education, and literature were Catholic. Perhaps more importantly, they were Catholic and it hardly mattered given the relative absence of a large competing religious faction in England.

This does not mean that Mary was not pious in her youth, she almost certainly was according to contemporary accounts, but rather that she was pious without the Catholic flavour of her piety being noteworthy. Linda Porter captures this well when she writes that Mary's childhood governess "was explicitly directed that Mary must 'at due times, serve God'. This meant the observance of the forms of traditional religion, the hearing of mass at regular intervals during the day and time spent in prayer and reading of scripture. The Mass and prayer were the outward forms of religious observance that Mary shared with all her countrymen. They were the markers of daily life that had endured for centuries."⁷⁵ This idea is echoed by Loades when writing about Mary's likely response to Henry's Act of Six Articles in 1539. He notes that,

⁷⁵ Porter, *The First Queen of England*, 41. The quote within Porter can be found in Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, xli, and comes originally from MS. Cott. Vit., C. i., f. 24.b.

“From her point of view, the mass, and the traditional ceremonies of the church simply represented true religion, which no human authority had any right to touch.”⁷⁶ This characterization speaks to the idea that Mary saw the Mass not as a confessional choice, but as the universally correct form of faith, which given her devout and traditional upbringing is hardly surprising. There is little doubt among contemporary sources that Mary regularly heard the Mass as a princess, with a number of sources making specific reference to her requests to hear the Mass, especially during times of difficulty such as the 1530s.⁷⁷

During her early life and the end of Henry’s reign, Mary’s dedication to the Mass remained politically and confessionally unremarkable, largely because even after Henry’s break with Rome, the Mass remained legal and continued to be practiced in England. Scholars have noted that Mary’s acquiescence to Henry’s religious regime could be explained by the idea that the Mass was what was most important to her. Pollnitz writes, “As Loades has pointed out, once Mary had accepted the Royal Supremacy in June 1536 she made no overt protest about religious worship in England until Edward’s council struck against the mass. She may have had reservations about aspects of Henry’s church but she was a consenting member of it.”⁷⁸ This prioritizing of the Mass is perhaps also demonstrated by her endorsement of texts such as Cranmer’s *Litany*. The status quo of Mass and obedience remained between Mary’s surrender to the Royal Supremacy in 1536 and Henry’s death in 1547.⁷⁹ It was after her father’s death, when

⁷⁶ Loades, “Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I,” in *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 13. In support of this statement Loades cites Gilbert Burnet, *History of the Reformation in England II* (London: Printed by J.D. for Richard Chiswell, 1683), 115-7.

⁷⁷ There are a few examples of Mary making offerings at masses in her privy purse expenses for various years Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, e.g. 24, 45 as well as records of Mary requesting permission to hear mass after her household was dismantled in 1534 noted in Thomas, *The King's Pearl*, 148 and originally found in Eustace Chapuys to the Emperor, *CSPSp V ii*, 53-70.

⁷⁸ Pollnitz, “Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII,” 125; Loades, “Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I,” in *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 13-17.

⁷⁹ Hearne, *Sylloge epistolarum*, 142.

her brother's decidedly Protestant regime started making substantial changes to religion in England, that Mary's dedication to the Mass took on a political tone and became a notably Catholic, and oppositional, practice. Porter has argued that at this point "what had once been a comforting ritual, but probably nothing more, became the touchstone of Mary's life. She embraced it almost ostentatiously, hearing four masses a day as early as June 1547, well before the full extent of Somerset's religious policy became clear."⁸⁰ When the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1549, new religious policy was imposed and the observance of traditional mass was prohibited.⁸¹ Initially, given her privileged position and strong dedication to the Mass, Mary was given a grace period in order to "accommodate herself to the new law."⁸² This came after the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V wrote on her behalf, asking that she be allowed to "continue in her observance of the ancient religion," an understandable request coming from a staunch Catholic and one of Mary's closest allies and supporters at the time.⁸³ This is an example of Mary demonstrating not only her diplomatic ties and privileged position as princess, but also her dedication to the Mass and the ancient religion. While Mary had practiced the Mass all her life, this is the moment where the record begins to show that Mary was willing to break the law and defy her brother the king in order to maintain this aspect of her devotion.

Despite an initial willingness to agree to the Emperor's request on Mary's behalf, Edward proved unhappy to tolerate Mary's religious habits in the long term. Throughout 1550 and 1551

⁸⁰ Porter, *The First Queen of England*, 158; Van der Delft to the Emperor, June 16, 1547, "Spain: June 1547, 16-30," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 9, 1547-1549*, eds. Martin A.S. Hume and Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912), 100-116. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol9/pp100-116>.

⁸¹ *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.4 (London: Dawson's of Pall Mall, 1963), 2 & 3 Edward VI c. 1 37.

⁸² Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, 180.

⁸³ Emperor to Van der Delft "Spain: March 1550, 16-31," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 10, 1550-1552*, ed. Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1914), 46-57. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol10/pp46-57>.

Mary and Edward had a number of exchanges in person, by letter, and via intermediaries regarding Mary's refusal to stop hearing the Mass and Edward's refusal to let her continue. In one such letter, from Francois Van der Delft, the Imperial Ambassador, to the Emperor in January 1550, regarding the King's invitation to spend Christmas at court, Mary is quoted as saying "They wished me to be at court so that I could not get the mass celebrated for me, and that the King might take me with him to hear their sermons and masses. I would not find myself in such a place for anything in the world...I shall...avoid entering into argument with the King, my brother, who, as I hear, is beginning to debate the question of religion and oppose ours, as he is being taught to do."⁸⁴ This passage demonstrates two key things. First, that Mary herself acknowledges the importance the Mass holds for her. Second, as Pollnitz has pointed out, that Mary sees Edward's tutors and advisors as playing a role in his religious views.⁸⁵ While Mary's observation is certainly not incorrect, it is perhaps somewhat hypocritical given that her own religious views were similarly impacted by her education and Catholic upbringing. There are numerous letters from this period that demonstrate Mary's repeated appeals to be allowed to continue observing the "ancient religion" and hearing the Mass.⁸⁶ The culmination of these requests was increasing frustration on the part of Edward and resulted in her being summoned to court in early 1551.⁸⁷ Despite the ongoing dispute, there is no evidence that Edward was ever successful in his attempts to stop Mary from hearing the mass. Given her experience with the Royal Supremacy in 1536, Mary was no stranger to defending her religious beliefs when under attack. However, while Mary likely felt a sense of filial duty to Henry, not to mention the fact

⁸⁴ Van der Delft to the Emperor, *CSPSp X*, 1-11.

⁸⁵ Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, 182.

⁸⁶ See much of *CSPSp X*.

⁸⁷ Edward to Mary, *CSPSp X*, 203-219.

that many of their beliefs were theologically similar, she had a very different sense of the power dynamic with Edward. Her younger brother, while king, was arguably still a child and did not hold the same authoritative weight that Henry had held for her. That being said, it still demonstrates a considerable amount of piety, conviction, and personal fortitude that Mary chose, and was able, to withstand Edward and his Council's repeated threats. If the Mass were not important to her, this prolonged defence would hardly have been worth it.

During her lifetime, Mary had a reputation for her steadfast personal piety and being unwaveringly virtuous. Many of her contemporaries, regardless of their personal religious persuasion, praised her piety and religious devotion. Many of these expressions come from prefaces or inscriptions in books or translations dedicated to Mary. As both Schutte and Goodrich have explored, Mary received a number of dedications as both princess and queen. Prior to becoming queen, Mary received a number of manuscript dedications from Henry Parker, Lord Morley, a nobleman and translator with whom she had a patronage relationship.⁸⁸ Schutte has identified eight dedications that are extant but suggests there were likely more that have been lost.⁸⁹ Schutte observes that, "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."⁹⁰ That Morley chose Mary as the recipient for these implicitly and explicitly Catholic texts and dedications demonstrates that he saw her as an individual who

⁸⁸ James P. Carley, "Parker, Henry, tenth Baron Morley (1480/81–1556), nobleman and translator," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 September, 2004. <https://www-oxforddnb-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21305>; Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 82.

⁸⁹ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 82-3.

⁹⁰ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 90.

shared those beliefs and who was in a position to support and advance them in her own way. This textual relationship shows that Mary had a reputation for Catholicism and piety even before her accession.

Another significant dedication that Mary received as princess was Mary Roper Clarke Basset's translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Basset was the granddaughter of Thomas More, a notable Catholic humanist whose work Mary had been familiar with since childhood.⁹¹ This translation took place at some point during Edward's reign, and as Goodrich has pointed out, can be viewed as an attempt on the part of the Morean pedagogical circle to promote and maintain Catholicism throughout the onslaught of the Edwardian church.⁹² Goodrich writes that, "Basset dedicated the work to Princess Mary, the single most influential Catholic Englishwoman of the Edwardian period and a rallying point for English Catholicism... As Edward's regents systematically moved to replace the Catholic Mass with Protestant ceremonies, Mary defended the mass and so became a public symbol of English Roman Catholicism."⁹³ That Mary was so easily and readily associated with Catholicism shows that most, if not all, public evidence of her religiosity could be linked with the "ancient religion." Much of this impression may have come from her public and prolonged defence of the mass during Edward's reign. However, given her patronage relationship with Morley it is likely that her reputation as a steadfast Catholic began much earlier. It is possible that this earlier impression stemmed from people associating Mary with her Catholic humanist mother, or perhaps her initial refusal to agree to the Royal Supremacy.

⁹¹ Jaime Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* [with text]," *English Literary Renaissance* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 2010): 301. Original in the British Library: MS Harley 1860, fols. 1-8.

⁹² Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation," 318.

⁹³ Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation," 318.

In the dedicatory preface itself, Basset makes repeated reference to Mary's virtue and wisdom.⁹⁴ This is typical of dedications to Mary, but the fact that Basset is writing this not in the hopes of a patronage relationship, but rather as a genuine imploration to a fellow Catholic woman is significant. It is interesting and noteworthy that Basset focuses on Mary's wisdom and education rather than her chastity, demonstrating that she viewed Mary as an intellectual woman rather than just a pious princess. This shows that at least in some circles, Mary's reputation as a well-educated Catholic humanist existed in conjunction with her reputation as a chaste potential bride in royal matchmaking. Basset makes specific reference to Mary's learned reputation and royal lineage when she writes:

I coulde fynde none, for so many consyderacions as I then sayd vnto theym (yf that my labou^r were in dede worthy to be accepted) comparable to yow^r noble grace, howe beyt, after that I had reuolved and called to my mynde first on the one partye, the noblyte, the excellencye, and maiesty of yowr parsonage, dyscendyng of the moste hyghe and royall blood, yowr so excellent and wondrefull vertewes, yow^r great knowledge and learnyng, the syngular and manyfolde gyftes bothe of god and nature, whych are in yowr highness so plentuously planted.⁹⁵

While Basset is certainly making a reference to Mary's father, King Henry VIII, here, it is possible she is also referring to Mary's mother, Queen Katherine of Aragon. Katherine's reputation as a virtuous Catholic queen was well known, as was her role in Mary's humanist education. By invoking Mary's ancestry, Basset it not only legitimizing Mary's position as princess, but also perhaps making reference to her Catholic roots. Furthermore, Basset's repeated appeals to Mary's learning and personal virtue show Mary's public reputation as a well educated Catholic.

⁹⁴ Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation," 318. Original in the British Library: MS Harley 1860, fols. 1-8.

⁹⁵ Goodrich, "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation," 323. Original in the British Library: MS Harley 1860, fols. 3-3v.

This chapter's final, and perhaps most unlikely, example of praise of Mary's piety is found in Nicholas Udall's dedicatory preface to Mary's translation of Erasmus' *Paraphrases on John*. A number of scholars have commented on the fact that Udall used this dedication as an opportunity to ascribe to Mary a reformist attitude that she almost certainly did not possess. Schutte has remarked that, "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. The dedication, then, tried to paint Mary as helping the evangelical cause, even though everyone knew that she was still a Catholic."⁹⁶ The fact that Udall, a man whose religious beliefs diverged decidedly from Mary's, still praised her for her piety shows that Mary's reputation for religiosity transcended confessional lines. Despite Udall's intention of twisting Mary's motivation for participating in the project, he is still unwilling or perhaps unable to deny Mary's piety. For example, he writes:

So may it never be able, as her deserts require, enough to praise and magnify the most noble, the most virtuous, the most witty, the most studious Lady Mary's grace...O how greatly may we all glory in such a peerless flower of virginity as her grace is: who in the midst of courtly delights and amidst the enticements of worldly vanities hath, by her own choice and election, so virtuously and so fruitfully passed her tender youth... She doth now also confer unto the same the unestimable benefit of furthering both us and our posterity in the knowledge of God's word.⁹⁷

It is clear that this dedication, written in the same period as Basset's, places a greater focus on Mary's virginity and chastity, while still praising her studiousness. That Udall so readily praises Mary's piety is both a product of these types of dedications in general, as well as a response to the fact that her devotion was undeniable, even to those who sought to be her detractors. In the case of Udall, his efforts to associate Mary with Reformist ideas demonstrate both his desire for

⁹⁶ Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications*, 45.

⁹⁷ Mueller, *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*, 160.

the support of such a well-known pious woman, as well as an intentional counter-narrative to Mary's well-established Catholicism. Contemporary accounts or opinions cannot always be trusted to be wholly accurate, but the fact that multiple instances exist of people strongly and repeatedly associating Mary with pious Catholicism is significant and meaningful in terms of understanding her religiosity. It is clear that beyond making religious choices for herself and in response to close influences such as parental figures, Mary also understood and took advantage of the public-facing nature of her person and used this to showcase her religious beliefs, thereby cultivating a reputation of Catholic piety.

All available evidence points to the fact that Mary's religious beliefs before her accession were firmly and decidedly Catholic. Her education and early life promoted these Catholic humanist ideals, which were also embodied by her parents. When her father chose to break with Rome, Mary fought passionately, to the point of risking her own personal safety, to avoid signing the articles of the Royal Supremacy. It was only after a prolonged and increasingly dangerous stand-off that Mary ultimately succumbed. Throughout the 1540s Mary's writing and translations demonstrate a continued devotion to her Catholic humanist roots, as well as her particular dedication to the Mass. During this decade Mary did participate in some projects that could be viewed as straying from Roman Catholicism, yet in all these activities Mary remained as traditional and conservative as her agency would allow. After the death of her father and the start of her half-brother's increasingly Protestant reign, Mary became even more resolved in her dedication to traditional elements of Catholicism, namely the mass. It is therefore clear that as a princess, Mary was unwaveringly Catholic and favoured conservative forms of religiosity whenever possible.

CHAPTER TWO

A Catholic Queen

Mary's reign lasted for just over five years, and she was 37 years old when she ascended the throne in 1553. When she became queen she had already endured decades of religious uncertainty and conflict at the hands of both her father and her half-brother Edward. Mary's brief, but impactful, reign ended with her death in 1558. Her reign in and of itself holds enormous significance because she was the first English queen regnant to inherit the throne in her own right. This was a considerable upheaval to the traditional gender roles of the sixteenth century and contributed to a sense of uncertainty and concern about her reign. In addition to the fact that she was a woman, Mary's Catholicism was well-known, and as such, she was devoted to returning England to the "Old Religion" and reversing the Reformist and Protestant policies of her father and brother. Paired with her gender, Mary's religious commitments represented a substantial amount of change for mid-Tudor England, though as many sources can attest to, it was not all unwelcome. The change was so significant that some earlier historians had even spoken of the "crisis" of mid-Tudor England, for example in Loades' 1992 book by that title. Mary's personal theology as queen continued to adhere to Roman Catholicism, in the form of both papal supremacy and liturgical rites, with a focus on maintaining and upholding the traditional aspects of the Catholic faith.

Analyzing Mary's personal religiosity while queen as it existed outside of her religious policy presents certain challenges, but there are strong indications that her religious beliefs and priorities discussed in the previous chapter continued after her accession. Mary's dedication to the Mass, which played a fundamental role in her earlier life, remained central to her personal piety throughout her reign. This chapter will analyze Mary's continued devotion to the Mass and

will also look more specifically at her relationship with church music and the eucharist, both of which became more apparent after her accession. These core components of Catholicism provided the framework for Mary's religious life as queen. This chapter will also revisit Mary's relationship with England's abbeys, monasteries, and shrines as queen and how this connected to her personal Catholicism. Finally, this chapter explores Mary's steadfast personal piety, coupled with her continued reputation as a devout and pious woman.

In addition to notable continuities with her pre-accession religiosity, three elements specifically associated with her role as monarch reveal new aspects to her devotion to Catholicism: the coronation ceremony, her marriage, and rites associated with the monarchy such as the blessing of cramp rings and the "king's touch" for scrofula. These elements work together to demonstrate the continuity of Mary's Catholic religious beliefs from her youth to her death. It is also important to note that while many of Mary's more confrontational displays of Catholicism feeling stopped once she was queen, this is likely due to the fact that she was finally free to express herself religiously, as opposed to any weakening or watering down of her personal convictions.

In keeping with her infamous refusal to stop hearing Catholic Mass during Edward's reign, Mary began her own reign by having a requiem Mass said for her Protestant brother. The arrangement of Edward's funeral was a difficult subject. While her half-brother did not leave explicit instructions surrounding his own funeral, his will did stipulate that "our sayd executors shall nott suffer any peece of religion to be altred," meaning that he wished to be buried according to the rites set out in the *Book of Common Prayer* authorized by the Acts of

Uniformity.¹ With the encouragement of Imperial Ambassador Simon Renard, Mary accepted the need for a Protestant service, which she did not attend, but a Catholic requiem mass was also held in her presence.² The September 5th, 1553 letter from Renard to Prince Philip read in part:

There was some discussion concerning the ceremonies that should be observed on that occasion, whether the Queen should be present or not, whether mass, which had been forbidden for the last seven [sic] years, should be said, or whether it should not; and the Queen had scruples of conscience on the subject, because the late King Henry, her father, mentioned especially in his will the funeral ceremonies to be observed, and she considered that the same should be held for her brother.³

The content of this letter is significant for two reasons. First, because it invokes the language of conscience. The fact that Renard describes Mary as having “scruples of conscience” indicates that her desire to have a Mass said for Edward did not stem from a place of power or control, but rather a genuine internal belief that holding a mass was the necessary and right thing to do. Second, Renard indicates that Mary’s “scruples of conscience” are linked to a lack of adherence to Henrician religious policy. Other evidence makes it clear that Mary sought to mimic Henry’s position on liturgical rights, and it is therefore unsurprising that part of her concern over a lack of mass for Edward stemmed from worry over contradicting Henrician policy and practice. Legally, then, Mary was compelled to have this Protestant service performed, but theologically, and based on the religious position of Henry VIII, a Catholic Mass needed to be said.⁴ Mary compromised by having Edward’s funeral, which she did not attend, done with the *Book of Common Prayer* and attending a separate requiem Mass said for him in the Tower of London.⁵ This incident

¹ By a Resident in the Tower of London, *The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt* ed. J. G. Nichols (New York: AMS Press, 1968), 101. [https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.carleton.ca/2027/heb.03963](https://hdl.handle-net.proxy.library.carleton.ca/2027/heb.03963).

² Simon Renard to Prince Philip, September 5, 1553, "Spain: September 1553, 1-5," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 11, 1553*, ed. Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1916), 197-211. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol11/pp197-211>.

³ Simon Renard to Prince Philip, *CSPSp* XI, 197-211.

⁴ Simon Renard to Prince Philip, *CSPSp* XI, 197-211.

⁵ John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 117, 119.

demonstrates not only Mary's deep-seated devotion to Catholic liturgical rites, but also the struggle she faced in attempting to introduce Catholic practices in anticipation of changes to statute law. That Mary made a point of finding a way to have a Mass said demonstrates her fundamental belief in the sacrament of Mass and its theological importance.

Within a month of her accession, Mary had reinstated Catholic Mass at court.⁶ The legal mechanisms through which she did so will be explored in Chapter Three, but all accounts demonstrate that her motivation for doing so was a genuine desire to hear the Mass herself as well as the belief that mass was necessary for the religious health of the nation. In late August 1553, an Imperial ambassador wrote that, "Mass is sung habitually at Court; not one mass only, but six or seven every day, and the Councillors assist."⁷ While this remark does not specify that Mary attended all these masses, it can logically be concluded that she had ordered and attended a good number of them. This sort of steadfast dedication to the Mass confirms the common notion that it was the center of her belief. It is also clear that while she initially proclaimed a certain level of religious tolerance as queen, Mary held strong negative opinions of those who chose not to attend Mass or those who attended insincerely. In November of 1553 Mary told Renard "that it would burden her conscience too heavily to allow Elizabeth to succeed, for she only went to mass out of hypocrisy...and it would be a disgrace to the kingdom to allow a bastard to succeed."⁸ This particular comment shows that Mary viewed the Mass as an active rather than a passive activity that required not only physical but also spiritual presence. This speaks to her own personal connection with the Mass as a genuine theological practice rather than simply

⁶ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 162-176.

⁷ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 183-197. The Councillors in this instance most likely refer to the Privy Councillors.

⁸ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 387-407.

something that one had to conform to. The use of the word “conscience” again demonstrates that Mary saw participation in the Mass as a spiritual duty, and one that she did not feel that Elizabeth was adequately fulfilling.

The final demonstration of Mary’s personal commitment to the Mass to be considered here is her inclusion of the request for masses to be said for her soul in her will as well as the performance of the Mass on her deathbed. Throughout her will, written in the spring of 1558, Mary repeatedly requests that the religious institutions that she is leaving money to pray for her soul among others. In one specific instance she writes,

And I will, charge, and requyre the said Abbot and Covent, and other the Fryers and Nunns and ther Covents above remembred, to praye for my Soulle, and for the Soulle of my said most Dere and well beloved Lord and husband, the King’s Highnesse, by whose specyall goodnesse they have been the rather erected, and for the Soulle of my said most dere beloved mother the Quene, and for the Soulles of all our Progenitors, with dayly Masses, Suffrages, and prayers.⁹

Among those religious houses listed in Mary’s will are: The Houses of Shene and Syon, The Monks of the Order of Carthusians, The Nuns of St. Brigittae, the Observant Friars of Greenwich, the Black Friars of St. Bartholomews, the Nuns of Langley, and the Monastery of Westminster.¹⁰ The wording in the will, and the locations given for some of the religious houses indicates that they were located in England, and that some had originally been established by King Henry V. Requests in wills for masses to be said were not uncommon in Tudor England, particularly among women. Christine Peters remarks that in their wills “a higher percentage of women than men include requests for masses....it would seem natural to interpret this as evidence for the greater female commitment to intercessory masses, and as a natural corollary of

⁹ Frederic Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary, daughter of King Henry the Eighth, afterwards Queen Mary: with a memoir of the princess, and notes* (London: W. Pickering, 1831), clxxxix.

¹⁰ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxxxvii-clxxxviii.

their association with piety... However, the evidence... suggests an alternative reading: the social reluctance to see extensive post-mortem intercessory provision for women as normal encouraged female testators to make such demands explicit in their wills.”¹¹ In the case of Mary, the request for intercessory masses falls into both of these categories. Her lifelong commitment to the Mass and her well-documented piety offer a solid explanation for why she would request these masses in her will. However, as Peters remarks, Mary may also have included this clause as a way to ensure that her wishes were carried out and that her post-mortem spiritual needs would be met. Particularly given that Mary had no clear vision of what would happen after her death in a religiously divided England, this official request is logical as well as theological. Mary wrote her will a number of months before her death in 1558, but her commitment to the Mass remained until the end of her life. On her deathbed Mary heard the Catholic Mass and received the traditional sacraments. Frederic Madden writes, “During her sickness her cheerfulness and piety never forsook her, and on the morning of her death mass was celebrated, by her desire, in her chamber. She was perfectly sensible, and received the Sacraments appointed by the Roman Catholic Church, but expired a few moments before the conclusion of the ceremony.”¹² That Mary was determined to hear the Mass in what would become the final moments of her life demonstrates the importance that it held for her and shows that it was indeed at the core of her religiosity.

An important element of Mary’s devotion to the mass that manifests more clearly in the sources after her accession is her reverence for the eucharist. As discussed in the previous

¹¹ Christine Peters, *Patterns of Piety: Women, Gender, and Religion in Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 46.

¹² Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxv. Madden cites the Bishop of Winchester’s Funeral Sermon found in MS. Cott. Vesp. D. xviii. F. 104 b.

chapter, the belief in transubstantiation is a cornerstone of traditional Catholic theology. For Mary, this extended to a fervent belief in and dedication to the real presence. At a few key moments throughout her reign, namely when working on the reinstatement of the Mass, making a decision about her marriage, during her wedding, and on her deathbed, Mary sought solace in the presence of the eucharist. Only a few days into her reign, the Imperial ambassadors reported a conversation with Mary about the reinstatement of the Mass and the issue of Edward's funeral during which "she cast a glance towards the Holy Sacrament that was on an altar in her chamber."¹³ This example demonstrates two important things. First, that Mary kept the eucharist in her chambers, which speaks to the spiritual importance that it held for her. Second, that the eucharist and its presence were a source of comfort and reassurance during times of importance or uncertainty. In October 1553, Renard described an even more poignant moment with the eucharist, in which Mary voiced the importance that it held for her. He wrote,

In the room where she spoke to me was the Holy Sacrament, and she told me that since I had presented your Majesty's letters to her she had not slept, but had continually wept and prayed God to inspire her with an answer to the question of marriage that I had first raised at Beaulieu...As the Holy Sacrament had been in her room, she had invoked it as her protector, guide and counsellor, and still prayed with all her heart that it would come to her help.¹⁴

While Mary is not the author of this letter, this passage explicitly describes her feeling towards the eucharist and her belief in its power and importance. Paired with other descriptions of her behaviour towards the eucharist it can be assumed that this is an accurate account of what she said. Mary's devotion to the eucharist and the language in the above passage may have been inspired by the poetic way that the consecrated host is described in some contemporary prayers. For example, in a 1557 Book of Hours, "O Merciful lord I am not worthi your thou shuldest

¹³ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 127-150.

¹⁴ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 316-331.

enter into my synful house yet thou Lord whych haste sayde, who that eateth my flesh, and drinketh mi blud he dwelleth in me and I in him: haue mercy upon me sinner, by the receiuing of this thy body flesh & blud. And grant that I receiue it not to my damnation, but through thy mercy, to the health of my soule, & the remission of my sins.”¹⁵ This type of reverence for and faith in the sacrament is consistent with descriptions of Mary’s personal feelings for the eucharist. It was also one of the most constant, physical, and spiritually significant reminders of her faith. By invoking the Holy Sacrament Mary is by extension invoking the real presence that she believed to be associated with it. In using this language Mary also positions the consecrated host as a political resource for her. This is significant as it speaks to her belief that Catholicism is the one true faith and that she was divinely ordained to rule England. Mary’s devotion to the eucharist was similarly documented at her wedding ceremony when she married Prince Philip II of Spain in 1554. In an account of the wedding a witness noted, “The King went up to the altar to receive the kiss of peace, which the Bishop gave him on his cheek, after the English custom, and then went to kiss the Queen, to whom he bowed low. All the while, for an hour, she remained with her eyes fixed on the sacrament.”¹⁶ This demonstrates that Mary viewed her marriage not only as a dynastic match, but also as a spiritual decision. The power that she believed she drew from the eucharist meant that it was not only a Catholic religious object, but a political resource. The imagery of Mary “fixing” her eyes implies a deep-seated focus on and reverence for the sacrament. By looking intently at the eucharist Mary may have been attempting to convey her respect for it, or perhaps even trying to access its perceived guidance and protection more

¹⁵ *The Prymer in Englishe and Latine, after Salisbury vse: set out at length with many Prayers and goodlye Pictures. Newelye imprynted thys present yeare. 1557* (London: John Wayland, 1557), sig. M4^r image 94.

¹⁶ 11. A letter relating Philip’s voyage to England and marriage, *CSPSp* XIII, 1-13.

directly. At many key moments in her life, Mary turned, literally, to the eucharist for reassurance.

Much as reverence for the Mass followed her until her final moments, so did her reverence for the eucharist. An eye-witness of her death wrote that, “At the levacion of the sacrament y^e strengthe of her bodye and vse of her tong being taken awaye, yet neverthelesse she, at the instante, lifted vp her eyes, *ministros nuncios devoti cordis*, and in the benediction of the churche she bowed downe her hedde, and withal yelded a mylde and glorious spirite into y^e hande of her Maker.”¹⁷ This passage describes an almost superhuman dedication to the eucharist which gave Mary strength in her final moments of life. This sort of extreme reverence speaks to the theological importance that the eucharist held for Mary throughout her life and provides insight into the traditionally Catholic nature of her religiosity. It is also significant that the *Book of Common Prayer* eliminated the elevation of the host.¹⁸ Therefore Mary’s actions here display not only Christian devotion to the sacrament, but to a specifically Catholic part of the ceremony.

In addition to known instances of her personal interactions with the eucharist, Mary also left textual evidence of this devotion. Daniel Page explains that “Mary left concrete evidence of her continuing love of the eucharist. During her reign, she acquired copies of the *Confutatio impiae cuisusdam determinationis Nicolai Ridley de Eucharistia* of Alban Langdale...and of Cuthbert Tunstall’s *De vertate corporis et sanguinis Christi Domini in Eucharistia*.”¹⁹ Tunstall’s text venerated the eucharist, and also chastised those who did not believe in the real presence. An

¹⁷ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxv. Madden cites Bishop of Winchester’s Funeral Sermon. MS. Cott. Vesp. D. xviii. F. 104 b.

¹⁸ Church of England, *The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administracion of the Sacramentes, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*, STC 16274 (London: Grafton, 1549), Dii- image 105-110.

¹⁹ Daniel Page, *Uniform and Catholic: Church Music in the Reign of Mary Tudor* PhD Dissertation (Brandeis University, 1996), 77.

excerpt from *De vertate* says that Reformers, “robbe and spoyle the most holye & blessed sacrament of the aultare of hys dignitie: & go aboute to make it as common bread and wine, which ungodly affirme, that the presence of Christe, or the veritie of his body is not in it. And thys thyng they labor to proue in their wicked and detestable books.”²⁰ This view of the eucharist as the “most holye & blessed” sacrament is consistent with Mary’s personal, and at times political, reliance on the eucharist. Paired with the multiple first-hand eye-witness accounts of her relationship with the eucharist, as well as her relationship with the Mass, this provides clear evidence that the eucharist was as important part of Mary’s beliefs.

The final key element of Mary’s devotion to the Mass is her interest in and deployment of traditional church music. Mary’s interest in church music was both part of her personal religious practice as well as a broader tool to return England to Catholicism. William Wizeman writes, “Queen Mary, however, loved religious music and appreciated its importance in drawing her people back to the Catholic liturgy and Catholic belief; once again, Mary showed prescience in perceiving the didactic role of the liturgy, and music that displayed ‘orthodoxy’, ‘intelligibility’ and ‘uniformity’ could serve this end.”²¹ For Mary, church music was an immutable part of the Catholic experience and she made every effort to maximize the benefit of this powerful liturgical tool. Some scholars, including Daniel Page, have gone as far as to identify church music as the

²⁰ John Venaeus, *A Notable Oration, made by John Venaeus a Parisien in the Defence of the Sacrament of the Aultare, Pronounced before the Whole Bodye of the Vniuersitie of Parise at the Feaste of Corpus Christi, in the Yeare of Oure Lorde God. 1.5.3.7. ; Wherevnto is Added a Preface, Taken Out of the Booke, Entituled De Ueritate Corporis & Sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia, Compiled by the Right Honorable and Reuerende Father in God, Cuthberte Tunstall, Bishoppe of Duresme. ; Translated Oute of Latine into Englishe by John Bullingham*, (London, by John Cawood, Printer to the Queenes highnesse, 1554), Bi image 14.

<https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/books/notable-oration-made-john-venaeus-parisien/docview/2240938895/se-2?accountid=9894>.

²¹ Wizeman, “The Religious Policy of Mary I,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 164. Wizeman cites Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 26-7.

crux of the Marian reformation. Page writes, “At the center of Mary Tudor’s Catholic revival... were the priests and musicians who formed the court department of the Chapel Royal. Mary’s peripatetic household chapel marked the intersection of her personal observances and her public Counter-Reformation of the English Church.”²² Mary’s Chapel Royal sought use traditional music as a tool in the popular and political return to Catholicism in England. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the revival of polyphony, antiphons, and other forms of church music was necessary after Edward’s reign, which had sought to simplify church music, in addition to switching it to the vernacular.²³ Page explains that “Practices and symbols from the past were selectively revived and reshaped in order simultaneously to invoke the authority of the orthodox past and to support the reestablishment of this orthodoxy in a vastly changed religious culture. The votive antiphons of Tallis... Mundy [and Sheppard]... memorialize this simultaneously reactionary and imaginative recension of Tudor festival polyphony.”²⁴ While William Tallis composed for Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, there is evidence that some of his most complex and ecclesiastically significant works were created during Mary’s reign. These included liturgically-based choral responds, several hymns, and the votive antiphon *Gaude gloriosa Dei mater*, an impressive piece which allegorically linked Mary with the Virgin Mary.²⁵

Various accounts from throughout Mary’s reign refer to the Mass being “sung” in England, including at court.²⁶ While the term “sung” is not in itself significant, as the *Book of Common Prayer* rites were also sung, the fact that it was sung in Latin speaks to the re-

²² Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 133-4.

²³ Joshua L. Gore, "The Compositions of Thomas Tallis: How the English Reformation Informed His Style," *Musical Offerings*: Vol. 11 : No. 2 , Article 1 (2020): 47. <https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/musicalofferings/vol11/iss2/1>.

²⁴ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 266.

²⁵ John Harley, *Thomas Tallis* (Farnham, Surrey: Routledge, 2015), 99, 112; Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 180.

²⁶ See for example: The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 162-176; The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 183-197.

introduction of traditional Catholic music into the church. Henry Machyn describes numerous examples of the mass being sung in England, the *Te Deum* being sung in Latin, and the presence of the chapel choir and musicians. On the day Mary was proclaimed queen, Machyn wrote that, “ther was *Te Deum Laudamus*, with song, and the organes playhyng, and all the belles ryngyng thurgh London.”²⁷ While this event took place before the establishment of Mary’s Chapel Royal, it still demonstrates the strong link between Mary, an emblem of Catholicism, and traditional Latin church music. In February 1554, an account by the Grey Friar’s describes the celebratory music in Mary’s chapel after the defeat of the Wyatt rebellion as, “and that same day was *Te Deum* songe in the qwenes chapelle for joye of it.”²⁸ In 1556 a Venetian ambassador named Marco Antonio Faitta attended some of the Holy Week celebrations in England and his account includes various remarks on the musical elements. When describing the Maundy Thursday ritual in which Mary gave her rich gown to the poorest woman present, he noted, “During this ceremony the choristers chaunted the miserere, with certain other psalms, reciting at each verse words – ‘In diebus illis mulier quæ erat in civitate peccatrix [in those days there was a woman in the town, a sinner].’”²⁹ The recorded presence of the chapel choir at such a significant religious event shows the link that existed for Mary between religious music and Catholicism. Page has identified this specific piece of music as John Sheppard’s *Deus misereatur* which is based on Psalm 66, and Faitta’s account reinforces the significance of this type of adoration during Mary’s

²⁷ Henry Machyn, "Diary: 1553 (Jul - Dec)," in *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550-1563*, ed. J G Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1848), 34-50. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/camden-record-soc/vol42/pp34-50>.

²⁸ "The Chronicle of the Grey Friars: Mary," in *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London Camden Society Old Series: Volume 53*, ed. J G Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1852), 80-98. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/camden-record-soc/vol53/pp80-98>.

²⁹ 473. Marco Antonio Faitta to Ippolito Chizzola Doctor of Divinity, May 3, 1556, "Venice: May 1556, 1-5," in *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 6, 1555-1558*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1877), 424-441. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol6/pp424-441>.

reign.³⁰ This piece was commissioned by Mary to be used for Maundy Thursday.³¹ This demonstrates that Mary saw music a key element of this important holy event and that she was actively choosing to use music to reinforce and promote her own Catholic image.

Another important element of Church service that was re-introduced under Mary was the return to the Sarum Latin Litany. The Litany of Saints was quite literally an invocation to a long list of “saints singly and collectively [including]: Mary, angels, patriarchs, apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins.”³² As Magnus Williamson has remarked, the Litany of Saints was a well known and easily recognizable component of pre-Reformation worship.³³ This component would have been included in the Catholic litany up until Archbishop Thomas Cranmer’s *New Litany* was introduced in 1544. This particular element of church music may hold specific significance to Mary because of her history with Cranmer’s *Litany*. As discussed in the previous chapter, in 1544 Mary wrote an inscription to Katherine Parr in Parr’s copy of Cranmer’s *Litany*. One of the ways that Cranmer’s *Litany* diverged from the traditional Latin version was the omission of the petitions to the Saints. This element had strong ties to specifically Catholic theology and was purposefully omitted by Protestants, including Cranmer. Given Mary’s history with the *Litany*, and the fact that she was fully aware that Cranmer had removed the list of saints in both it and the *Book of Common Prayer* which he authored in 1549, it is interesting to see the reintroduction of the full Latin text into Church music during her reign. This demonstrates that despite her apparent endorsement of Cranmer’s *Litany* in 1544, the inclusion of the petitions to the Saints was clearly spiritually significant to her. This desire for its inclusion may be rooted in both her

³⁰ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 203-4.

³¹ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 201.

³² Magnus Williamson, “Queen Mary !, Tallis’s O sacrum convivium and a Latin Litany”, *Early Music* 44.2 (2016): 256.

³³ Williamson, “Queen Mary !, Tallis’s O sacrum convivium and a Latin Litany,” 256.

deep sense of traditionalism as well as a more profound theological devotion to the saints. Both explanations point to Mary as using church music to reinforce her traditionally Catholic beliefs.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Mary had a personal interest in religious houses such as abbeys and monasteries. While the records from before her accession come almost entirely from a single source, her privy purse expenses, once she became queen a variety of sources attest to the fact that Mary engaged with these organizations on a personal and financial level. The legislative mechanisms employed by Mary in order to reinstate monasteries and shrines will be discussed in the next chapter; here the focus will be on how these elements factored into her personal faith and priorities. As early as January 1555, Mary was engaging with these types of religious organizations. In the Grey Friars' Chronicles from Mary's reign they write that, "the vth day of januarij [1555] was sent Edwardes day and there was sett up the scrynn at Westmyster, and the aulter, with dyvers juelles that the qwene sent thether."³⁴ The Grey Friars were a Franciscan order that were among those re-instated under Mary.³⁵ Here Mary is giving jewels to Westminster Abbey for the altar that was stripped during the Henrician dissolution of the religious houses and the Edwardian divestation of the parishes and religious houses.³⁶ This demonstrates that Mary was not only allowing these religious houses to re-open, but also willing to personally support their re-endowment. As Page has explained, the shrine of Edward the Confessor at Westminster was of particular interest to Mary. He writes, "The confessor was a particularly valuable image in helping bolster Mary's image as a legitimate,

³⁴ "The Chronicle of the Grey Friars: Mary," in *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London Camden Society Old Series: Volume 53*, ed. J G Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1852), 80-98. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/camden-record-soc/vol53/pp80-98>.

³⁵ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 70; *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Vol. III, Philip and Mary, 1555-1557* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1938), e.g. 354.

³⁶ *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.3 (London: Dawson's of Pall Mall, 1963), 31 Henry VIII c. 113 733-9.

Catholic monarch. The last Anglo-Saxon king served as an important symbol of royal authority and religious power... Similarly, the accretion of myths about Edward's piety, chastity in marriage, and healing abilities were especially germane to Mary.³⁷ As demonstrated by Mary's reputation for personal piety, her conviction that her marriage was done out of godly duty rather than physical desire, and her reverent re-introduction of blessing cramp rings and touching for the king's evil, it is clear that the symbolism of Edward the Confessor was both theologically relevant to her as well as strategically useful in establishing her traditional Catholic image.³⁸

Machyn also recorded Mary's efforts to rebuild Edward's shrine when he wrote:

The xx day of Marche was taken up at Westmynster agayn with a hondered lyghtes kyng Edward the confessor in the sam plasse wher ys shryne was, and ytt shalle be sett up agayne as fast as my lord abbott can have ytt don, for yt was a godly shyte to have seen yt, how reverently he was cared from the plasse that he was taken up wher he was led when that the abbay was spowlyd and robyd; and so he was cared, and goodly syngyng and senssyng as has bene sene, and masse song.³⁹

This passage illustrates a convergence of Mary's desire to return to the Catholic mass and re-instate the religious houses, her interest in church music, and her efforts to situate herself as a traditional Catholic monarch. Given the cost to her and her personal involvement in some of these activities, it is reasonable to assume that much of what she did was out of genuine piety rather than an exercise in image building. Machyn's passage itself is interesting in that it highlights that the shrine was a "godly shyte," demonstrating the reverence that many Catholics held for saints and their shrines. Both the reverence to the shrine and the speed with which the abbott was instructed to set it up again are indicative of his and Mary's dedication to the shrine. Lastly, the reference to "syngyng" and "masse song" creates a direct connection between

³⁷ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 73.

³⁸ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 74.

³⁹ Machyn, "Diary: 1557 (Jan - June)," *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, 123-141.

traditional church music, and other aspects of Catholic theology and practices in the form of saints and shrines. It can therefore be seen that Mary's efforts to rebuild the shrine were part of her broader, holistic plan to return England to all traditional aspects of Catholic theology and practice.

Mary's largest personal interaction with the religious houses can be found in her will. Not only does Mary's will outline numerous religious houses as benefactors, but in it she also explicitly outlines her own role in the re-instatement of said houses. She wrote:

The Howses of Shene and Sion, the which were erected by my most noble Progenitor K. Henry the Fyfte for places of Religion and prayer, the oon of Monkes of th' order of Carthusians and th' other of Nunns Ordinis S^{te} Brigittae, we in the tyme of the late Scisme within this Realme clerly dissolv'd and defac'd, which sayde howses are lately by my said dere Lord and husband and by me reviv'd and newly erected accordynge to ther several ancient foundacyons, order, and Statutes, and we have restor'd and endow'd them severally with diverse Mannors, londs, tenements, and hereditaments, sometime parcel of ther several possessions. For a further increase of ther lyving and to thentent the said Religious persons may be the more hable to reedifye some part of ther necessary howses that were so subverted and defac'd, and furnish themselves with ornaments and other thynge mete for Godds servyce, I will and geve unto ether of the said Religious howses of Shene and Sion the summe of *fyve hundred pownds* of law-full money of England.⁴⁰

In this passage, Mary is not only linking herself legislatively with the re-edification projects, but also personally. By choosing to include the religious houses as such a prominent aspect of her will, a deeply personal document, she is signifying their importance to her. She is also signifying that she saw the dissolution of the religious houses as wrong-headed and heretical. The language of the houses having been "subverted and defac'd" speaks to Mary's outrage at how they were treated by her father and brother. This shows that for Mary, religious houses represented an important and necessary aspect of religion, which ties her beliefs more firmly to traditional Catholicism. A good portion of her will is dedicated to her endowments to religious houses as

⁴⁰ Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxxxvii-iii.

well as her requests that they pray for her soul, King Philip's soul upon his death, and the soul of her deceased mother, Katherine of Aragon. Mary's commitment to these prayers and masses for the dead can be seen as especially significant when contrasted with the attack on these activities under Edward. Among the injunctions issued under Edward was a 1551-2 entry which specified that "whether they keep and use any month-ends, anniversaries, exequies, funerals, or offices for the dead, after the corpse is buried, which is the maintenance of the purgatory, and false belief and state and condition of the dead," and "whether they teach or bear the people in hand that the Psalms appointed for burial in the King's Majesty's Book for thanksgiving unto God for the deliverance of the dead out of this miserable world, be appointed or placed instead of the dirge, wherein they prayed for the dead."⁴¹ Her request for prayers is therefore both a personal request based on her beliefs, as well as a political and theological statement about the value of prayers for the dead. It is a direct and intentional rejection of Edwardian policy. Religious houses and orders who were listed in her will included Syon, Sheen, the Carthusian monks, the Bridgettine nuns, the friars of Greenwich, the black friars of St. Bartholomew's, the nuns of Langley, and the Monastery of Westminster.⁴² The fact that Mary left any money at all to the religious houses and orders demonstrates that they were significant to her. However, the fact that she left them hundreds of pounds demonstrates a deep and meaningful connection. Mary's prioritization of these elements in her will demonstrates that she was anticipating and planning for the longevity of these institutions, even after her death. Her request for prayers indicates that Mary found the religious houses theologically significant and part of a robust Catholic framework.

⁴¹ *Visitation Articles and Injunctions Volume II 1536-1558*, eds. W.H. Frere and W.P.M. Kennedy (New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910), 301-2.

⁴² Madden, *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary*, clxxxvii-clxxxix.

Even as a princess, Mary's piety was well known and this did not change once she took the throne, if anything her own faith and the public's perception of it seemed to grow. Mary's devotion to her faith was something that caught the attention of the Imperial ambassadors who served her during her reign. On two separate occasions Renard wrote that Mary, "had wept over two hours that very day, praying God to inspire her in her decision," and "when the queen heard the news she retired to her devotions, and to-day has received the Sacrement."⁴³ In the first example, Mary was in the midst of making a difficult decision about her marriage. In the second, she had just received news that the Holy Roman Emperor, who she viewed as a father figure, had taken Marienbourg in a military conflict. In both of these fraught situations, Mary sought comfort and reassurance in her faith. Much in the same way that she turned to the Mass and the eucharist for spiritual guidance and comfort, she also turned to God and her devotions in private. This demonstrates that for Mary religiosity was as much something that existed behind closed doors as something for public display and consumption.

Mary's steadfast piety was widely acknowledged by those around her and this helped to affirm the feelings of providence that Mary herself felt on the throne. Paulina Kewes writes, "In Mary's case the hand of Providence was detected not only in her remarkable delivery from the harassment of Edwardian reformers and the suppression of Northumberland's coup and, later, of Wyatt's rebellion, but also in her successful restoration of Roman Catholicism. Mary's confessional integrity made the task of Catholic propagandists easy... [for she] had clung steadfastly to her faith."⁴⁴ This becomes clear when reading the correspondence of Imperial

⁴³ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 316-331; Simon Renard to the Emperor, July 2, 1554, "Spain: July 1554, 1-15," in *CSPSp* XII ed. Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1949), 300-312. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol12/pp300-312>.

⁴⁴ Paulina Kewes, "Godly Queens: The Royal Iconographies of Mary and Elizabeth," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 53.

ambassadors in England. While a number of them had mixed, or wholly negative, views of England and its subjects, they could not deny the piety of the queen. In various letters from her reign Mary is described as “that most saintly queen,” “a saintly woman,” “a perfect saint,” and “a saint.”⁴⁵ This sort of repetitive association shows that to the observer, Mary was inextricably linked with religion and piety. Everyone in the sixteenth century England held religious beliefs, but Mary was singled out for hers, and her religiosity became one of her defining traits as a woman and a queen. As evidenced by her will and her continued devotion to the Mass and eucharist, Mary’s piety stayed with her until the moment of her death. Before she died, Mary “requested that she might be interred in the habit of a poor religieuse.”⁴⁶ Maria Hayward writes that “this was an expression of her piety and this type of request was not without precedent. Her mother was known to wear a habit of the order of St. Francis, as did several male Habsburgs, her husband’s relatives.”⁴⁷ This may demonstrate that Mary viewed herself more as Catholic woman than as a queen, which certainly aligns with her support of the religious orders in England and her insistence that she only chose to marry for the good of the realm. While Mary certainly held the belief that she was meant to be queen, she also seemed to see returning England to Catholicism as her primary monarchical role. This demonstrates that even as a figure in the political realm, Mary still inwardly identified with a religious and perhaps even monastic ideal. In death, as in life, faith was of the utmost importance to Mary.

⁴⁵ Cardinal del Monte to Cardinal Pole, *CSPSp* XI, 316-331; 11. A letter relating Philip’s voyage to England and marriage, *CSPSp* XII, 1-13; 37. “An account of what has befallen in the realm of England since Prince Philip landed there, written by a gentleman who accompanied the Prince to England and was present at all the ceremonies, in the shape of a letter to another gentleman, a friend at Salamanca,” *CSPSp* XIII, 30-39; 89. Gonzalo Pérez to Juan Vázquez de Molina, *CSPSp* XIII, 76-95.

⁴⁶ Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England* v. 2 (London: Henry Colburn, 1842), 444.

⁴⁷ Maria Hayward, “Dressed to Impress,” in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 88.

At times, Mary's piety was, perhaps to some, extreme. David Loades has commented that Mary could not understand anyone who did not share her religious views; to her, heretics were a virus.⁴⁸ He wrote that, "To eradicate such a virus, which threatened the souls of all whom it infected, no measures were too extreme. To punish such heretics was not a policy, but a duty solemnly enjoined by God."⁴⁹ This characterization by Loades is perhaps a bit extreme, as Mary publicly indicated on multiple occasions that she was willing to be religiously tolerant.⁵⁰ It is, perhaps, difficult to reconcile this stance of tolerance with her role in the burnings of almost 300 Protestants during her reign. However, even at its most fervent, Mary's Catholicism remained undeniable. As Victor Houlston has commented, "What ever one felt about the burning of heretics, there was never any doubt that Mary's faith was genuine and her concern for the spiritual health of her people was passionate."⁵¹ While Mary may have crossed the line from personally pious to professionally persecutory at some points during her reign, there is no doubt that this stemmed from her intense devotion to the Catholic faith and her conviction that it was the true religion.

There has been some scholarly speculation about the level of Mary's dedication to Rome, yet the record indicates that at her core, Mary considered the papacy to be an integral part of Catholicism.⁵² Examples surrounding her coronation and marriage later in this chapter speak to

⁴⁸ David Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. Eamon Duffy and David Loades (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 28.

⁴⁹ Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, 28.

⁵⁰ See for example: Proclamation for the order and conformity in religion, August 18, 1553, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Mary I, SP 11/1 f.14. Gale Document Number: MC4304000021.

⁵¹ Victor Houlston, "Her Majesty, who is Now in Heaven: Mary Tudor and the Elizabethan Catholics," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 37.

⁵² For scholarly speculation see for example: Valerie Schutte, *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications: Royal Women, Power, and Persuasion* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 77; Wizeman, "The Religious Policy of Mary I" in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, 158; Anna Whitelock, "A queen and by the same title, a king

the weight that she placed on papal authority, as well as the immutable role the pope had to play in the practice of legitimate Catholicism. There were a variety of instances where Mary truly and genuinely believed that she required papal absolution or dispensations in order for her actions to be considered religiously legitimate. Beyond her transactional spiritual relationship with Rome, Mary also repeatedly proclaimed her personal support of the papacy. A letter from 1553 reads, “the Queen, who said she had always been most obedient and most affectionate towards the Apostolic See, and that ‘*interiormente*’ his Holiness had no more loving daughter than herself.”⁵³ Here Mary is directly linking herself to Rome, not only on the professional level that she might be expected to as queen, but also on a personal level. The correspondence of the Imperial ambassadors during Mary’s reign is also riddled with references to her obedience and desired submission to Rome. For example, in December 1553, when Cardinal Pole expressed a desire to return to Rome, given that he was denied access to the Holy Roman Emperor, Mary was “perturbed on hearing this report, as it might seem to the Pope and Consistory that she was not willing to promote the return of her kingdom to its obedience to the Pope.”⁵⁴ The very idea that Mary cared about the Pope’s opinion of her shows that she had a vested interest in England’s relationship with the papacy. Six months later, when the topics of religion and church property were once again being discussed, the opinion of the papacy was still frequently raised. In an August 1554 letter, the Imperial Ambassadors in England wrote that, “Every effort shall be made to prove to the Pope, the Consistory and all Christendom that their Highness's foremost and

also”: Mary I: Queen-in-Parliament,” in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*, eds. Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 101-2.

⁵³ 813. Report to be made to the Pope by the messenger returned from England [Henry Penning], October 21, 1553, “Venice: October 1553, 16-31,” in *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 5, 1534-1554*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1873), 426-440. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol5/pp426-440>.

⁵⁴ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 439-446.

greatest desire is to lead England back to a dutiful attitude, thoroughly re-establish religion and once more set up the service of God. The Queen wishes us to discuss the matter with the Chancellor, the Bishop of Ely and Secretary Petre, which we shall do to-morrow.”⁵⁵ This example clearly shows both Mary’s direct involvement in re-establishing Catholicism in England, as well as continued efforts to show the pope England’s willingness and dedication to returning to the papal fold. It was of great importance not only to return to Catholicism domestically, but also to reignite a strong papal relationship based on trust and shared ecclesiastical goals. It is clear, therefore, that unlike her father, Mary’s idea of Catholicism included an active and reverent relationship with the papacy.

Mary’s coronation, while primarily a function of government, was also a deeply religious affair. Theologically, her coronation was more similar to that of her father, who was crowned decades before his break with Rome, than that of her Protestant brother six years earlier. English coronations were heavily religious and given England’s unrepaired split with Rome, it was initially unclear how Mary could be crowned in a way that upheld her Catholicism.⁵⁶ The largest hurdle in terms of religion was the state of Mary’s soul if she were crowned as England’s queen while the schism between England and Rome continued. In order for her coronation to be legitimate in the eyes of the Catholic church, she and the bishop performing the ceremony needed to be absolved of schism by the Church via Cardinal Reginald Pole.⁵⁷ This needed to be done informally, as her first Parliament, at which she planned to repeal Edward’s religious

⁵⁵ 24. The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XIII, 13-30.

⁵⁶ Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*, 130.

⁵⁷ 813. Report to be made to the Pope by the messenger returned from England [Henry Penning], *CSP Venice* V, 426-440.

legislation and reconcile with Rome, would not take place until after her coronation.⁵⁸ Mary received a papal promise of absolution for herself and the bishop, and was therefore able to be crowned as a Catholic queen without guilt.⁵⁹ This indicates that Mary valued the role and legitimacy of the papacy in Catholicism.

Another aspect of her coronation that was of concern to Mary was the holy oils used to anoint the monarch. The Imperial ambassadors in England reported that, “the Queen entertains a scruple that the holy chrisms prepared in England may not be such as they ought because of the ecclesiastical censures upon the country; and desiring that her coronation may be in every way regular, she has sent us a request to write to the Bishop of Arras to send her some of the holy oil from over there for her anointing.”⁶⁰ The use of the word “scruple” here is part of a larger pattern of Mary voicing concerns of the conscience when she was faced with difficult decisions, particularly decisions that she felt contradicted her Catholic theology. This language implies that her concerns went beyond political pragmatism and were instead rooted in her considerable piety. Mary received the requested holy oils from the Bishop of Arras shortly after and was able to secretly use these for her coronation.⁶¹ In order for Mary to view herself as a legitimate, Catholic queen she needed the proper oils, consecrated by the Roman Catholic church. However, in order to be viewed by the people of England as a legitimately crowned monarch she needed the perception that she was using the oils consecrated according to English law. This speaks to the conflict that Mary often felt as both a Catholic woman and the monarch of a schismatic

⁵⁸ 813. Report to be made to the Pope by the messenger returned from England [Henry Penning], *CSP Venice V*, 426-440.

⁵⁹ 813. Report to be made to the Pope by the messenger returned from England [Henry Penning], *CSP Venice V*, 426-440.

⁶⁰ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp XI*, 211-229.

⁶¹ The Bishop of Arras to Simon Renard, *CSPSp XI*, 229-238.

nation. As Alice Hunt has noted, “The matter of the oils and the absolution was not simply a matter of petty confessional politics, but of personal conscience and salvation.”⁶² It is clear from Mary’s words and behaviour leading up to her coronation that she had genuine pious concerns rather than simply a desire to act in discordance with English law. The evidence indicates that Mary truly believed that these steps were necessary in order for her to be rightfully queen but also maintain her personal Catholicism.

The final aspects of Mary’s coronation which caused her confessional pause were the Mass and the oath that she would take as the new monarch. The oath had been remodelled in the Protestant fashion for Edward’s coronation. In addition, the Mass was currently still illegal and the “second *Book of Common Prayer*...had replaced ‘mass’ with ‘communion’ and erased the word ‘sacrament.’”⁶³ This meant that Mary was once again in the position of deciding between what she theologically believed to be right and what was acceptable under existing English law. In September 1553, Mary expressed concern that she may be made to swear an oath that referenced the new religion. Renard and others responded that she should not take the oath if it mentioned the new religion as it “would be contrary to her assurances... that she wished to live and die in the observance of the old religion... She must follow the old and accustomed form of oath. She told us afterwards that she had seen the old form of oath wherein no mention was made of the new religion, but it was said that she should observe the laws of England; and in order to remove every uncertainty she would have the words just and licit laws added.”⁶⁴ Here again there is evidence of a compromise between the legal realities of the coronation and Mary’s desire to uphold her traditionally Catholic beliefs. That Mary would even consider breaking English law

⁶² Alice Hunt, “The Reformation of Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth,” in *Tudor Queenship*, 66.

⁶³ Hunt, “The Reformation of Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth,” in *Tudor Queenship*, 66.

⁶⁴ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 238-250.

for this speaks to the importance that it held for her. Accounts of Mary's coronation make it clear that in ceremony, it was a thoroughly Catholic affair. Renard mentions "priests in full canonical dress" and described the coronation as having been done "according to the rites of the old religion."⁶⁵ It was, therefore, a thoroughly Catholic coronation for a thoroughly Catholic queen.

Mary's views on marriage as well as her wedding ceremony itself shed light on the aspects of her faith that she found most important. Throughout her life Mary was involved in several potential marriage arrangements, largely by the design of her father. None of these matches ended up taking place, leaving Mary single, virginal, and childless when she took the throne. Mary repeatedly stated that prior to becoming queen she had no interest in marriage and had intended to live her life as a virgin. In her speech before the Wyatt rebellion, a rebellion undertaken in response to her decision to marry the Spanish Prince Philip II, she said, "I am neither so desirous of a wedding, nor so precisely wedded to my will that I needs must have a husband. Hitherto I have lived a virgin; and I doubt not, with God's grace, to live so still. But if, as my ancestors have done, it might please God that I should leave you a successor... I trust you would rejoice thereat."⁶⁶ Mary's depiction of herself as virginal here is both literal and symbolic. Mary, as a pious and unmarried woman was almost certainly a virgin, but she was also using that language to craft her public image and express her religious convictions. Duncan writes, "Although consistent with traditional ideals, Mary's representation of herself as virginal and chaste may have been designed to trigger comparison in the minds of her audience to her namesake, the Virgin Mary. The identification of Queen Mary with Mary, mother of God, was

⁶⁵ Simon Renard to Prince Philip, *CSPSp XI*, 261-272.

⁶⁶ Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, 352. Strickland cites Holingshed.

not new: similar connections had been made from the time she was young.”⁶⁷ Here Mary is using her existing symbolic connection with the Virgin Mary to convey her piety and religious position to her subjects. In doing so, she is holding herself to the highest ideal of female religiosity and is making clear that piety and chastity are priorities for her. Mary contrasts these sentiments with the attractive possibility of an heir. Given the state of the Tudor succession when Mary became queen, the idea of an heir, particularly a male heir given the distaste for a female ruler, was very desirable. For Mary, feelings of responsibility to provide the kingdom with an heir were almost certainly present. But beyond this task, “A legitimately-born natural heir was the most uncontentious way for a monarch to meet that particular responsibility, and in this case it would have the extra advantage of defending the catholic succession.”⁶⁸ Through this lens, Mary’s marriage and any subsequent efforts to produce an heir can be viewed as an attempt to secure Catholicism in England once again. Having already chosen a Catholic husband in Philip, having a Catholic heir was the next step to ensuring that the “Old Religion” remained after her death.

After deciding not only that she should marry, but also who she should marry, the next choice was *when* she should marry. Given that she took the throne at age 37, and was marrying primarily to produce an heir, she fell on the logical answer which was: as soon as possible. Having definitively decided to marry Philip in October 1553, Mary ultimately waited many months before meeting and marrying her would-be husband.⁶⁹ During the months of uncertainty Mary repeatedly expressed concern that Philip would arrive in England during Lent, and that she

⁶⁷ Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England’s First Queen* (1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 54.

⁶⁸ Judith Richards, “Mary Tudor as ‘Sole Quene’?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy.” *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (1997): 906-7.

⁶⁹ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 316-331.

was unwilling to marry during Lent without a papal dispensation. In December 1553, Renard wrote:

Paget and the Queen herself have told me that if the Prince could come hither by Septuagesima she would ask the Pope for a dispensation to marry, even though it were in a season when marriages were forbidden, but her mind was quite made up not to do so during Lent. Great pains must be taken to get over this difficulty, and a dispensation must be procured from Rome, not only to remove the hindrance of consanguinity but also to enable the marriage to be celebrated in Lent.⁷⁰

This passage highlights two key points. First, that Mary does not wish to be married during Lent. While the celebration of Lent is not specific to Catholics, the fact that Mary is so adamant about not being married during Lent points to strong traditionally Catholic beliefs, stemming from the fact that she saw liturgical rites as more important than political pragmatism. Second, the fact that Mary does not wish to be married during Lent without a papal dispensation shows that not only does she recognize the religious season of Lent, but also that she recognizes the ecclesiastical authority of the pope. This is significant because it is a clear example of how Mary's religious beliefs diverge from Henry VIII's. While Henry remained theologically Catholic, for most of his reign, after instructing Cardinal Wolsey to secure a papal annulment of his first marriage in 1533, he no longer recognized the authority of the apostolic see.

The other issue with Mary's marriage arrangements was that "all the bishops in England have been made by the King without legitimate authority to do so, and since the schism took place... may be reckoned unqualified."⁷¹ After Henry's break from Rome, he (as the Supreme Head of the Church of England) had the power to create new English bishops, and also had the authority to control how the bishops enforced religious law.⁷² Therefore, given that these bishops

⁷⁰ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 423-438.

⁷¹ The Emperor to Don Juan Manrique de Lara, *CSPSp* XI, 446-459.

⁷² *The Statutes of The Realm* v.3, 25 Henry VIII c. 19 460.

been created by the ruler of a nation in schism, rather than the pope, they were not considered legitimate. It is clear from the above that Mary was navigating a difficult religious terrain in the lead-up to her marriage. The record shows that she was unwavering on her desire, bordering on need, for the dispensations from the pope noted earlier. At no point in time did she indicate that she would be willing to waive any of her concerns in order to expedite the marriage. This shows that for Mary, religious concerns and compliance were of the highest importance, above even her political reality. In February of 1554, Mary received the necessary dispensations from the pope meaning that she was free to marry Philip, her cousin, during Lent, in a ceremony officiated by an illegitimate English bishop.⁷³ When it finally arrived after months of delay, Mary and Philip's wedding ceremony followed the Catholic tradition in all key areas. As previously noted, the service was read in Latin, as both Mary and Philip would consider that proper.⁷⁴ The choir also sang, and a Catholic Mass was performed.⁷⁵ At every step of her marriage, Mary prioritized the religious implications of her decisions. By opting to marry a Catholic, in a Catholic ceremony, with the blessing of the Holy Apostolic See, Mary signalled that all of these things were important to her.

Some of the most public facing ceremonial expressions of Mary's piety were her Easter season rituals, particularly the blessing of cramp rings, washing of the feet, and touching for the King's evil. In sixteenth century England it was believed that monarchs had certain healing powers and the ability to bless cramp rings.⁷⁶ Judith Richards explains that "Cramp rings were believed to provide protection against such conditions as epilepsy, arthritis and other 'cramping

⁷³ The Emperor to the Ambassadors in England, *CSPSp* XII, 66-82.

⁷⁴ 11. A letter relating Philip's voyage to England and marriage, *CSPSp* XIII, 1-13.

⁷⁵ 11. A letter relating Philip's voyage to England and marriage, *CSPSp* XIII, 1-13.

⁷⁶ Judith M. Richards, "Gender Difference and Tudor Monarchy: The Significance of Queen Mary I." *Parergon* 21, no. 2 (2004): 32.

muscle' conditions, and their blessing was a frequent duty of both French and English medieval monarchs."⁷⁷ Mary was known to bless cramp rings, particularly during the Easter season. Describing Good Friday in 1556 a visiting ambassador wrote, "Her Majesty next gave her benediction to the rings... On their being uncovered she commenced reciting a certain prayer and psalms, and then, taking them in her two hands, she passed them again and again from one hand to the other, saying another prayer which commenced thus: '*Sanctifica, Domine, annulos istos.*'"⁷⁸ Here Mary is actively participating in her role as a sacredly ordained Catholic monarch. She is fulfilling the religious duty that she undertook as part of her Catholic coronation. She is also demonstrating her preference for tradition and for Latin prayer. Mary's blessing of cramp rings was not only ceremonial, she also sent these rings to others as gifts. Imperial correspondence shows Mary sending "150 rings, blessed by her" to the Holy Roman Emperor in 1554.⁷⁹ This indicates that Mary was not just invested in the ceremonial aspect of blessing the cramp rings described above, but also genuinely believed in the efficacy of these rings and her blessing. It also speaks to her broader desire to bring back traditional Catholic practices, many of which had been officially or popularly stopped during Edward's reign.⁸⁰

The cramp rings were just one part of the broader healing rites and Easter traditions reintroduced during Mary's reign. Carole Levin explains that "For Mary, as a Catholic, the Easter season was an especially holy time. Mary continued the practice of washing the feet of the poor on Maundy Thursday... The day following Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Mary blessed cramp rings... Mary also touched for the king's evil on Good Friday, traditionally a particularly

⁷⁷ Richards, "Gender Difference and Tudor Monarchy," 32.

⁷⁸ 473. Marco Antonio Faitta to Ippolito Chizzola Doctor of Divinity, *CSP Venice VI*, 424-441.

⁷⁹ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp XII*, 164-180.

⁸⁰ Page, *Uniform and Catholic*, 121.

holy day for this ritual.”⁸¹ These elements are all captured in Venetian ambassador Marco Antonio Faitta’s account of the events in 1556. He described how Mary washed the feet of 41 poor women, the number matching her age. He wrote, “Her Majesty knelt down on both her knees before the first of the poor women, and taking in the left hand the woman's right foot, she washed it with her own right hand, drying it very thoroughly with the towel which hung at her neck, and having signed it with the cross she kissed the foot so fervently that it seemed as if she were embracing something very precious.”⁸² This ceremonial foot washing is clearly rooted in traditional Christian virtues such as chastity, humility, and piety and references Christ washing his disciples’ feet at the last supper (the origin of Maundy Thursday).⁸³

Another major component of these religious rites was touching for the King’s evil, also known as scrofula.⁸⁴ Like the blessing of the cramp rings, this healing act was seen as one of the sacral powers of an ordained monarch such as Mary. It was likely unsettling for some onlookers to see Mary, a woman, performing acts that had historically been closely associated with the clergy and male rulers. That Mary opted to continue these traditions in spite of her gender demonstrates that she deeply valued their spiritual significance. Faitta wrote, “her Majesty went to bless the scrofulous...she knelt and recited the confession, on the conclusion of which her Majesty turned towards my right reverend Lord the Legate, who gave her absolution... she caused one of those infirm women to be brought to her, and kneeling the whole time she commenced pressing, with her hands in the form of a cross, on the spot where the sore was, with

⁸¹ Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 46.

⁸² 473. Marco Antonio Faitta to Ippolito Chizzola Doctor of Divinity, *CSP Venice VI*, 424-441.

⁸³ Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 44.

⁸⁴ Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 36.

such compassion and devotion as to be a marvel.”⁸⁵ The use of words such as “passion” and “devotion” on the part of Faitta indicate that Mary took these rites very seriously and approached them from a place of deep spirituality. For Mary, these rites were a form of genuine connection with her subjects, the Catholic monarchs who came before her, and even God. Levin has commented that, “A genuinely pious woman, she exacted less than the full public effect from these rituals,” particularly when contrasted with Elizabeth.⁸⁶ All of this points to the fact that in addition to her interest in re-invigorating these traditionally Catholic rites, Mary also felt spiritually moved by them and saw them as a natural extension of her role as a sacredly ordained Catholic monarch. In many ways, these rites can be seen as an opportunity merge her personal piety as a Catholic woman and her duties as a Catholic queen. While this practice continued with Protestant monarchs into the eighteenth century, when Mary was performing it in the mid-sixteenth century it undoubtedly held Catholic significance for her.

Much as the evidence from prior to her accession did, sources from Mary’s reign point almost indisputably to her staunch and steadfast Catholicism. From the first days of her reign, Mary prioritized the reintroduction of the Mass in England, largely due to her immense personal devotion to the Catholic Mass, traditional Latin church music, and the sacrament of the eucharist. These were aspects of her faith that she valued early in her life and they followed her to her reign, where she pursued them with renewed vigour. Church music in her favoured Latin returned in force as a component of the Mass and as queen the Mass was a faithful constant and the eucharist became a trusted source of divine comfort and guidance. Queen Mary also financially supported the religious houses and orders that were dissolved during her youth,

⁸⁵ 473. Marco Antonio Faitta to Ippolito Chizzola Doctor of Divinity, *CSP Venice* VI, 424-441.

⁸⁶ Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 45-6.

demonstrating the importance she placed on these types of religious institutions. Prior to taking the throne Mary already had a reputation for Catholic piety and as queen she continued to live up to it. Mary's attitude towards her coronation and marriage, and her insistence that they be celebrated in the Catholic fashion, with all of the necessary permissions from the pope demonstrates the traditional nature of her religiosity, as well as her fervent belief that Rome had an important role to play in proper Catholicism. Finally, Mary worked to embody the traditional Catholic Easter rites celebrated by her predecessors as a way of expressing her piety and charity as a Catholic woman and a Catholic queen. These elements all show that Mary was a deeply pious woman and that her piety remained rooted in traditional Catholicism throughout her reign.

CHAPTER THREE

Mary's Religious Policy Priorities as Queen

As the previous chapters have demonstrated, Mary was a devout Catholic woman for decades before she became queen. Her religious past and upbringing undoubtedly impacted her time as a monarch. Mary's personal choices as both princess and queen demonstrated a deep and lasting devotion to Catholic rites and the papacy and situated her as a pious and traditional woman. This chapter will turn to Mary's role as queen and will demonstrate how her personal religious beliefs provide context and motivation for the religious policies enacted during her reign. Evidence provided in previous chapters has demonstrated Mary's deep commitment to various aspects of traditional Catholicism including the Mass, the real presence, Catholic humanist scholarship, and religious houses, as well as her loyalty to Rome and her recognition of the importance of the pope and papacy in religious life. Most, if not all, of these personal commitments are readily displayed through the religious proclamations and acts that Mary signed, issued, or revived during her reign. In one of her first royal proclamations, Mary reiterated her dedication to the religion of her youth. The proclamation reads, "Her majesty...cannot now hide that religion which God and the world knoweth she hath professed from her infancy hitherto, which as her majesty is minded to observe and maintain for herself by God's grace during her time, so doth her highness much desire and would be glad the same were of all her subjects quietly and charitably embraced."¹ This is perhaps one of the clearest and most public expressions of Mary's personal religious beliefs. In this passage she is directly stating her own religious persuasion, as well as her desire to have her subjects also follow this religious

¹ Paul Hughes and James Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations II 1553-1587* (London: Yale University Press, 1969), 5.

path. Mary's ideals of the religion that "she hath professed since her infancy" have been demonstrated in the previous chapters. This chapter will explore the mechanisms that Mary employed to turn these ideals into a legal reality.

This chapter argues that Mary's priorities as queen were based in her life-long devotion to traditional Catholic practices as well as loyalty to Rome. First, it will examine the tone and language of Mary's proclamations surrounding religion in order to identify which areas were her personal priorities. Due to the fact that they were not subject to the parliamentary process, proclamations offer a somewhat more direct window into Mary's personal feelings surrounding various policy areas. While proclamations are still not necessarily a direct reflection of Mary's specific views, they can offer insight into her overall priorities as well as how she and her government chose to frame religious ideas. Second, this chapter will review the legal changes enacted by Mary's parliaments surrounding the Mass, religious houses, heresy, her parents' marriage, and other areas of religion with the view of contextualizing these laws through what is known about her personal beliefs. While Mary was not necessarily personally involved in drafting the acts brought before parliament, as queen she did have the power to veto legislation, meaning that neither of the houses of parliament would have created acts that they felt had a high likelihood of being rejected. Next, it will analyze the significance of England's reconciliation with Rome under Mary, particularly given Mary's previous emphasis on her own personal reconciliation with Rome. Finally, it will examine England's revival of the heresy laws in conversation with Mary's views about heretics. When considered together, these elements of Mary's religious policy as queen will demonstrate that she used her reign to enforce Catholicism, and at times her own specific religious beliefs, more broadly in England.

In addition to the changes brought about through acts of parliament, which will be discussed below, Mary also set religious policy through numerous royal proclamations. Paul Hughes and James Larkin, the editors of the edition of Mary's proclamations, define a proclamation as "a public ordinance issued by the sovereign in virtue of the royal prerogative, with the advice of the Privy Council, under the Great Seal, by royal writ."² Mary issued dozens of proclamations during her brief reign, but this section will focus on those pertaining to religion, particularly as they relate to Mary's personal religiosity. One of Mary's first royal proclamations was issued on August 18, 1553 and was titled, "Offering Freedom of Conscience; Prohibiting Religious Controversy, Unlicensed Plays, and Printing."³ This proclamation set the stage for temporary religious tolerance, while still making clear Mary's personal beliefs. The passage above expressing Mary's life-long dedication to her faith, and her desire that her subjects should share her faith comes from this proclamation. This proclamation's purpose was three-fold. First, in case there was any doubt in the mind of the English people, it made clear that Mary viewed herself as Catholic and intended to follow the Old Religion. Second, it invited her subjects to either follow her religion if they did not already, or return to Catholicism if they had been forced to stop practicing their faith. The Catholic Mass and other aspects of Catholicism had been outlawed during Edward's reign, but there were those who maintained their Catholic theology despite outward acts of conformity. Mary maintained both her Catholic theology and outward religious practices, as demonstrated by repeated acts of non-conformity during Edward's reign. For these theological Catholics, Mary's invitation was an opportunity to return to the faith they had been deprived of in recent years. Third, beyond the idea of inviting England back to

² Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, xvii.

³ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 5.

Catholicism, the proclamation also served to give royal permission to return to Catholicism, something that may have proved significant for English Catholics who felt threatened or oppressed during Edward's reign. The language quoted from the proclamation could be viewed as a reflection of the persecution that Mary felt during Henry and Edward's reigns, and her desire to provide religious security for English Catholics during her own reign. In a more practical sense, this proclamation also signalled that the clergy was allowed to start reverting to the Latin liturgy and other traditionally Catholic rites, even before the Edwardian Act of Uniformity had officially been repealed in parliament. There is evidence demonstrating that in the days directly following this proclamation, the Mass was already being said in the chapel royal. In an August 27th letter the Ambassadors in England wrote to the Emperor and told him that,

Mass is sung habitually at Court; not one mass only, but six or seven every day, and the Councillors assist... On Saint Bartholomew's day mass was sung at St. Paul's; matins and vespers are already being recited there in Latin. The high altar has been set up again in St. Paul's, and in several other churches mass has been sung and the crucifix replaced. In this way it seems that little by little things will take the road that will lead to the discussion and adoption of some good measures by Parliament.⁴

This shows that well before Parliament officially reinstated the Mass, Mary's proclamation signaled to the country that the Latin liturgy was allowed once more. This is a very early example of the role that proclamations played, and the strategic way in which Mary and her Councilors used them to advance religious goals outside of the parliamentary system.

In March 1554 Mary issued what was arguably her most significant proclamation in terms of religion. This proclamation "Announcing Injunctions for Religion," pre-dated her second parliament by a few weeks and in many ways set the stage for the religious acts that

⁴ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, August 27, 1553, "Spain: August 1553, 26-31," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 11, 1553*, ed. Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1916), 183-197. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol11/pp183-197>.

Mary's government intended to table during parliament. As Frederic Youngs has explained, in 1553 the "validity and power" of proclamations "was unchallenged," and proclamations themselves served a variety of purposes.⁵ In their most basic form, "royal proclamations offered the most effective means of oral propaganda for the vast realm."⁶ They were a way to disseminate a message to the masses, and in this case, the message of religious rules was one that Mary was keen to have her subjects receive. This type of proclamation was also a way to "frame temporary legislation."⁷ The fact that it was issued shortly before her second parliament, which introduced substantial religious changes, suggests that this proclamation was intended to indicate that significant change in religious practice was imminent. One key aspect was the provision "that every bishop and his officers... shall with all speed and diligence... put in execution all such canons and ecclesiastical laws heretofore in the time of King Henry VIII used within this realm of England... not being direct and expressly contrary to the laws and statutes of the realm."⁸ While Mary and Henry did not always see eye-to-eye on all aspects of religion, for example the Oath of Supremacy, in the years before his death Henry's religious policy veered towards the conservative end of Catholicism in some ways. For example, in 1543 Henry's parliament passed an act titled, "An Acte for thadvancement of true Religion and for thabbolishment of the contrarie." This is a lengthy act that focuses primarily on scripture and religious writing and seeks to control public access to the vernacular bible, as well as to render heretical books illegal. The act takes specific issue with the "craftye false and untrue translacon of Tyndale," as well as heretical writing more broadly. This conservative direction would have

⁵ Frederic Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 30.

⁶ Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*, 38.

⁷ Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*, 39.

⁸ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 35.

been agreeable to Mary, something that is evidenced by the fact that in many of her proclamations and statutes, including the above, she chooses to return religious policy to its state during the conservative years of Henry's reign, rather than imply that she was introducing an altogether new policy. However, as expected, in other instances Mary and her government expounded upon or altered extant Reform legislation that had been put in place under her father and half-brother.

The injunctions also include requirements that members of the clergy refrain from heresy, prevent and dissuade heretical behaviour in others, that church services be said in Latin, that holy days and fasting from the reign of Henry VIII be observed, and contained provisions against clerical marriage.⁹ The proclamation reads: "That all and all manner of processions of the Church be used, frequented, and continued after the old order of the Church in the Latin tongue... That all such holy days and fasting days be observed and kept as was observed and kept in the latter time of King Henry VIII... That the laudable and honest ceremonies which were wont to be used, frequented, and observed in the Church be hereafter frequented, used, and observed."¹⁰ This language surrounding the "old order of the Church" and the "laudable and honest ceremonies" speaks to the traditionalism of Mary's government, and perhaps even Mary herself. The fact that the injunction not only returns to the vernacular Catholic Litany, but the Latin Catholic Litany shows that Mary was generally supportive of Henrician policy, but preferred the most traditional version from early in his reign. The content of these injunctions resonates with acts passed in Mary's parliament, but also with her personal beliefs and religious priorities as laid out in previous chapters. Mary used these injunctions as a way to publicly set

⁹ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 35-8.

¹⁰ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 37.

out her religious policy and aims prior to her government establishing them as laws authorised by parliament. The focus on the form of religious services, heresy, and clerical marriage resonates with Mary's own views about the most significant theological and ritual aspects of Catholicism, and their inclusion in the injunctions could have been motivated by those views.

Mary also issued two proclamations on the topic of heretical and seditious books, one in 1555 and one in 1558.¹¹ As Youngs has pointed out, these proclamations were part of the larger campaign against heresy. He writes that, "at Mary's accession there was no legislation in force against heresy nor any provision for regulation of dissident books... Eventually Mary had the laws on heresy from pre-Tudor days restored, and the matter of books was subsumed into the larger question of religious conformity."¹² As noted above, the Henrician government did, at times, have legislation in place for the regulation of heretical books. However, much of this legislation was voided by ecclesiastical policy during Edward's reign. Motivation for this desire to control books can be found in some aspects of Mary's personal religious life. Having been raised and educated in a Catholic, humanist environment, and having spent time in the highly literate circles of court, Mary would have had a keen understanding of the power, and danger, of heretical books. This legislation may also have stemmed from the timely and practical need to control the exponentially growing volume of available books. The 1555 proclamation, titled "Enforcing Statute against Heresy; Prohibiting Seditious and Heretical Books," lists some examples of books and writings that were prohibited. This list included:

Any book or books, writings or works made or set forth by or in name of Martin Luther, or any book or books, writings or works made or set forth by or in the name of Oecolampadius, Zwinglius, John Calvin, Pomeraine, John Alasco, Bullinger, Bucer, Melancthon, Barnardinus Ochinus, Erasmus Sarcerius, Peter Martyr, Hugh Latimer, Robert Barnes, otherwise called Friar Barnes, John Bale, otherwise called Friar Bale,

¹¹ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 57, 90.

¹² Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*, 198.

Justus Jonas, John Hooper, Miles Coverdale, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury, William Turner, Theodore Basille, otherwise called Thomas Becon, John Frith, Roy, and the book commonly called *Hall's Chronicles*.”¹³

Many of these writings, such as those of Calvin and Luther, were prohibited for their unmistakably Reformist views. The two authors on the list whose inclusion was perhaps most significant to Mary herself were William Tyndale and Thomas Cranmer. As noted above, William Tyndale completed a translation of the bible from Latin into the vernacular English, and in 1543, Henry took specific issue with this translation. Given Mary's apparent personal desire to mimic Henrician religious policy, as well as the desire of her and her regime more broadly to return to Latin religious texts and liturgical rites, Tyndale's inclusion on this list is unsurprising. Thomas Cranmer's presence is perhaps even easier to link to Mary, given her tempestuous past with him and the fact that she was the one who personally decided to have him burned for heresy. Cranmer is one of the individuals whose Protestantism most directly and detrimentally affected Mary. Beyond this specific history with Mary, Cranmer was also instrumental in Edward's ecclesiastical policy, including the writing of the *Book of Common Prayer*. While Mary obviously did not act alone in authoring or issuing these proclamations, the ideals expressed therein are ideals that can be traced to her personal religiosity. It makes sense, therefore that she sought to limit the spread of this seditious material which she viewed as a threat to the return of the true religion.

During her brief reign, Mary's parliaments revived a number of English laws that had been repealed under her father and brother, as well as repealing several religious statutes enacted during their reigns. Going into her first parliament in the fall of 1553, Mary's top priorities were

¹³ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 58.

legitimizing her parents' marriage and therefore her accession, and repealing the Edwardian religious statutes.¹⁴ Her 1553 parliament passed two acts explicitly related to religion: an act to repeal several of Edward's religious acts and an act for the protection of preachers, ministers, and other clergy.¹⁵ Before examining these two statutes or the marriage statute closely, it is worth noting that the first bill introduced in the Lords in this parliament, 'for avoiding treasons and praemunire,' was not explicitly related to religion, but did enter already bearing Mary's signature, which was highly unusual.¹⁶ Jennifer Loach has explained that this bill "repealed all definitions of high treason other than those set out in the act of 1352," and that the signature upon entry was "an indication both of its importance and of [Mary's] willingness to see it enacted."¹⁷ Loach has further argued that:

It was believed that the real purpose of the measure was to restore the authority of the pope in England, which raised the whole question of the future of former ecclesiastical property. However, the bill in its final form does not mention church property, nor, explicitly, the pope, although the repeal of the act that had made it treasonable to deny that Henry VIII was the head of the English church showed plainly that Mary intended to come to terms with Rome.¹⁸

This demonstrates that from very early on, Mary had plans for a reconciliation with Rome and that she and her government were actively working to create and pass legislation to facilitate this reconciliation. While the details of the Marian religious plan, such as the revival of the heresy laws, may have evolved over time, it is clear from both evidence of her personal intentions, as well as the actions of her government that the plan to re-establish Catholicism existed from the

¹⁴ John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 141.

¹⁵ *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.4 (London: Dawson's of Pall Mall, 1963), 1 Mary, ST. 2 c. 1 200-1, c. 2 202, c. 3 203-4, c. 13 215.

¹⁶ Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 76.

¹⁷ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 76.

¹⁸ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 76.

early days of her reign. This bill also highlights the nuance surrounding religious belief more broadly, as according to Renard, the hostility towards this bill seemed to stem from fear of losing ecclesiastical property, rather than a theological reluctance to reconcile with Rome.¹⁹ As John Edwards has noted:

Despite being...keen to return to Catholic doctrine and practice, even the restored traditionalist bishops did not show any sign of wanting a return to papal jurisdiction, although they would do the necessary when the time came. In addition, those among the MPs who were the proud 'possessioners', as contemporary language had it, of former ecclesiastical property... probably did not imagine that anything the Queen did would threaten these delightful trophies of their wealth and status. Their illusions would quickly be shattered.²⁰

While Mary never took a firm stance on the return of church property, likely in part because she was repeatedly advised against it, she did facilitate a substantial break from Henrician Catholicism by removing the Royal Supremacy and reconciling with Rome.²¹

The first act approved by her first parliament declared Mary's legitimacy. The topic of her parents' marriage was a high priority for Mary. The need to legitimize her father's marriage to her mother, Katherine of Aragon, was essential to establishing her own legitimacy as ruler, and insisting that her subjects recognize this. The record shows that there was no doubt in Mary's mind that the union between her parents was valid and that she was the rightful heir to the throne.²² Having this belief recognized through an act of parliament was an important step in ensuring that the English people, as well as international allies, also understood her to be the

¹⁹ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 76.

²⁰ Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*, 138.

²¹ See for example: Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp XI*, 331-337; Simon Renard to the Emperor, March 22, 1554, "Spain: March 1554, 21-31," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 12, 1554*, ed. Royall Tyler (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1949), 164-180. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol12/pp164-180>; 49. The Emperor's Instructions to Francisco de Eraso, September 1, 1554, "Spain: September 1554," in *Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 13, 1554-1558*, ed. Royall Tyler (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954), 39-55. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol13/pp39-55>.

²² See the section on the Royal Supremacy in Chapter 1.

rightful queen. Her need to have this legitimized is captured in a letter from the Imperial ambassadors in England to the Emperor in September 1553 which expresses the Queen's desire for a copy of the sentence from Rome pronouncing the marriage valid:

For it will be needed at the next session of Parliament...In this next session it is intended to repeal the divorce, and to pronounce that the said Lady Catherine was duly, canonically and lawfully married, thus annulling the former Act of Parliament...This appears to be a necessary measure, for otherwise the accusation of bastardy which has been brought against the Queen would always be coming up for discussion and would not be effaced from the people's minds.²³

It is therefore clear that the issue of "bastardy" was not only a potential issue in Mary's mind, but also a genuine threat to her reign if not rectified. Indeed, the issue of bastardy was the main reason given by Edward for his decision to promote Jane Grey to the throne rather than Mary or Elizabeth.²⁴ While it is almost certain that Edward's true motivations to remove Mary from the succession were religious, it is significant that the issue was legitimacy was the one that he and his council used to have Jane crowned.²⁵

However, it could be argued that the topic of her parents' marriage was not only a legitimacy issue, it was also an issue of religion. The second reason Mary needed to pass this act was to send the clear message that she viewed Henry's break from Rome and his subsequent divorce as heretical and baseless. This act can be viewed as a direct contradiction to Henry's own position on both his marriage to Katherine and the changes to the succession statutes that followed and therefore sets Mary purposely at odds with his policies. As discussed in the first chapter, nearly twenty years prior to her accession Mary had been forced to sign three articles of

²³ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 250-261.

²⁴ By a Resident in the Tower of London, *The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, ed. J. G. Nichols (New York: AMS Press, 1968), 93. <https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.carleton.ca/2027/heb.03963>.

²⁵ Paulina Kewes, The 1553 succession crisis reconsidered, *Historical Research*, Volume 90, Issue 249, (August 2017): 465, <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1111/1468-2281.12178>.

the Act of Supremacy, one of which declared her father and mother's marriage illegitimate.²⁶

The evidence of that incident demonstrated that Mary endured genuine threats and serious emotional turmoil before she ultimately signed the articles, a decision that the record shows weighed very heavily on her conscience. The fact that Mary placed a priority on overturning this can be viewed as a response to her fervent disagreement with it in the first place. In addition to ascertaining her right as the legitimate monarch, the letter noted above shows that Mary was also willing to demonstrate her reliance on and faith in the papacy. In using Rome's declaration on the legitimacy of the marriage as evidence in parliamentary law, Mary brought her personal devotion to the papacy and its rulings into the public sphere and into English policy. And by declaring that her birth and her mother's marriage were legitimate, Queen Mary sought to do what Princess Mary could not.

Turning to the explicitly religious legislation of this parliament, the need to overturn numerous acts set forth by Edward is unsurprising. It is clear from a variety of sources that Mary and Edward had substantial confessional differences and that the half-siblings frequently clashed on ideas of religion. Examples of this discussed in earlier chapters include Mary's refusal to stop hearing the Mass when it was outlawed by Edward, Mary's refusal to go to court for Christmas because she was worried Edward would make her attend Protestant services, Mary's prominent display of rosaries upon entering London to visit Edward, Mary's view that Edward's tutors were filling his mind with Reformist ideas, and finally Mary's decision to have a requiem Mass said after her brother's death, despite his rejection of Catholicism and devotion to the *Book of Common Prayer*.²⁷ While Mary certainly shared some beliefs with her theologically Catholic

²⁶ Thomas Hearne, *Sylloge epistolarum*, in Titus Livius, *Vita Henrici Quinti* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1716), 142-3.

²⁷ See Chapters 1 and 2.

father, when it came to Edward if the siblings *could* disagree, they almost certainly *did* disagree. Mary's behaviour throughout Edward's reign demonstrates not only disdain for the religious changes, but also for his authority as king more broadly. Her decision to ensure that Edward's statutes were repealed and his religious policies reversed was hardly surprising given her considerable disagreement with them while he was alive. Two key elements that Mary chose to repeal were the Edwardian Act of Uniformity, including the use of the *Book of Common Prayer* and a change to the traditional sacraments, and his statute permitting clerical marriage. While Mary's inscription to Katherine Parr in Thomas Cranmer's *An Exhortation unto Prayer... Also a Litany* may be perceived as an endorsement of the vernacular church service, it is clear from Mary's later behaviour during Edward's reign that any change to the essence of the Mass itself was unacceptable to her.²⁸ This included changes to the traditional sacraments, which later evidence from during her own reign shows she was extremely dedicated to, as well as changes to other elements such as church music. As we know from Sir William Paget's conversation with Renard, Mary instructed the councillor directly to prepare articles concerning religion in readiness for the parliament. In a letter to the Emperor dated October 5, 1553, Renard wrote that, "The Queen had sent for [Paget] to deliberate on the articles concerning religion, to be brought before Parliament, that might give some trouble."²⁹ This demonstrates that Mary had a degree of direct involvement in the preparation of the religious articles put forth in her first parliament. Her involvement with the religious articles is significant, as it suggests that she had a strong, personal, and vested interest in this area of policy.

²⁸ Melita Thomas, *The King's Pearl: Henry VIII and His Daughter Mary* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Amberley, 2017), 267.

²⁹ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 261-272.

These changes enacted by Mary's first parliament were certainly not innovative. In fact, by repealing this Edwardian legislation, Mary was working to return England to the religious state it had existed in under Henry. As Jennifer Loach has noted, "Much of Mary's policy, and in particular much of her religious policy, involved the undoing of the past; parliament necessarily, therefore, played an important part in English affairs during her reign."³⁰ This return to Henrician legislation is in line with Mary's history of acquiescence to Henry's religious policy. However, during later parliaments it became clear that Mary would not be satisfied by a return to Henrician Catholicism, in essence theological Catholicism disconnected from the papacy, but rather sought a full return to the religion of her childhood, including a reconciliation with Rome. While there is limited evidence from Mary's personal religious life of her feelings towards clerical marriage, the fact that she secured the repeal of this Edwardian statute in her first parliament demonstrates that it was a priority. As Edwards observes: "By the time the parliament came to an end, on 5 December 1553, Edward's statutes enforcing the use of the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, permitting the marriage of priests and reducing the number of sacraments from the seven which had been definitively declared in 1439 by the Council of Florence, to two – baptism and Holy Communion – had all been repealed."³¹

In addition to the issue of the marriage and the statute undoing the Edwardian Reformation, Mary's first parliament also passed a law granting heightened protection for the clergy. Its provisions sought to ensure that bishops, ministers, and other clergy members in England would be able to perform Catholic religious services and rites without the fear of attack from the public. One section sets out punishments for those who:

³⁰ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 15.

³¹ Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*, 141.

maliciouslye willinglie or of purpose molest lett disturbe vexe disquiete or otherwise trouble any Person Vicar Parishe Preist or Curate, or any lawfull Preist, preparing saieng doing singing ministring or celebrating the Masse or other such Divine Service Sacramentes or Sacramentalles as was most commonly frequented and used in the last yere of the Raigne of the late Sovereine Lorde King Henrye theight, or that at anye time hereafter shalbe allowed sett for the or aucthorised by the Quenes Majestie.³²

While Mary was obviously never a member of the clergy, she did experience a level of persecution for her religious beliefs during both Henry and Edward's reigns. Her much loved Catholic rites and religious ties to the papacy were threatened and even outlawed during her earlier life. Under Henry's Act of Supremacy she was forced to denounce the pope, and under Edward's Act of Uniformity the Mass, a staple of her religious practice, became illegal. It therefore seems highly logical that one of her first acts as queen was one that offered legal protection to members of the clergy who wished to return to practicing Catholicism. Of course, there were certainly also clergy who did not wish to return to Catholicism, but rather were forced to do so by Mary's new legislation. This act realized her goal of reinstating Catholicism as England's faith and offered protection to her fellow Catholics, something she herself had not always received. The act permitted those who wished to practice what she saw as the true religion to do so without harassment. The fact that Mary's parliament thought it necessary to provide protection for priests against their parishioners indicates an awareness of the strength of Protestantism in at least some parts of England by the 1550s, and the consequent resistance the regime might face in its efforts to return England to Catholicism.

After restoring the mass and repealing Edward's religious statutes in her first parliament, Mary continued on her path towards the Marian counter-reformation in her subsequent parliaments. Mary's second parliament, held in April 1554, did not see religious laws passed to

³² *The Statutes of The Realm* v.4 , 1 Mary, ST. 2 c. 3 203.

the extent that was needed in 1553, nevertheless a number of bills pertaining to religion did reach the statute book, including one concerning the regulation of certain religious cathedrals and schools.³³ This 1554 act is significant because it resonates with Mary's interest in religious houses and organizations before her accession, as well as her interest in properly regulated clergy, something also implied by her statute against clerical marriage. The act reads "That our saide Sovereine Ladye the Quene from hensforthe during her naturell lyef (which our Lorde long preserve) shall have by virtue of this Acte full power and auctoritee to make and prescribe unto every of the sayd Churches, and the Deanes Prebendaries and Ministers of the same, and to their successours, suche Statutes Ordinaunces and Orders for the good Governance Rule and Ordre...as shall seme good to her Highnes."³⁴ The wording of the act is interesting, as the language implies a certain level of direct involvement and power from Mary herself. While this may in part be rhetorical, the inclusion of these specific references to Mary and her involvement sends the message that this legislation mattered to her and that she would play a role in the governance of these religious institutions. This demonstrates that both in her private life, through gifts and will endowments, and publicly through her government's law-making, Mary supported England's traditional Catholic religious institutions.

In her third parliament (November 1554), her first after her marriage to Philip II of Spain, Mary's government introduced two key pieces of legislation relating to religion. The first reinstated several former heresy laws in order to broaden her regime's ability to prosecute heresy, a key element in their efforts to return England fully to Catholicism. The Marian act revived three specific heresy laws: one from the reign of Richard II concerning "tharresting and

³³ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1 Mary, ST. 3 c. 9 233.

³⁴ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1 Mary, ST. 3 c. 9 233.

apprehencon of erronious and hereticall Preachers,” another from Henry IV “concerning the repressing of Heresies and punishm^t of Heretikes,” and a third from the reign of Henry V “concerning the suppression of Heresie and Lollardye.”³⁵ The statute then, explicitly linked Reformers with earlier heresies such as Lollardy. When used by Mary and her supporters it referred to non-Catholics, particularly practicing Protestants or Reformers.

It is also notable that this parliament was not the first time that Mary and her regime had attempted to revive the old heresy laws. Mary had tried to revive them in her second parliament held in April 1554, but had been forced to back down as a result of uncertain support and broader governmental goals. On April 27th Renard wrote to the Emperor telling him,

The Queen... now realises the dangers which the split in the Council place in her path, the importance of bringing Parliament to a close, of using moderation in religious questions, of avoiding steps that might provoke a fresh rebellion and of taking precautions to guard his Highness on his arrival here. She...has decided to prorogue Parliament until a more fitting time... The bill providing that heretics be punished with death has passed the Lower House of Parliament, but I hear that the Lords will not consent to the capital penalty.³⁶

These concerns were confirmed days later when the House of Lords rejected the revival of the heresy laws.³⁷ As Eamon Duffy has noted, “The growing numbers of lay and clerical hardliners in the London gaols and in episcopal custody in 1554 thus left the ecclesiastical authorities in no doubt that drastic exemplary action was essential if they were to enforce conformity. However, the parliamentary failure of Gardiner’s attempt to revive the heresy laws in April 1554 left the regime without sanctions other than imprisonment, public penance and excommunication.”³⁸

This demonstrates that almost a year before the laws actually took effect, there was interest from

³⁵ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 6 244.

³⁶ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XII, 220-230.

³⁷ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XII, 230-244.

³⁸ Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Mary Tudor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 90-1.

at least some of Mary's councillors, and perhaps the queen herself, in pursuing stronger laws for the suppression and punishment of heretics. While Duffy sees Gardiner as the primary proponent for harsher laws, Loades argues that "it was the queen who was the driving force, not out of any natural cruelty, but from an implacable sense of duty."³⁹ It seems likely that Gardiner would have acted at least with the queen's approval given her deep personal piety and strong conviction that Catholicism was the true religion. Indeed, there is evidence suggesting that Mary was involved in and supportive of the revival of the heresy laws. In a May 1554 letter, Renard told the Emperor that, "The Queen sent Basset to tell me that Parliament finished yesterday in a manner satisfactory to its members and creditable to her Majesty. The lords gave their assent to the old penalties against heresy, which they openly proclaimed they meant to see stamped out." The fact that Mary herself sent Basset to share this good news, as well as the language noting that the outcome was "creditable to her Majesty" shows that Mary was publicly and personally supportive of this legislation. The bill did not ultimately pass in May of 1554, but Mary's continued interest in it is significant. As Loades remarks, this interest came from a place of deep personal piety and a genuine belief in Catholicism as the true religious, rather than a place of hostility or zealotry. This personal piety was a driving factor throughout Mary's reign, and certainly echoes the multiple displays of religious conviction that Mary undertook before becoming queen.

While the bid to revive the heresy laws in the first parliament of April 1554 was not successful, it is worth noting that this failure was very likely *not* a result of moral or theological objection on the part of members of either house of parliament. Loach has argued that the

³⁹ David Loades, "The Marian Episcopate," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 51-2.

opposition to the bill was primarily based on the belief that reviving the heresy laws would somehow “authorize the seizure of former church property” rather than because of doctrinal disagreement.⁴⁰ She notes that:

the bill went swiftly through the Commons... and through the Lords... Not one peer registered a protest against the measure. Since there had been no marked change in the composition of the house of Lords between Mary’s second parliament and the third it would appear that the reason why a bill rejected in May was passed without difficulty in December was that the anxieties of lay peers had to some extent been allayed by the agreement reached with the pope.⁴¹

This example demonstrates both the fickle and political nature of parliament, as well as the fact that Mary’s policies, while certainly a representation of her own beliefs, may have faced opposition on the basis of both secular and ecclesiastical concerns.

The other fundamental religious change during Mary’s third parliament was an act reuniting England with the pope and Rome.⁴² This act is one of the most significant of Mary’s reign, and also one of the most telling in terms of the details of her personal religious beliefs. Throughout her life, Mary repeatedly and consistently demonstrated loyalty to Catholic rites, and to the Holy Roman See. During her parents’ divorce and her father’s Act of Supremacy, she fought fervently to avoid submitting to the articles that negated the authority of the pope and Rome, as discussed in chapter one. When she became queen, she secretly sought out holy oils consecrated by Rome for her coronation out of the belief that without these papal oils, she could not truly be an ordained Catholic monarch.⁴³ In the lead up to her marriage she also repeatedly sought advice and dispensations from the pope to allow her to marry a close relative, during lent,

⁴⁰ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 99.

⁴¹ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 115.

⁴² *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8 246.

⁴³ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 211-229.

in a ceremony officiated by an English bishop.⁴⁴ The fact that Mary felt that she needed these dispensations in order for her marriage to be legitimate shows that she cared a great deal about the role of the papacy in her personal Catholicism.

While Mary only achieved England's full reconciliation with Rome in late 1554, "signs of her intent to reunite England with the Catholic church may be discerned as early as her first parliament in October 1553. She had already signed one of the first bills presented, which nullified the Henrician treason legislation... there were further signs of her desire for reunion in September 1553... She restored canon law as it stood in 1529, before the break with Rome, and thus effectively brought the royal supremacy to an end."⁴⁵ The 1554 act, the culmination of Mary's efforts to reconcile with Rome, demonstrates that she also cared a great deal about the role of the papacy in English religious life more broadly. This act repealed all Henrician statutes separating England from Rome. One section reads "upon our humble submission and promise made, for a declaracon of our repentance, to repeale and abrogate suche Actes and Statutes as had bene made in Pliam^t since the said xx^{ty} yere of the said King Henry theight, against the Supremacie of the Sea Apostolike, as in our submission exhibited to the said most Reverend Father in God by yo^r Ma^{ties} apperethe."⁴⁶ This part of the act is significant in that it undoes the Henrician legislation which separated England from Rome and made him, rather than the pope, the head of the Church of England. This act was a key legal step in bringing England back into the papal fold. As noted above, given Mary's lifelong devotion to the papacy and its role, it hardly seems surprising that she chose to enact legislation that would allow and ensure Rome's

⁴⁴ The Emperor to the Ambassadors in England, *CSPSp* XII, 66-82.

⁴⁵ William Wizeman, "The Religious Policy of Mary I," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 154-5.

⁴⁶ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8 246.

role in English religious life. Once again, both politically and theologically this act was not new, rather it was a return to the traditional form of religion that Mary cherished and had been long-established in England before the Reformation.

The other key aspect of the return to Rome was the papal absolution of the English people who had been living in schism for the past two decades. This absolution had two parts: One was the legal inclusion in this act. The other was the public absolution offered by Cardinal Pole. On the topic of returning the people of England to the papal fold, the act says, “Wee, [parliament and the whole body we represent] arre at thintercession of yo^r Ma^{ties} by theauthoritie of our Holy Father Pope Julye the thirde and of the Sea Apostolike, assoiled and dischargd and delivered from Excomunicacon Interdiccons and other Censures Ecclesiasitcall whiche hathe hanged over our heads... since the time of the said scisme.”⁴⁷ This act worked to legally and spiritually absolve the English nation of its sins of schism. For faithful Catholics who had disagreed with the schism and lived with it for the past twenty years, this was an important step in the return to tradition and normalcy. This act was accompanied by a “sombre ceremony before the queen and the prince and the two Houses of Parliament on 30 November 1554 [where] the cardinal absolved the queen’s subjects from 20 years of schism and reconciled the nation to Rome.”⁴⁸ For Mary, and certainly others in attendance, this was a moving and perhaps even life-altering event.

Cardinal Pole, who gave the absolution, was a trusted religious advisor to Mary and played a key role in England’s religious policy after his arrival in November 1554.⁴⁹ Twenty

⁴⁷ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8 246.

⁴⁸ Claire Cross, “The English Universities, 1553-58,” in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 67.

⁴⁹ Numerous sources outline the importance of Pole’s role in Mary’s regime. See for example *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006); David Loades, *The Reign of*

days prior to the absolution, Mary issued a proclamation “Ordering Obedience to Cardinal Pole.”⁵⁰ This proclamation expresses gratitude for Pole’s presence as well as the expectation that the English people will submit to his authority as the realm returns to the jurisdiction of the Holy Apostolic See.⁵¹ Beyond her support for him and his work in this very official public capacity, Mary also had personal affection for Pole which may have stemmed from a variety of things including his temperament, his Catholic values, the fact that his mother had been her governess decades earlier, or any combination of the three.⁵² Regardless the reason, having such a close confidante and advisor absolve her country of schism was undoubtedly meaningful for Mary. An account of the ceremony noted, “All who heard [Pole] say he spoke very eloquently; and he rose to his feet, imitated by the King and Queen, whilst the members of Parliament and all those present knelt down to receive the Legate’s absolution with every sign of reverence and repentance. They then went down to the chapel to hear the Te Deum, and when it had been sung and the prayers said, the Legate stood in front of the altar and gave his benediction.”⁵³ Mary’s presence at, and clear involvement in the ceremony is unsurprising given her position as queen, but it is likely that Mary attended out of both an official and a spiritual sense of duty. Once again, this decision to have Cardinal Pole publicly absolve England of the sins of schism can be linked to key aspects of Mary’s personal religious experience. When she took the throne, Mary sought papal absolution prior to her coronation.⁵⁴ As discussed in the previous chapter, Mary

Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-58, 2nd ed (London and New York: Longman, 1991); Edwards, *Mary I: England’s Catholic Queen*.

⁵⁰ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 49.

⁵¹ Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 49.

⁵² Linda Porter, *The First Queen of England: The Myth of “Bloody Mary”* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2008), 41.

⁵³ 127. Don Pedro de Cordova to the King of the Romans, *CSPSp* XIII, 112-123.

⁵⁴ 813. Report to be made to the Pope by the messenger returned from England [Henry Penning], October 21, 1553, “Venice: October 1553, 16-31,” in *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 5, 1534-1554*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1873), 426-440. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol5/pp426-440>.

wanted to be certain that her coronation would be both legally and spiritually binding and sought to ensure that she could be crowned as a Catholic with the permission and forgiveness of the pope. Mary received papal absolution for herself prior to her coronation, therefore it is logical that Mary would want to give her people, her proverbial children, the same gift. Particularly when viewed in this light, Mary's actions surrounding England's reconciliation with Rome were likely in part motivated by her life-long personal relationship with the papacy, as well as the desires of her Catholic councillors and advisors.

As Eamon Duffy has remarked, the first two years of Mary's reign made three significant legal changes that allowed for the systemic reintroduction of official Catholicism. He writes: "The restoration of the Mass and the outlawing of the Book of Common Prayer after December 1553 signalled a majority return to catholic observance. But the reconciliation with the papacy on 30 November 1554 was the signal for an escalation of the whole process of systematic enforcement, a process given potentially lethal teeth when heresy laws came back into force at the end of January 1555."⁵⁵ By legalizing the Mass and offering protection to clergy members practicing traditional rites in her first parliament, Mary set the stage for a full return to Catholicism in England. In short order she also reconciled the nation with Rome and granted English authorities greater legal opportunities to prosecute heresy, another crucial component of achieving religious uniformity. For Mary, who cherished the practice of Mass and her relationship with the papacy, and who could not personally abide by heretics, these policies represented the ultimate trifecta for an effective and theologically sound return to traditional Roman Catholic rites in England.

⁵⁵ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 15.

Beyond bringing England out of schism, the “Acte repealing all Statutes Articles and Provisions made against the See Apostolick of Rome since the xxth yere of King Henry theight, and also for the establishment of all Spyrтуall and Ecclesiasticall Possessions and Hereditaments conveyed to the Layete” also reintroduced a number of Catholic rites and elements that had been outlawed under Henry and Edward. Among these elements was the reintroduction of religious houses. This act confirmed that “all the Bishoprikes Cathedrall Churches Hospitalles Colledges Scholes and other suche Foundacons nowe continuing, made by auctorite of Parliament or otherwise established according to thorder of the Lawes of this Realme sithence this Scisme, may be confirmed and continued for ever.”⁵⁶ The act also reinstated all “Monasteries Abbeis Pories Chantries Colledges and all other Gooddes and Cattalles of Religious Howses.”⁵⁷ This is a significant departure from Henrician and Edwardian policy, which dissolved the monasteries and religious houses and stripped them of their goods.⁵⁸ This is another example of an area of English religious policy that may have in part been motivated by Mary’s personal religious priorities. As noted in previous chapters, Mary had been giving small sums of money and gifts to religious houses since her time as princess. As queen she also provided money and goods for the rebuilding of the houses, in addition to leaving them generous sums of money in her will. Her personal support for the religious houses is clear and well documented, meaning that her decision to reinstate them through an act of parliament had a clear basis in her own views.

Having examined the major religious policies that Mary and her government enacted, this chapter will now turn to a more detailed analysis of how Mary’s personal piety and commitment

⁵⁶ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8 248.

⁵⁷ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.4, 1&2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8 248.

⁵⁸ *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.3 (London: Dawson of Pall Mall, 1963), 31 Henry VIII c. 113 733-9.

to Catholicism led to the revival of the heresy laws, as well as how this piety may have contributed to the level and intensity of this persecution and prosecution. Mary began her reign with the recognition that following the reigns of her father and brother, there were many reformed souls in England who needed the opportunity to return to the true faith, Catholicism, and be saved. After her triumphant rise to the throne in August 1553, Mary issued a proclamation for order and conformity in religion. It is possible that this version is a draft or unofficial version of the proclamation discussed earlier in this chapter. This draft's language suggested a fairly open stance on religion, arguably one that is more generous than might be expected given Mary's well-known Catholicism and what she had suffered for it. On the topic of religious practice it read:

She, her father, grandfather and all... progenitors kings of this realm, with all their subjects, have ever lived and died in Christ's true religion, as her majesty is minded to maintain, agreeable to God's word and the primitive church, and would be glad the same were embraced by all her subjects. Yet she will not compel them to break laws of this realm in force concerning church service, but will permit all that will to use the same laws until further order; nevertheless forbidding all subjects to move seditions or stir unquietness by interpreting the laws after their brains and fancies, commanding all to live in quiet and charity, leaving those new-found devilish terms of papist or heretic.⁵⁹

In this proclamation, Mary is not only drawing attention to her personal convictions, but also placing them in a broader narrative. By recounting her lineage, she is not only highlighting the ancient and traditional nature of Catholicism, but also situating herself as a natural continuation of that legacy. Mary is expressing both her personal ties to Catholicism, as well as England's longstanding ties to the faith. Through issuing this proclamation, Mary signalled to her subjects that she intended to continue practicing the traditional Catholic faith, and that she invited, and perhaps even encouraged, them to do as well. However, she also indicated a certain level of

⁵⁹ "Proclamation for the order and conformity in religion," August 18, 1553, [Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Mary I, 1553-1558](#). SP 11/1 f.14. Gale Document Number: MC430400021.

understanding that some people may not be comfortable breaking the current English laws by returning to Catholicism. Through this and other proclamations discussed above, Mary indicated that she was comfortable, and happy, to have her subjects immediately return to Catholic liturgical services, even before the Edwardian religious statutes were repealed, the mass was legally reinstated, and England was reconciled with Rome. However, once these actions took place in the early years of her reign, her subjects no longer had to “break the laws of the realm” in order to practice Catholicism, and therefore Reformers were open to persecution if they continued to practice the Reformed faith. From Mary’s perspective, once Catholic rites and a relationship with the papacy had been legally brought back to England, there was no logical reason for people to continue practicing the New Religion.

Part of the Marian regime’s plan for the successful return to Catholicism involved the revival of the old heresy laws. Whether it was the original intention of the revival or not, the regime then used these laws to pursue an intense persecution of heretics, the level of which was unparalleled in Europe. There is little doubt about Mary’s personal involvement in the persecution of heresy and the subsequent burning of nearly 300 heretics during the last three years of her reign.⁶⁰ For one, as has been demonstrated, some historians, Loades, see Mary as the driving force behind the parliamentary legislation re-instating the old heresy laws. The record shows that among members of the council as well as the public, there was little support for these laws, so little, in fact, that it took Mary three parliaments to succeed in having the act passed.⁶¹ The first revived law, from Richard II allowed for the arrest and imprisonment of heretical preachers and their followers “till they will justify them according to Law and Reason of Holy

⁶⁰ “Appendix: The Marian martyrs,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 225-71.

⁶¹ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XII, 220-230.

Church.”⁶² The second act was more explicit about the need to publicly burn heretics, and why: heretics were to be taken “before the People in a high place do to be burnt; that such Punishment may strike in Fear to the Minds of other.”⁶³ The final law, revived from the reign of Henry V, provided for the arrest, imprisonment, and trials of suspected heretics by both ecclesiastical and secular courts and the confiscation of property owned by convicted heretics.⁶⁴ Together, these laws offered Mary and her regime a good deal of breadth in their ability to prosecute heretics.

It goes without saying that Mary and her government believed England was facing levels of “heresy” far greater than ever before, meaning that stricter measures likely seemed necessary and warranted in order to slow the tide. Considering Mary’s personal religious convictions, as well as the governmental need for control of its subjects, the question was no longer *whether* to punish those who had refused the invitation to return to Catholicism, but *how* to punish them and with what level of force. The revived heresy laws provided the *how*, and Mary and her regime used them to their full capacity in their efforts to punish and eliminate heresy. Mary almost certainly saw the heresy laws as helpful tool for ensuring the return to the Old religion in England. Loades certainly reads the evidence to this effect when he writes “The queen’s view was less detached, as might be expected. Burning was the punishment of a wicked individual, and the elimination of the threat which he represented to the simple, as well as a warning to possible imitators... The elimination of heresy was therefore uppermost in the minds of all those most directly concerned with the management of ecclesiastical affairs at the beginning of

⁶² *The Statutes of The Realm* Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.2 (London: Dawson of Pall Mall, 1963) 5 Richard II 2 c. 5 26.

⁶³ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.2, 2 Henry IV c. 15 128.

⁶⁴ *The Statutes of The Realm*, v.2, 2 Henry V 1 c. 7 182-3.

1555.”⁶⁵ This portrayal seems likely given that Mary sought to revive a law to this immediate effect. Eliminating heresy through public burnings was not just a punishment for the offender or a warning to others, it also functioned as a form of protection for the spiritual health of the nation. By removing this heresy, Mary believed that she was working towards a fulsome return to the true religion, Catholicism, in England.

Thomas S. Freeman has argued that “For Mary and her ministers, any tolerance of heresy would be repudiating the divine providence that had miraculously raised her to the throne. Tolerating religious dissenters, moreover, meant tolerating those who prayed for the failure of her religious policies, if not her actual death. And tolerance would mean abandoning the souls of at least some of her subjects to damnation.”⁶⁶ Given this, to allow Protestants to continue practicing their faith was clearly not an option, both to ensure uniformity and conformity to Catholicism and because Mary herself would have had no doubt that heretics were already damned. Having at multiple points in her life been forced into decisions that risked her own soul, Mary would have been especially sensitive to the risk of damnation, which sheds light on her fervent efforts to avoid it.

However persuasive the arguments in favour of persecution may have been for Mary and her government, it is hard, as Duffy acknowledges, to see this in a positive light. He writes that: “The greatest barrier to a positive assessment of the Marian restoration...remains the fact of the burning of more than 280 protestant men and women in just under four years, from February 1555 to November 1558. This was the most intense religious persecution of its kind anywhere in sixteenth-century Europe, and it...constitutes a horrifying moral blot on any regime purporting to

⁶⁵ Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 273.

⁶⁶ Thomas S. Freeman, “Burning Zeal: Mary Tudor and the Marian Prosecutions,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, eds. Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 203.

be Christian.”⁶⁷ Of course, there were those who condemned the burnings. John Foxe, the Protestant martyrologist and author of *Actes and Monuments*, was, according to Judith Richards, “an extraordinarily powerful advocate for the decidedly minority view that even obdurate heretics should not be burned.”⁶⁸ Building on Foxe, the protestant Gilbert Burnet’s seventeenth century *History of the Reformation* asserted that “The whole nation stood amazed at these proceedings, and the burning of such men, only for their consciences, without the mixture of any other thing so much as pretended against them. And it was looked upon as a horrible cruelty, because those men has acted nothing contrary to the laws; for they were put in prison, at first for smaller matters, and there kept till those laws were passed, by which they were now burnt.”⁶⁹ It is to be expected, however, that Protestants took issue with Mary’s religious policies, much as Catholics took issue with the religious policies of Edward and later Elizabeth.

What role did Mary’s personal beliefs and actions played in this “horrifying moral blot”? There is ample evidence demonstrating Mary’s personal involvement in and support for these punishments. In May of 1555, Mary and Philip sent Bishop Edmund Bonner a letter admonishing him for his lax treatment of heretics. A key section reads, “We thought convenient, both to signify this Our knowledge, and therewith also admonish you, to have in this behalf such regard henceforth to the Office of a good Paster and Bishop, as when any such Offender shall be by the said Justices of Peace brought unto you, ye do use your good wisdom and discretion, in procuring to remove them from their Errors, if it may be or else in against them (if they shall be

⁶⁷ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 7.

⁶⁸ Judith Richards, “Examples and Admonitions: What Mary demonstrated for Elizabeth,” in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt. 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 40.

⁶⁹ Gilbert Burnet and Nicholas Pocock, *The history of the reformation of the Church of England. A new ed., carefully rev., and the records collated with the originals*, v. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865), 487-8,

obstinate) according to the order of the Laws.”⁷⁰ Here Mary and Philip are explicitly pushing for more consistent and rigorous policing and punishment of heresy, suggesting that Mary did not just reinstate the heresy laws to give herself options, but because she fully intended to make uses of them.

Later in 1555 Mary gave directions to her council stating that, “As for the punishment of heretics, she wished it might not be done rashly; yet she would have justice done of those who by learning studied to deceive the simple: but would have it so managed, that the people might see they were not condemned but upon just occasions; and therefore ordered that some of the council should be present at all the burnings about London, and that there should be every where good sermons at those times.”⁷¹ This passage acknowledges that Mary was aware of, and supportive of the burnings that she felt were warranted. It also shows a personal interest in the events themselves through her instructions that council members should attend, and that Catholic preaching should take place. In this way she was capitalizing on the public gatherings as a way to spread “good sermons” and as a way to educate the public on the right ways of religion.⁷² These examples make it clear that Mary was both aware of, and supportive of the prosecution of heretics in England, even to the point of punishment by public burning. As Freeman has written, “her readiness to follow this advice, and to establish guidelines for local officials on the arrest and execution of heretics, speaks volumes about the importance she attached to these activities. The burning of heretics was a policy zealously implemented and enforced by Mary, and as

⁷⁰ Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. of the Progress made in it Till the Settlement of it in the Beginning of Q. Elizabeths Reign* (London: Printed by T.H. for Richard Chiswell, 1683), 285; Gilbert Burnet, *History of the Reformation in England II* (London: Printed by J.D. for Richard Chiswell, 1683), 500.

⁷¹ Burnet, *History of the Reformation in England II*, 508-9.

⁷² Duffy has also suggested that these instructions were designed to mitigate Protestant attempts to use the burnings as a venue for the glorification of heretics. Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 122.

sovereign ruler, she bears the greatest responsibility for it.”⁷³ It is therefore undeniable that Mary was one of the chief architects of the aptly named Marian burnings. Prior to her reign, Mary’s way of religious life was repeatedly challenged by “heretics” and heretical policy. This is not to say that Mary’s personal difficulties alone fueled these fires of faith, but rather that she knew first-hand the type of disruption and unrest that heresy could bring to a kingdom. For the most part, she was not motivated by revenge against those who had challenged, even persecuted her, but by her strong belief that Catholicism was the only true way to salvation. This required conformity to the law and required laws to punish those who did not conform.

For the analysis of Mary’s personal involvement, the nature of heresy also becomes an important factor. Mary, unlike Henry, Edward, and later Elizabeth, did not see herself as the Supreme Head of the Church of England. She disliked this title from the start and ceased using it officially in December 1553.⁷⁴ Mary viewed the pope as the religious head of England, something further confirmed by her later acts for England’s reconciliation with Rome. This meant that for Mary acts of religious non-conformity were heresy, crimes against the Church, rather than treason, crimes against the crown. As William B. Robinson and other scholars have noted, “Though Elizabeth had Catholics hanged, drawn, and quartered, she did so over a much longer period of time and she made a great show of declaring the victims were not guilty of heresy but of treason.”⁷⁵ As Robinson implies, the distinction made by Elizabeth and her government between heresy and treason disguises the fact that Jesuits and seminary priests

⁷³ Freeman, “Burning Zeal: Mary Tudor and the Marian Prosecutions,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, 203.

⁷⁴ Simon Renard to the Emperor, *CSPSp* XI, 439-446; Loades, *The Church of Mary Tudor*, 34.

⁷⁵ William B. Robinson, “Marrying Mary to the Black Legend: Anti-Catholicism and Anti-Marian Messages in Anglo-American Films about Philip II of Spain,” in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*, eds. Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 236; Judith Richards, “Examples and Admonitions: What Mary demonstrated for Elizabeth,” in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, 40.

committed treason because they worked to sustain and strengthen Catholicism in England, particularly by holding private masses in secret. This to the death commitment to the mass is how Loades explains the Marian prosecution:

So what turned this humane, well-read humanist Christian, who was so well loved by her servants, into the most ruthless persecutor in English history? The same commitment to the sacrament of the altar, which had caused her to defy her brother and celebrate four Masses a day... also gave her a profound hatred for those who rejected it. It was not the denial of the papacy, or the English Bible of even justification by faith... but the rejection of transubstantiation. Over and over again, this was the issue that sent heretics to the stake.⁷⁶

This analysis falls squarely in line with what is known about the aspects of Mary's faith that were most important to her. The previous two chapters have demonstrated the considerable value that Mary placed on the Mass and the Holy Sacrament and her fervent dedication to these two elements of her faith. Therefore, her regime's prosecution of those disregarding these elements seems well supported by Catholic belief more broadly as well as Mary's personal religious priorities. Out of the approximately 112 martyrs whose reasons for arrest are known, about 37 of them, or one-third, are linked in some way to the Mass or Holy Sacrament.⁷⁷

On the topic of religious tolerance however, it is also worth noting that Mary did employ and even befriend a number of Protestants during her reign. Richards has written that some Protestants who stayed in England and had success during Mary's reign "might even be seen as demonstrations that Mary also looked less into men's souls, more required that they should obey the laws of the land, including those regulating church attendance and, on occasion, presence at

⁷⁶ Loades, "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, eds. David Loades and Eamon Duffy (Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006), 28.

⁷⁷ In this group I have included the following reasons for arrest: Trying to prevent the celebration of mass, denying transubstantiation, attacking a priest performing a mass, failure to attend church, refusing to receive the sacrament, denouncing the mass, denying the Real Presence, failing to display reverence for the sacrament, denouncing a priest during service, turning one's back while holy water was cast during mass, refusal to attend mass, denouncing the celebration of mass, and leaving one's husband when forced to attend mass. "Appendix: The Marian martyrs," in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*, 225-71.

the mass....The case of Lady Anne Bacon, frequently cited as a woman of particularly strong reformist convictions, is one striking example of such a friendship with Mary.”⁷⁸ This characterization falls in line with what is known about Mary in her life prior to her accession. Mary was very close with Katherine Parr who had notably Reformist tendencies even at that time, and that Mary participated in some writing and translation activities that could have been viewed as aligned with a reformist agenda.⁷⁹ During the later years of her father’s reign, after her reluctant submission to the Act of Supremacy, Mary existed in relative peace at her father’s court. This could be attributed to the fact that despite their differing views on the papacy, Mary and her father shared a reverence for the Catholic mass and transubstantiation. It was not until Edwardian laws threatened the mass that Mary’s behaviour became outwardly antagonist to Reformers. It seems reasonable then, that Mary was willing to co-exist with and even befriend theological Protestants as long as they maintained an outward willingness to participate in and even conform to a revitalized Catholic England.

In her public policy as in her personal life, the record demonstrates that Mary valued traditional Catholic rites and the role of the papacy. Her immediate priorities as queen, repealing the Edwardian and Henrician religious statutes, reuniting with Rome, and reintroducing mechanisms for a more thorough prosecution of heresy, were motivated by her personal convictions as well as her adherence to conventional Catholic practice. Mary disagreed with the religious policies of both her father and brother, preferring more traditional Roman Catholic rites and a relationship with Rome, making it understandable that she sought a return to these policies

⁷⁸ Richards, “Examples and Admonitions: What Mary demonstrated for Elizabeth,” in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, 40.

⁷⁹ See for example Mary’s loving message to Parr written in one of Parr’s books. Notably a vernacular church service in *Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence*, ed. Janel Mueller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 625.

once she was in power. She also had a strong personal connection to Rome and the role of the papacy in her own faith, having suffered spiritually and emotionally decades earlier when she was forced to sign articles denying the Pope as the religious head of England. This relationship led to her determination to see a full return to the papal fold as queen, something she achieved through an act of parliament and Cardinal Pole's public absolution of England's sins of schism. This absolution also mirrored the absolution that she herself had received from the pope prior to her coronation. Mary's strong religious convictions also led her and her government to prosecute heresy to a greater degree than past regimes. This came from a need for political stability through religious conformity in addition to Mary's genuine belief that heretics were theologically in the wrong and needed to be punished for the spiritual good of the nation. Again, the prosecution of heretics focused on individuals who offended the aspects of Catholicism that Mary most cherished, the mass and the holy sacrament. It can therefore be seen that when given the reins and the authority of a monarch, Mary readily and consistently transferred her personal religious beliefs and priorities into laws that became the religious policies of England.

CONCLUSION

Mary Tudor was a Catholic woman who became England's first queen regnant. Her life was one of devotion, to her pious Catholic mother, to her theologically Catholic father, to the Holy Roman Emperor who was like a surrogate father to her, to her humanist fifth stepmother, to her Catholic husband, and to her cousin and religious advisor Cardinal Reginald Pole. Chief among Mary's devotions, and perhaps the uniting force binding this unlikely group together, was her faith. From the earliest days of her youth, Mary was raised as a Catholic princess. Her education, household, and upbringing were all centred around these two things: she was the royal daughter of two Catholic humanist parents and the heir presumptive of the English throne. In the 1530s, when Henry VIII chose to divorce Katherine of Aragon and break with Rome, these identities took on a newfound uncertainty. Despite repeated threats and increasing danger to her life and wellbeing, Mary clung to her title and her faith, the two things that she fervently believed to be true. It was only after a prolonged struggle of conscience that she finally made the difficult decision to succumb to her father's Act of Supremacy, thereby rejecting her own title, her parents' marriage, and the pope. This decision weighed heavily on Mary, and while she maintained an outward façade of conformity for the rest of her father's reign, she continued to assert her faith at nearly every opportunity throughout her life. Mary's translations, as well as dedications written both by and to her all point to her deep and widely known Catholic beliefs. Likeminded individuals such as Lord Thomas Morley and Mary Basset saw Mary as a beacon of traditional Catholicism and appealed to her on the basis of her royal status and known piety. Even in instances when these her writing projects may have been seen to tacitly support Reformist views Mary strove to emphasise the elements that she found important, including papal involvement and transubstantiation. She fought fervently for her beloved Mass during her

brother Edward's reign, and indeed it was this cherished sacrament that was one of the first to return when she took the throne. Mary also used the rosary in a public act of defiance towards her Protestant brother and in doing so publicly associated herself with an ancient and easily recognizable Catholic symbol.

Her time as queen was characterized by a deep personal devotion to the mass, church music, and the eucharist. Mary and her government also worked to protect and reinstate these elements of Catholicism, among others, through proclamations and statutes. For Mary, unlike her father, Catholicism was not only the traditional rites and sacraments, which she cherished, but also a spiritual relationship with Rome. This distinction between Mary and Henry's beliefs became abundantly clear almost immediately after she took the throne. The correspondence in the Calendar of State Papers Spanish provides ample evidence that Mary was devoted to Rome and did not see papal reconciliation as optional. Throughout her early days as queen, Mary repeatedly sought papal involvement in key moments. She secretly requested special coronation oils consecrated by the pope so that even though England was still in schism with Rome, she would feel that she was being crowned as a Catholic queen. When she decided to marry Prince Philip II of Spain she ensured that all of the papal dispensations were in order to allow her to marry her cousin, during Lent, in a ceremony officiated by an illegitimate English bishop. In addition to the papal elements her coronation and wedding ceremony themselves were both conducted in the strictest of Catholic fashions. Beyond ensuring that the necessary Roman Catholic approvals were in place for key personal events, Mary also worked to reconcile England with Rome more broadly and to end England's decades long schism. By the end of 1554 she and her government had achieved this through an Act of Parliament and a public absolution given by Cardinal Reginald Pole. Mary's personal and public dedication to her faith did not go unnoticed.

If anything, the pious reputation that she had gained as a princess swelled during her time as queen. Onlookers repeatedly referred to her as a most “saintly” woman and even her detractors could not deny her piety. Mary reinforced this saintly imagery by engaging in traditionally Catholic and princely activities such as providing endowments to religious houses and shrines, and her participation in the Holy Week rites of blessing cramp rings, washing the feet of the poor, and touching for the King’s evil. These activities were not only spiritually significant to Mary herself, but also linked her publicly to the ancient faith and practices of her progenitors.

In addition to creating her reputation for Catholic piety, Mary’s personal beliefs also provided context and motivation for many of the religious policies enacted by her government. In her first parliament Mary’s government legislated the legitimacy of her parents’ marriage, thereby undoing a key aspect of Henry’s Act of Supremacy and removing any possibility of Mary’s own bastardy. This parliament, and indeed Mary’s even earlier proclamations, also allowed for the return of traditional Catholic rites including the Mass. Mary’s August 1553 proclamations supported the mass so clearly that months before it was technically made legal again, it was being sung across the country. As noted above, the reconciliation with Rome was of great importance to Mary personally and it also became a legal priority. Once Mary and her government had reinstated traditional Catholic rites, undone Edwardian religious statutes, and achieved reconciliation with Rome, they turned to the persecution of heresy as essential to maintaining the strength of Catholicism in England. a way to maintain this newly Catholic status quo. The Marian government revived three old English heresy laws allowing for broader punishment of heretics, in this case Reformers. These laws provided Mary and her government with the legal mechanism necessary to root out threats to Catholicism. While Mary did not enact these laws on her own, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that she personally approved of the

persecution of heretics and saw heresy as evil. This perspective, if it did exist, likely stemmed from Mary's unwavering personal belief that Catholicism was the one true religion and that it was morally right and necessary to root out those who believed otherwise.

From a pious princess to a Catholic queen, Mary demonstrated that religiosity could take many forms and could be expressed in ways both subtle and explicit. Despite moments where she was forced to set aside some aspects of her faith, Mary used every opportunity to convey her Catholicism. She stood by the traditional rites of her youth and maintained a reverent devotion to the papacy and its role in Catholicism. Mary may have shared much of her theology with her father, but they differed on papal supremacy, and it was this factor that largely set apart the religious policies that they established during their respective reigns. She relied on her faith as she navigated a lifetime of difficult decisions, from signing the Act of Supremacy, to her choice of husband, to the running of a country both religiously divided and reluctant to follow a female ruler. Throughout her life she was many things: a princess, a daughter, a bastard, a queen, a king, a wife, and through it all, always, a Catholic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I Manuscript Sources

British Library (BL)

BL MS 17012

BL MS Harley 1860

MS Cotton Vesp. D

MS Cotton Vit. C

Proclamation for the order and conformity in religion, August 18, 1553, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Mary I, SP 11/1 f.14. Gale Document Number: MC4304000021.

II Printed Primary Sources

By a Resident in the Tower of London, *The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt*. Edited by J. G. Nichols. New York: AMS Press, 1968. <https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.library.carleton.ca/2027/heb.03963>.

Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 5, 1534-1554. Edited by Rawdon Brown. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1873. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol5>.

Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 6, 1555-1558. Edited by Rawdon Brown. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1877. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol6>.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 5 Part 1, 1534-1535. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol5/no1>.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 5 Part 2, 1536-1538. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1888. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol5/no2>.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 9, 1547-1549. Edited by Martin A.S. Hume and Royall Tyler. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol9>.

- Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 10, 1550-1552.* Edited by Royall Tyler. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1914. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol10>.
- Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 11, 1553.* Edited by Royall Tyler. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1916. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol11>.
- Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 12, 1554.* Edited by Royall Tyler. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1949. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol12>.
- Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 13, 1554-1558.* Edited by Royall Tyler. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol13>.
- Calendar of the Patent Rolls Vol. III, Philip and Mary, 1555-1557.* London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1938.
- Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London Camden Society Old Series: Volume 53.* Edited by J.G. Nichols. London: Camden Society, 1852. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/camden-record-soc/vol53>.
- Church of England. *The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administracion of the Sacramentes, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.* London: Grafton, 1549. STC 16274.
- Cranmer, Thomas. *An Exhortation unto Prayer. . . Also a Litany with Suffrages to be said or sung in the time of the said processions.* London: Berthelet, 1544. RSTC 10620.
- Hearne, Thomas. *Sylloge epistolarum*, in Titus Livius, *Vita Henrici Quinti*. Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1716.
- Katherine Parr: Complete Works and Correspondence.* Edited by Janel Mueller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Machyn, Henry. *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550-1563.* Edited by J.G. Nichols. London: Camden Society, 1848. *British History Online*. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/camden-record-soc/vol42>.
- Madden, Fredric. *Privy purse expenses of the Princess Mary, daughter of King Henry the Eighth, afterwards Queen Mary: with a memoir of the princess, and notes.* London: W. Pickering, 1831.

Proclamation for the order and conformity in religion, August 18, 1553, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Mary I, SP 11/1 f.14. Gale Document Number: MC4304000021.

The Prymer in Englishe and Latine, after Salisbury vse: set out at length with many Prayers and goodlye Pictures. Newelye imprynted thys present yeare. 1557. London: John Wayland, 1557. STC 16080.

The Statutes of The Realm Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.2. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1963.

The Statutes of The Realm Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.3. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1963.

The Statutes of The Realm Printed by Command of His Majesty King George the Third, v.4. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1963.

Tudor Royal Proclamations II 1553-1587. Edited by Paul Hughes and James Larkin. London: Yale University Press, 1969.

Venaeus, John. *A Notable Oration, made by John Venaeus a Parisien in the Defence of the Sacrament of the Aultare, Pronounced before the Whole Bodye of the Vniuersitie of Parise at the Feaste of Corpus Christi, in the Yeare of Oure Lorde God. 1.5.3.7. ; Wherevnto is Added a Preface, Taken Out of the Booke, Entituled De Ueritate Corporis & Sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia, Compiled by the Right Honorable and Reuerende Father in God, Cuthberte Tunstall, Bishoppe of Duresme. ; Translated Oute of Latine into Englishe by John Bullingham.* London; John Cawood, Printer to the Queenes highnesse, 1554. <https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/books/notable-oration-made-john-venaeus-parisien/docview/2240938895/se-2?accountid=9894>.

Visitation Articles and Injunctions Volume II 1536-1558. Edited by W.H. Frere and W.P.M. Kennedy. New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910.

Vives, Juan Luis. *The Instruction of a Christen Woman.* Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

III Secondary Sources

“Appendix: The Marian martyrs,” in *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives.* Edited by Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Beem, Charles. "Princess of Wales? Mary Tudor and the History of English Heirs to the Throne." In *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*. Edited by Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Bowers, Roger. "The Vernacular Litany of 1544 in the Reign of Henry VIII." In *Authority and Consent in Tudor England*. Edited by C.S.L. Davies, G.W. Bernard, and S.J. Gunn. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- Burnet, Gilbert. *History of the Reformation in England II*. London: Printed by J.D. for Richard Chiswell, 1683.
- _____. and Pockock, Nicholas. *The history of the reformation of the Church of England. A new ed., carefully rev., and the records collated with the originals*, v. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865.
- _____. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. of the Progress made in it Till the Settlement of it in the Beginning of Q. Elizabeths Reign*. London: Printed by T.H. for Richard Chiswell, 1683.
- Carley, James P. "Parker, Henry, tenth Baron Morley (1480/81–1556), nobleman and translator." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 September, 2004. <https://www-oxforddnb-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21305>.
- Cross, Claire. "The English Universities, 1553-58." In *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Edited by David Loades and Eamon Duffy. Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006.
- Dodds, Gregory D. *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Mary Tudor*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- _____. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Duncan, Sarah. *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen*. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Edwards, John. *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Erler, Mary. *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Freeman, Thomas S. "Burning Zeal: Mary Tudor and the Marian Prosecutions." In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Edited by Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Goodrich, Jaime. *Faithful Translators: Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2013.
- _____. "Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas: The Politics of Pious Translation at the Henrician Court." *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews: Women Devotional Writers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* 24, no. 1-2 (March 28, 2011): 11–20.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0895769X.2011.540501>.
- _____. "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* [with text]," *English Literary Renaissance* 40, no. 3 (Autumn 2010): 301-328.
- Gore, Joshua L. "The Compositions of Thomas Tallis: How the English Reformation Informed His Style," *Musical Offerings*: Vol. 11 : No. 2 , Article 1 (2020): 45-58.
- Graves, Michael A.R. *The House of Lords in the Parliaments of Edward VI and Mary I : an Institutional Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Harley, John. *Thomas Tallis*. Farnham and Surrey: Routledge, 2015.
- Hayward, Maria. "Dressed to Impress." In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*. Edited by Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Houliston, Victor. "Her Majesty, who is Now in Heaven: Mary Tudor and the Elizabethan Catholics." In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Edited by Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Hunt, Alice. "The Reformation of Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth." In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*. Edited by Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Jacobs, Alan. *The Book of Common Prayer: A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Kewes, Paulina. "Godly Queens: The Royal Iconographies of Mary and Elizabeth." In *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*. Edited by Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Kewes, Paulina. The 1553 succession crisis reconsidered, *Historical Research*, Volume 90, Issue 249, August 2017, 465, <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1111/1468-2281.12178>.

- Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Loach, Jennifer. *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Loades, David. "Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I." In *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Edited by David Loades and Eamon Duffy. Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006.
- _____. "The Marian Episcopate." In *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Edited by David Loades and Eamon Duffy. Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006.
- _____. *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-58*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Longman, 1991.
- McConica, James. "Erasmus, Desiderius (c. 1467–1536), humanist scholar and reformer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004. <https://www-oxforddnb-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-39358>.
- Miller, John Desmond. *Beads and Prayers: The Rosary in History and Devotion*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2002.
- Mitchell, Nathan D. *The Mystery of the Rosary: Marian Devotion and the Reinvention of Catholicism*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- Mortimer, Ian. "Machyn [Machin], Henry (1496/1498–1563), chronicler merchant." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sep. 2004. <https://www-oxforddnb-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-17531>.
- Page, Daniel. *Uniform and Catholic: Church Music in the Reign of Mary Tudor*. PhD Dissertation. Brandeis University, 1996.
- Peters, Christine. *Patterns of Piety: Women, Gender, and Religion in Late Medieval and Reformation England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Pollnitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- _____. "Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII." In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Edited by Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Porter, Linda. *The First Queen of England: The Myth of "Bloody Mary."* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008.
- Richards, Judith. "Examples and Admonitions: What Mary demonstrated for Elizabeth," in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*. 1st ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- _____. "Gender Difference and Tudor Monarchy: The Significance of Queen Mary I." *Parergon* 21, no. 2 (2004): 27-4.
- _____. "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy." *The Historical Journal* 40, no. 4 (December 1, 1997): 895–924. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/194949694/>.
- Robinson, William B. "Marrying Mary to the Black Legend: Anti-Catholicism and Anti-Marian Messages in Anglo-American Films about Philip II of Spain." In *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*. Edited by Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Schutte, Valerie. *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications: Royal Women, Power, and Persuasion*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Seesengood, Robert Paul. *Paul a Brief History*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Strickland, Agnes. *Lives of the Queens of England* v. 2. London: Henry Colburn, 1842.
- The Church of Mary Tudor*. Edited by David Loades and Eamon Duffy. Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006.
- Thomas, Melita. *The King's Pearl: Henry VIII and His Daughter Mary*. Stroud and Gloucestershire: Amberley, 2017.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain: Catholic Christendom 1300-1700*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2014.
- Weikel, Ann. "Mary I," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 23 Sept 2004, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/18245>.
- Whitelock, Anna. "A queen and by the same title, a king also": Mary I: Queen-in-Parliament." In *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I*. Edited by Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Williamson, Magnus. "Queen Mary I, Tallis's O sacrum convivium and a Latin Litany", *Early Music* 44.2 (2016): 251-70.

- Wizeman, William. "The Religious Policy of Mary I." In *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Edited by Susan S. Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Wooding, Lucy. "The Marian Restoration and the Mass." In *The Church of Mary Tudor*. Edited by David Loades and Eamon Duffy. Aldershot and Hants: Ashgate, 2006.
- Youngs, Frederic. *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.