2016

Stoking the Fires: The Relationship between Mary Tudor and Eustace Chapuys, 1529-1545

Derek Michael Taylor
taylor661@marshall.edu

STOKING THE FIRES: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARY TUDOR AND EUSTACE CHAPUYS, 1529-1545

A thesis submitted to the Graduate College of Marshall University

In partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts in History

By

Derek Michael Taylor

Approved by

Dr. William Palmer, Committee Chairperson

Dr. Robert Deal

Dr. Damien Arthur

Marshall University

May 2016

APPROVAL OF THESIS

We, the faculty supervising the work of Derek Michael Taylor, affirm that the thesis *Stoking the Fires: The Relationship between Mary Tudor and Eustace Chapuys, 1529-1545*, meets the high academic standards for original scholarship and creative work established by the Master of Arts in History program and the College of Liberal Arts. This work also conforms to the editorial standards of our discipline and the Graduate College of Marshall University. With our signatures, we approve the manuscript for publication.

Dr. William Palmer, Department of History	Committee Chairperson	Date
Dr. Robert Deal, Department of History	Committee Member	Date
Dr. Damien Arthur, Department of Political Science	Committee Member	Date

CONTENTS

Abstract

Most published research regarding the court of King Henry VIII and the early years of the English Reformation has relied upon the correspondence of ambassador Eustace Chapuys. Although Chapuys' assessments of the goings on in England at the time have been often disputed among scholars in regard to their accuracy, little research has been attempted to understand the man writing the letters that have so frequently been cited. During his sixteen years as ambassador Chapuys became a close friend of Henry's eldest living child, Mary Tudor, who later became Queen Mary I. This relationship has previously gone unexplored. This thesis examines the relationship between Mary and Chapuys through research of primary documents from the letters of Chapuys and others. It also makes extensive use of works by researchers of sixteenth-century England, who have often misjudged Chapuys' personality and role in the events that took place in the 1530s and 1540s.

Introduction

Mary Tudor, Eustace Chapuys, and the English Reformation

Given the tumult and torment that marked her adolescence and early adulthood, it is little surprise that Mary Tudor became one of England's most notorious monarchs as Queen Mary I. Deemed illegitimate by her father, King Henry VIII, when his second wife gave birth to the future Queen Elizabeth I in 1533, Mary spent much of her time as a young woman mourning both the loss of favor her father had shown her as a young girl and the poor treatment suffered by her mother, Queen Catherine of Aragon, at the hands of Henry before Catherine's death in 1536. Throughout this period beginning in 1529 and concluding with his retirement in 1545, Mary's friend Eustace Chapuys served the princess not only as her confidant but also her champion at Henry's court and also her political advisor. This thesis aims to look closer at their relationship in order to better determine its nature and, if possible, its effects on Mary.

Although he retired nearly a decade before Mary became the first queen regnant of England, Chapuys was a pivotal figure in Mary's maturation process. The Holy Roman Ambassador to the court of King Henry VIII, Chapuys was a chief ally and friend to Catherine, the first of Henry VIII's six wives and his original queen. Through this tie to Catherine, Chapuys also built a strong relationship with Mary, who was thirteen years old when she met the ambassador. He remained in England until his retirement, when Mary was twenty-nine years old and eight years from becoming queen. This relationship between Mary and Chapuys began just as the roots of the English Reformation were beginning to sprout, and the friendship's high marks and low moments were tied tightly to some of the starkest changes made by Henry to the Church of England. This is an important element of the past historiography of Mary's life, as will be addressed later in this introduction.

Mary's staunch Catholicism was destined to be challenged by England's shift to Protestantism even if the dissolution of her parents' marriage had not been at its heart. It is difficult to believe, for instance, that she would have been any more likely to acknowledge that the king rather than the Pope was the head of her church, regardless who that king would have been. During her father's life, which ended in 1547, this was the most noticeable change made to the faith, but it was drastic enough for Mary to refuse to acknowledge it for years. Even then, she made such an acknowledgement out of fear for her own life and as a result of Chapuys' guidance.

The English Reformation was far less organic than its continental forerunner and counterpart. Unlike in southern Germany, where first Martin Luther and then contemporaries such as Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin began to change the face of Western Religion through grass roots movements, the English Reformation was imposed on the people of England from the highest reaches of their government in the form of King Henry VIII. Whereas Catholicism stressed the importance of good works as a pathway to salvation, Luther and Zwingli stressed biblical tenets that stated the only way a person may be saved was through faith in Jesus Christ as the son of God. Calvin went further, basing his understanding on logic that states if God is omniscient and omnipotent, that same god has known from the very beginning of time what persons will be saved and what persons will not.

Henry had been vehemently opposed to the Protestant movement as it began to spread across Europe, and his reformation was based purely in his desire to take a second wife and secure the Tudor dynasty through the birth of a male heir. With Mary being the only living child his marriage to Catherine had produced, Henry was obsessed with furthering his family line. This preoccupation was closely tied to the way his father, King Henry VII, took the throne by

way of victory in the Wars of the Roses in 1485 and the numerous claimants associated with Henry VIII's sisters, Margaret (1489-1451) and Mary (1496-1533) through marriage. Nevertheless, although Henry VIII had been recognized as *Fedei defensor* by Pope Leo X after the king published a damning and self-written response to Luther's ideas in 1521, it gradually became apparent that after numerous attempts to gain a divorce through the church, Henry was so set in his resolve to marry Anne Boleyn that he would, and did, break with the Catholic Church in order to make that happen.

Henry built his original case for an annulment upon a verse in the Old Testament book of *Leviticus*, which states, "And if a man shall take his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing: he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless." Since he and Catherine had no sons that lived, Henry conveniently interpreted "childless" to mean "sonless" and saw himself cursed as a result of his marrying the widow of his older brother, Arthur. The potential for such a result was actually considered by the Catholic Church prior to Henry and Catherine's marriage in 1509, but a papal dispensation was issued that deemed Arthur, who died at the age of fifteen and just five months after his marriage to Catherine in 1501, had not been consummated. The decision allowed the marriage to take place without fear of it running afoul of the Levitical statute.

The decree from the church that allowed Henry to marry Catherine and fulfill England's obligations to the Treaty of Medina del Campo made by his father with Spain in 1489 actually trapped Henry in more ways than one. First, it established a concrete position by the church in regard to his marriage to Catherine in terms of its validity. To successfully argue that this marriage was invalid due to its illegality according to Levitical law would force the church to formally acknowledge that it had erred in its judgement in 1509. Though the doctrine of papal infallibility was not defined dogmatically until the nineteenth century, it had been defended by

many church leaders since the thirteenth century, and was still widely accepted in the Tudor era. Secondly, though less to the point of this paper, it would put England in peril of losing its alliance with Spain that had since the treaty's authorship allowed England to be less worried about military advances by France while at the same time considerably adding to its then-struggling treasury by way of the dowry paid to England for Catherine's betrothal. It was, to say the least, a dangerous proposition for Henry to pursue an annulment by the means he chose. His ultimate accomplishment of the goal through a break from the Catholic Church and appointment of himself as the head of the Church of England laid the foundation for the actions for which Mary is best remembered.

Because the English Reformation was not a continued outgrowth of the Lutheran Reformation in Europe, its origins and development must be understood independently lest events that influenced the development of the reformation on the continent inaccurately be given the same weight in the development of the English Reformation. The historiography of the English Reformation remains contested. In the early 1960s, leading Reformation historian A.G. Dickens argued that Protestantism was popular in England during Henry's reign, and grew as a popular groundswell against the Catholic Church. Dickens' research suggests that in a way the growth, spread and victory of Protestantism in England were the results of a few well-timed events. Followers of fourteenth century theologian and reformer John Wycliffe, known as the Lollards, were still active in numerous regions of England in the sixteenth century. Wycliffe had attacked the clergy's heightened social status and was a proponent of a vernacular Bible, sharing many of the same opinions Luther was to espouse more than one hundred years later in Germany. Among Wycliffe's sixteenth-century adherents was William Tyndale, whose versions of the New Testament were already circulating through England when he wrote a book in 1528

called *The Obedience of a Christian Man.* That work advocated that a king should also be the head of the church in his country, and Anne Boleyn gave Henry VIII a copy of this book in 1531 while the king was still struggling in pursuit of an annulment from the Catholic Church. Dickens argues that when Henry decided to break from Rome, a sizable part of his kingdom was ready and willing to go with him.[1]

A significant part of the problem with this historiography was its reliance on the idea of widespread popular distaste for the Catholic Church, and on the opinion that the Catholic Church was overwhelmingly corrupt and not only was it corrupt but said corruption was widely acknowledged by a significant portion of the public. It is true that at the upper echelons of the Church hierarchy political power plays, greed, and all forms of intrigue were present and had been for centuries. With the post-World War II release of local government and church records from the Tudor era, however, historians discovered that local parishioners seldom complained about church officials in the 1500s. Some of these historians came to quickly realize that many historians that preceded them had errantly accepted anti-Catholic commentary from that time as factual.

In the decades that followed the release of the above-mentioned records, historian Christopher Haigh researched the local records at Lancashire, and concluded that the corruption that so commonly tied to the Catholic Church of this era is simply not revealed by any evidence from the era. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that something as wide-sweeping as the English Reformation could have developed purely from the grass-roots level led by ordinary citizens who were dissatisfied with Catholicism. Haigh further notes that a "rapid Reformation from below"

[1] A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (State College, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 56-60; Christopher Haigh, "The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation," *The Historical Journal* 25 (1982): 997.

would be logistically almost impossible, due to the reliance on the written and spoken word in the spread of Protestantism. The lack of literacy and large numbers of people needed to facilitate such a large movement would have made such grass-roots spread slower, not quicker. Haigh's work paved the way for later historians such as Eamon Duffy and J.J. Scarisbrick, who found that Catholicism still had considerable adherents and supporters during the reformation imposed by Henry VIII and even later.[2]

There has been enough research of the English Reformation over time for there to have developed several distinct groups of opinions regarding its origin and evolution. The idea of "reformation from below" still prevails among many historians. The historians, like Dickens, argue that the Reformation moved quickly from below; those who say it moved quickly from above; those who say it moved slowly from above; and those who say it moved slowly from below.

The view that the English Reformation was imposed on the people from the monarch and moved in quick order is fairly new in the grand scheme, having been first mentioned by Maurice Powicke in an essay published in 1936 and caused such alarm that he amended the statement in the essay's second edition. This group of historians was gradually led by the work of G.R. Elton, who cast the religious change as an arm of Henry VIII's Chancellor Thomas Cromwell in Cromwell's push to further strengthen the monarchy by limiting or eliminating the power of the Church of England through carefully planned programs of propaganda that encouraged citizens to accept the new faith through coercion. Elton's view was that this program only strengthened under the reign of Edward VI, and Haigh agrees that by the time Mary became queen in 1553 England was closer to being a Protestant country than it was a Catholic one. A study of the

[2] Haigh, "Recent Historiography," 998-999.

county of Kent undertaken by Peter Clark produced convincing evidence that by the mid-1540s the political and legal structure of the county had become overwhelmingly Protestant to the point that the spread of Protestantism through independent actions of English citizens had become the norm, and further imposition from the king was no longer necessary for its survival. Haigh questions the ability of Elton and other adherents to this view to correctly apply their evidence to less populated areas of England, however, noting that the justices of the peace and diocesan administrators in charge of implementing and enforcing the king's edicts have been shown to have been ineffective in doing so in other research. Without such enforcement, less-populated areas would have been hard pressed to mirror the changes seen in a county such as Kent.[3]

Finally, there is a "slow reformation from both sides" school led by Haigh. His main point of contention is that all the evidence that supports each of the models comes exclusively from groups and regions of England that would logically support the conclusions reached in those model while not addressing other regions and groups. Those who believe the Reformation progressed slowly tend to focus on rural areas and those who find that it moved swiftly gravitate toward research focused in the cities. As an exception to the rule there is Margaret Bowker's study of the diocese of Lincolnshire, which included London as well as a total of nine counties that included a wide array of socioeconomic groups. Bowker found that the Reformation, which had been stiffly imposed in the core of the region, nevertheless progressed slowly throughout the entirety of Lincolnshire, and that Edward's more extreme measures were met with more resistance than those of Henry. When Mary visited these areas as queen, there were isolated critics of Catholicism but nothing in the way that indicated the peoples of the country were strong proponents of Protestantism. While he acknowledges that much recent Reformation

[3] Haigh, "Recent Historiography," 995-996; Christopher Haigh, "A.G. Dickens and the English Revolution," *Historical Research* 77 (2004): 25.

scholarship has been built off the work of Dickens and Elton, Haig writes that Bowker's findings are exceedingly important as research moves forward, because they represent the most likely method by which the Reformation grew, which is to say that it was only during the reign of Elizabeth from 1558-1603 that Protestantism took a firm hold in England.[4]

Mary was caught in the crossfire of several historical forces. Her devotion to Catholicism was intensified by the way in which Protestantism was given an open door into England, by whatever means and rate it spread. Although her father's break with Rome was little more than a nominal change and the church service in his kingdom did not change during his rule, it nevertheless was a shockingly stark change to the religion that Mary grew up being taught to practice. That it paved the way for the adoption of Calvinist philosophies by the Church of England during the reign of her younger half-brother, Edward VI, who ruled from 1547 to 1553, made things even worse for her. By this point, not only was Mary fighting a battle over succession and religious practices but she was also in the unenviable position of being at odds with her half-brother while he ruled as minor. Edward's Protestant advisors had considerable influence over his decisions, putting Mary's well-being in every bit as much danger as it had been during the time when Anne Boleyn was queen. Mary could not possibly have foreseen the changes made in the late 1540s when she was a teenager nearly two decades earlier. However, she easily could have seen Anne Boleyn as the personification of heresy that not only broke apart her parents' marriage and rendered her a bastard, but threatened the souls of herself and her entire country by its refusal to accept papal authority and blessing through the form of its king, her father.

[4] Haigh, "Recent Historiography," 1003-1004.

This aforementioned devotion to her faith during a time of widespread religious upheaval throughout Western Europe fixed Mary's fate as a historic pillar of the era. Whether England remained Protestant and evolved along that path in the long run or reverted to Catholicism under her rule, the rule of Mary as queen was destined to be remembered as an important touchstone in the timeline of religious history of the west. The level of her success or failure and the commitment with which she approached the implementations of policy would determine how starkly she would be remembered, and in what light. Historian Patrick Collinson acknowledges that the negative historical view of Mary can be primarily attributed to her death just five years after acceding to the throne while leaving no heir. Collinson argues that if Mary had lived there is "no reason why" Catholicism would not have remained the official religion of England. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, in their compilation of essays constructed to show how historiography of Mary's reign has changed over time, wrote that if Mary had lived another ten years, England would still today be a Catholic country. Because she did die in 1558 without an heir and was replaced by her Protestant half-sister Elizabeth, not only have Mary's reign and persona been saddled with negative opinions but much of her earlier personal life has been disregarded by historians unwilling to challenge the established historiography of the era that leads to a Protestant victory. Mary's uninvestigated life includes her relationship with the Catholic Eustace Chapuys.[5]

For all his high-mindedness and protests about how the English Reformation was being researched by historians in the mid-twentieth century, Dickens was part of this machinery that ignored Mary. In a review written in 1962 he wrote that historiography of the Reformation had suffered because so many simply studied the major players of the story, and not focused on local

[5] Patrick Collinson, *The Reformation: A History* (New York: Modern Library, 2006), 133-134; Susan Doran and Thomas Freeman, eds. *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (New York: Palgrave), 1.

areas and everyday people. This followed a 1959 work in which Dickens insisted that the Reformation in England could not properly be understood without in-depth research into personal histories. Dickens was half right, of course, but to investigate the personal lives and religious practices of everyday people would still produce only a partial picture. Henry VIII's personal life has been poured over and mined for information time and again by historians, with much of that research focusing on his six marriages. Meanwhile, the personal life of Mary I's early years has been all but ignored to this day.[6]

Negative accounts of Mary's reign appeared soon after her death and the start of Elizabeth's rule. John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, commonly referred to as the *Book of Martyrs,* is called by Collinson, "the most radical piece of historical revisionism ever undertaken." The work detailed each of the more than three hundred burnings of heretics ordered by Mary during her reign in such imaginative ways that Collinson writes it was, "hard to know whether the burnings caused much revulsion at the time." It is curious, then, why so many historians for such a long period of time used works such as Foxe's without much of a second thought regarding the authenticity of his claims. The answer, of course, is that England flourished under Protestantism, becoming a global power only after its religious conversion was complete. The works of writers like Foxe helped to bolster a creation myth of sorts for Imperial England. In the process they aimed to leave England's Catholic era as its prehistoric age, and even among those who favored Mary's fight against encroaching Calvinist philosophies the return to a Henrician-era Protestant Church of England was favorable to Papal rule. This early response to Elizabeth's success following Mary's reign had a strong effect on how the era has been studied and assessed in the modern era. When Mary was swept to the throne through a

[6] Haigh, "Dickens and the English Reformation," 30.

coup d'etat in 1558, it came as a surprise to her supporters that she wished to actually reunite England with Rome. It was easy to sweep Marian Catholicism away as the Elizabethan Church of England settled into its existence. For instance, by the time James I became king in 1603, Elizabeth's anti-Catholic reputation was used as a standard for how he should deal with them in his own time, and Elizabeth's own victory over the Spanish Armada in 1588 was used as a vindication of her religious policies and comapred to James' own survival of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. Foxe's literature was far from the only of the time that worked to demonize Catholicism in England. John Milton's *Paradise Lost* is rife with what Haigh calls "anti-Catholic satire." As Haigh writes, "historians in the whig-protestant tradition, the English Reformation was rapid and little resisted – essentially because it was a progressive, reformist movement which brought a better Church and a better state with an appeal which was obvious to but the intellectually inert and the morally bankrupt." With these views merging into part of the national identity it is little surprise that comparatively minor characters from the previous era like the foreign-born Chapuys, were left as uninteresting relics.[7]

The cause of Mary and Chapuys ever having their day in the objective historiographical light was damaged because of the popularity of Dickens' manifest destiny-style writing of the English Reformation. Thanks to Dickens's work and the next wave of historians that included Collinson and McCulloch, "The Reformation had been rescued from the Anglo-Catholics, and made properly Protestant," Haigh wrote in 2004. Dickens had approached the subject by criticizing the elements of Catholicism that early Calvinists and especially Puritans had railed

[7] Patrick Collinson, The Reformation: A History (New York: Modern Library, 2006), 134-135; Diarmaid MacCullough, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 18; Christopher Haigh, "Catholicism and anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts, by Arthur Marotti," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2001), 755; John Foxe, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (Alachua, Fla.: Bridge-Logos), 250-253; Christopher Haigh, "Revisionism, the Reformation and a History of English Catholicism," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1995), 395.

against so vehemently as if he were one of them, which was hardly the basis for an objective inquiry and yet it became a widely accepted and highly influential historiography that was also heavily filled with Dickens' patriotism and idea that the events of the sixteenth century were necessary in order for England to become the great country Dickens' believed it to be in the 1950s.[8]

Mary's reactions to her turbulent life prior to her ascension show her unbending religious policy was predictable, and yet in great part as a result of Dickens' approach that turbulent life has not been investigated in more than passing mention in regard to her personal life and reactions to the events that made her life turbulent. It is the purpose of this thesis to investigate the content of the communication between Chapuys and the young Mary, to determine the true nature of that relationship. In this pursuit, the historiography that painted Mary's religious policy and the persecution of Protestants during her reign as one that resulted from recklessly poor planning must be discarded, or at least kept in check. As Eamon Duffy explains in his book, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor*, the aforementioned notion is overwhelmingly whiggish in nature, and adopted in no small part over centuries of development to further glorify the accomplishments of Queen Elizabeth I, as explained above. Mary unwittingly enabled the memory of her reign to be developed as it was by, as leading Marian historian David Loades puts it, "antagonizing her successor, without being able to impose any limitations upon her freedom of action." Elizabeth and her supporters were almost assuredly going to capitalize on anything that could be caricaturized of her predecessor's persona and demonize it. Furthermore, while Elizabeth did not burn Catholics once she took the throne in 1588 she did rule over a similar number of religious executions. The method of execution

[8] Haigh, "Dickens and the English Reformation," 31-36.

matters little in the grand scheme of things, and as such, Mary should not be seen as a bloodthirsty tyrant any more than her royals peers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[9]

Chapuys, meanwhile, has been considered by historians significantly less so than Mary, at least as a three-dimensional individual. To be fair, it is with good reason aside from his Catholic background. Mary was a ruling monarch with policy-changing power and Chapuys was the diplomatic representative of a monarch, and as such his life has been of less interest due to its lack of direct impact on the lives of the masses. However, recently Chapuys' importance to the Tudor era has begun to be recognized more than it has in the past, when he was considered for little more than as a major source of documentation from the era, and one whose credibility has regularly been debated by historians. His letters, mostly to his employer the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, provide historians with the most comprehensive single body of primary source material for English history during his stay there. While these letters have been used as fodder for debate regarding their ability to portray an accurate picture of Henry VIII's kingdom, the man who wrote them has largely remained unexamined beyond acknowledgement of his obvious biases.

While being frequently noted for calling Anne Boleyn, "the whore," and "the concubine," in his correspondence, such terms were actually first coined – as far as this historical narrative is concerned – by Dr. Pedro Ortiz, who was the Holy Roman ambassador to the Vatican while Chapuys was in England. Chapuys most commonly referred to Anne as "the Lady" or "The Lady Anne" prior to Ortiz's correspondence cast her in harsher terms. Chapuys later followed suit, and it is most likely that Chapuys was simply following Ortiz's lead once a norm had been

[9] Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010), 79-80; David Loades, "The Reign of Mary Tudor: Historiography and Research," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 21 (1989), 547.

established to cast her in a more negative light. This actually contradicts the long-held belief that Chapuys hated Boleyn from the very start. On the contrary, Chapuys was reserved in his characterizations of her for a few years after arriving in England, and it was only as Ortiz's terms for her began to be commonplace, and Mary's status began to be diminished that the ambassador became more openly critical of Anne.[10]

In fact, it was not until 2014 that Chapuys received his first full biography, written by Australian historian Lauren Mackay. Her work is an important first step in demystifying this important figure, but her conclusions are still mostly reached through his official correspondence rather than through substantial evidence found about his personal life unrelated to his career. Mackay's biggest contribution to this study, therefore, is a six-page chapter devoted to her assessment of Chapuys' relationship with Mary. Mackay quickly notes that there has been a shift in recent historiographical assessment of the relationship, and somewhat defensively blames Loades in no small part for what has, to Mackay, been an unfair rendering of the relationship as one in which Chapuys manipulated the princess to forward the interests of the emperor.[11]

To believe otherwise, however, is somewhat naïve. For Chapuys' mission to be successful as it was defined he could only hope to get close enough to Mary in order to be able to manipulate her to the will of her cousin, Charles, her mother's nephew. The mistake Mackay makes is in rushing to Chapuys' defense is by equating manipulation with an absence of genuine care and concern for Mary. The act of manipulation and the existence of genuine care are not mutually exclusive, as almost any parent can attest, and it is in this idea where a *de facto* father-daughter relationship can be seen to emerge between the parties in question. This was a running

[10] Pedro Ortiz to Eustace Capacho (Chapuys*), Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII*, Vol. 5, October 1531, 16-31, 231.
[11] Lauren Mackay, *Inside the Tudor Court: Henry VIII and his Six Wives through the Writings of the Spanish Ambassador, Eustace Chapuys* (London: Amberly, 2014), 189.

theme for Mary throughout her life, and Mackay is correct in her argument that the two manipulated each other, but in reality that is what close friends tend to do. It is disappointing, then, that although Mackay writes that after Catherine's death Chapuys refocused his mission to solely watch out for Mary's interests that there is so little information about the relationship beyond that in her book. Instead we are left with much of the same rehash of Henry's marriages cast through Chapuys' eyes that largely gave us what we already knew about Chapuys, just cast with him as the central character of the story.[12]

The reliability of Chapuys' letters has been a source of debate among scholars for more than a century. While his charge from Charles V explicitly states that even Henry VIII should expect him to be biased, some historians have nevertheless gone out of their way to bemoan the inaccuracy of his accounts when posing their own theses. Few have been more incredulous of Chapuys' than historian Retha Warnicke, author of *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn*. Warnicke regularly questions the validity of Chapuys' claims in her popular biography of Henry's second wife, but like most historians, Warnicke relies heavily upon his account for information that is crucial to her work. Warnicke surmises that Chapuys cannot be considered a reliable source while at the same time using whatever parts of his letters that aid in forwarding her argument.

What Chapuys forces us to remember is that he was not a historian seeking to document the actions taking place in front of him for interested third parties. As an ambassador, he was trying to actively influence those events and convince his employer of courses of action to take in England as a result of his observations. Therefore, the tone of Chapuys' letters are nearly as important as the moments he is taking account of because that tone sheds light on his state of mind and his priorities while serving the emperor. Rather than debating the authenticity of the

[12] Ibid, 194.

claims he made in his letters, it is better to view Chapuys' correspondence as the first-hand account of a key player in the proceedings, given from his point of view and reflecting his hopes and fears in regard to the way events were unfolding in front of him.[13]

Among the schools of historiography that can be applied to Reformation-era research in Early Modern England, one element is somehow missing from all four of them. There is little scholarship that has been undertaken in recent years that looks at the Catholic side of the story and its main players. It is with this in mind that this thesis seeks to illuminate more about the personality and life of Mary Tudor, especially in regard to her friendship with Imperial ambassador Eustace Chapuys. It is hoped that this work fills a gap in historiography that can lead to better understanding of all parties involved in the events of the English Reformation.

[13] Retha M Warnicke, *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991) 1-3.

Chapter One

Roots of the Relationship

Eustace Chapuys supplied historians with the most significant contribution to Henrician studies through his correspondence from his time as the ambassador of Emperor Charles V to England. These letters chronicle Henry VIII's pursuit of a papal dispensation to end his marriage to Catherine of Aragon so that he could marry Anne Boleyn in the hopes of producing a male heir to ensure the continuation of the Tudor dynasty. The correspondence also illustrates the international ramifications of that pursuit, as it took account of the opinions and actions of many in the Tudor court during Chapuys' time there. Although it did her little good as shall be addressed later, Charles V was Catherine's nephew, and maintaining positive relations with England at this time were of vital interest to the Holy Roman Empire, which was beset by threats on its eastern front by the Turks and to the west by France. As a result of the disruption, Henry's 'Great Matter' and England's resulting break from the Catholic Church were to continental affairs, Chapuys' existence to historians has long been relegated to that of an observer and reporter, a primary source for research of the era. Rarely has his personality been given attention by scholars other than when those scholars rightfully challenge some of his observations as being tainted by pro-Imperial biases and sentimentality that saw everything he reported through a way that painted Catherine to be the primary heroine of the story, with her daughter Mary Tudor emerging to take her mother's starring role in Chapuys' letters by 1533. An active player in the drama that was 1530s England, Chapuys' was a close friend to Mary and had plenty to do with how her life developed.

Chapuys came to England as ambassador in August 1529. By this time, Henry's active pursuit of an annulment had been ongoing for close to two years. Henry's top advisor, Cardinal

Thomas Wolsey, was actually on the verge of falling out of favor with the king in late summer of that year in part for his failure to produce Henry's hoped-for result.[14] The ambassador's chief instructions from Charles V were to intercede on Catherine's behalf in the matter of her marriage and to, if possible, put an end to the relationship between Henry and Anne in order to pave the way for a reconciliation between the king and the wife he had cast aside. Chapuys was not simply sent to England to serve as a diplomat but as a marriage counselor, of sorts. This fact is important because the issues he was charged to deal with were personal matters that were bound to render him to history as a biased reporter. This is the historian's conundrum with Chapuys: he was neither an objective observer nor central figure in the narrative, and therefore his own story has fallen through the cracks in exchange for historical debate regarding the legitimacy of his opinions on greater matters.

That so little is known of Chapuys' personal life is likely the primary reason that his role in English affairs has lacked greater attention. Born between 1490 and 1492 in Annecy in the Duchy of Savoy, Chapuys was not actually Spanish, a common misconception. He was educated at the University of Turin, the University of Valence, and finally, Sapienza University of Rome, where he earned a doctorate in civil and canon law. He was ordained in July 1517 and worked as an official in the diocese of Geneva, serving the Duke of Savoy and Charles de Bourbon and in 1526 became the Duke of Bourbon's ambassador to the court of Charles V in Granada. Perhaps fittingly, it was the sack of Rome by a renegade group of Imperial soldiers in 1527 that brought

[14] While Wolsey failed in gaining a papal decision in Henry's favor, to say this failure was the reason of his downfall is too simple to be true. As Chancellor, Wolsey had gained great wealth and power within the kingdom and was hated by much of the aristocracy in part from jealousy but also because of his perceived lack of humility. As the family of Anne Boleyn increased in power among Henry's court, Wolsey's position became more tenuous. His failure, therefore, provided Henry an opportunity to rid himself of a growing problem within his court and a man who was distrusted by Anne.

him into direct service of Charles, in part due to the death of Bourbon in the fighting.[15] These, of course, are professional accomplishments that amount to a resume, however, and still do not illuminate much about Chapuys' personal life.

While historian and Mary Tudor biographer David Loades never refers to Chapuys in the parental role regarding the princess, he does place the mantle on Charles, who Mary referred to as being "like a father" to her numerous times in letters sent to the emperor, as will also be addressed later. Loades goes further in his biography of Mary to explain that her final letter to Charles, written in the summer of 1556, served as an example of her inability to separate politics and her personal life, as she blamed the emperor for not making good on promises and assurances she believed to have been given to her by him. It also conveyed evidence, Loades writes, of a person who is wholly dependent on a more experienced person to be available to lead her. Chapuys manipulated Mary, and likely not just in the short term. His attitude, excitability, and penchant for the dramatic became hallmarks of her own personality and he appears to have had a lasting effect on her through the terms of subsequent imperial ambassadors Francois van der Delft and Simon Renard, who were attendant when Mary was later in a position to affect policy herself.[16]

Mackay's biography devotes just one brief chapter to Chapuys' early, pre-diplomatic life before diving in to his career as Charles' ambassador, leaving his religious outlook only lightly regarded. He came from an upper-middle class family that had ties to minor nobility, but his father, Louis Chapuys, had a law degree and was elected the overseer of Annecy's market once it was chartered in 1492. Louis Chapuys was forced out of his position just a year later, however,

[15] C.S.L Davies, "Chapuys, Eustache (1490/92-1556)". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online edition.). Oxford University Press.
[16] David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1989), 264; Mary to the Emperor, *Calendar of State Papers: Spain*, Vol. 13, July 1556, 271.

after losing the confidence of merchants, and he returned to law. Of religious leaning little is known of the family, but Eustace Chapuys did befriend one Francois Bonivard while the two were students at the University of Turin. Bonivard was a noted religious reformer and ecclesiastic, who interestingly enough was a protestant, and Chapuys was tied to numerous reformers through the early stages of the Reformation on the continent. While Chapuys has long been noted for his ardent Catholicism, it is not obvious by Mackay's research that he carried such a spiritual view into his profession. In fact, Mackay notes that while Chapuys disagreed with the way that Henry VIII was trying to leave the church, he might not have been altogether opposed to the break itself. The impact Chapuys had on Mary was not so much in reinforcing her faith. It was in the way she reacted to challenges to her faith.[17]

Chapuys was not a priest by any means, but he knew canon law and the Catholic faith well. In May of 1529, Ambassador Inigo de Mendoza was recalled from England in a continuation of what had been a series of briefly held assignments by Charles' envoys. Mendoza's lasted just two-and-a-half years. Mendoza had been kept from meeting with Catherine through the early movements of Henry's search for a divorce, and Charles was not pleased with his lack of progress on that matter or in the attempt to secure an alliance with England against France. Mendoza's own poor health played a role in his failure in England but so, too, did Wolsey, then at the zenith of his power and completely capable of exploiting anti-Spanish sentiment among the English to limit Mendoza's effectiveness. Charles turned then to Chapuys, who had been in his service for nearly two years. Someone other than a Spaniard was necessary for the mission, and one with whom Wolsey would not be so easy to master was

[17] Mackay, *Inside the Tudor Court*, 14-18.

exactly what Charles and his aunt needed in the role. Above all, he was Catholic, which was of the utmost importance to Catherine.

Charles' instructions were included in his credentials Chapuys received 19 May 1529. The emperor was quite clear with what he expected of his ambassador, but perhaps unaware of how strong Henry's resolve was to prove within the next several years.

> Also the King, by his magnanimity, will respect the fact that because of the duty of relationship and singular love that we have always had and have for our Aunt like we would have for our mother, and also for our Cousin their daughter, we couldn't not help, favour, advise and defend their cause by all legal and reasonable means. And he shouldn't hold it against us as he told us that the request he did was only to know if the marriage between him and the Queen is valid or not, for the satisfaction and guarantee of his conscience.

Charles knew that Henry was not simply seeking a response from the Vatican for the purpose of theological debate, as the letter seems to indicate. Curiously, Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio had already visited England to try the case there, but gave no decision. Charles did not need to explain why the king should be prepared for Chapuys to act in a protective manner toward Catherine and Mary while simultaneously serving as a conduit for improved relations between England and the Holy Roman Empire, and it is no small wonder that Chapuys' correspondence is seen as so one-sided. As Loades notes, "His commitment to Catherine, and later to Mary, coloured Chapuys' observations and distorted his judgement, so that he consistently exaggerated both Henry's maltreatment of his wife and the weight of her political support." Chapuys was walking into a wasp's nest.[18]

The religious rift that Mary was to play a vital role in for nearly thirty years was just beginning to gain momentum when Chapuys arrived in England. In fact, Chapuys' first letter to Charles upon reaching London indicated that Wolsey's status was in peril. The ambassador was

[18] Charles V to Eustace Chapuys, 1529, Archives Dungt, Haute-Savoie, quoted in Mackay, 22-24; Loades,m *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 59.

quick to take note that Wolsey's predicament was due to his inability to "bring about the divorce," and that other parties were watching the proceedings with interest and exacerbating the rift between Henry and his chancellor "to undermine his influence with the King, and get the administration of affairs in their own hands." While this was an administrative and personal complication that involved a religious leader, it was not in itself a religious complication. Henry's break from Rome had nothing to do with a philosophical difference with Wolsey regarding faith. Nevertheless, Wolsey's loss of status created opportunities for others who did have views contradictory to those of the established church to wield influence with the king.[19]

Thomas Cranmer had been involved in the pursuance of Henry's annulment since 1527, and after earning the right to have the case heard in England proved fruitless a year later it was his idea to survey opinions from European theologians, whereas Wolsey had relegated this effort to English universities. By the end of 1529, however, Wolsey had been replaced as Lord Chancellor by Thomas More, who approved of Cranmer's plan, and soon after Cranmer was in Rome presenting the findings to the pope. It was during his continental sojourn that Cranmer was first exposed to Reformation thought outside of his University of Cambridge peers, and he even married the niece of Andreas Osiander, a leader in the reformation movement in Nuremburg, violating his vow of celibacy in doing so. Although unable to convince Charles V to support Henry's wish for a divorce, the king had named Cranmer the Archbishop of Canterbury upon the death of William Warham, and Cranmer was brought back to England.

[19] The Holy Roman Empire's sack of Rome in 1527 rendered the pope essentially incapable of giving a ruling in Henry's favor, as the pope was being forced to rule and act under the influence of Charles V. In the prolonged wait for an answer, Henry solicited the opinions of various scholars throughout Europe on the case. Finally, unable to secure a favorable decision even after being granted the right to hold the case in England in late 1528, Henry proclaimed himself head of the Church of England and broke away from Rome, gaining an annulment from Archbishop Thomas Cranmer and marrying Anne Boleyn in 1532. At the time of Chapuys' arrival, Henry was awaiting an answer from Rome; Eustace Chapuys to Charles V, *Calendar: Spain*, Vol. 1, September 1529, 188-203.

Once there, he played a pivotal role in England's break from Rome as well as in the development of the Church of England until his execution at the hands of Mary.

When Chapuys arrived in England, Mary had seen little change in the life she had led since her birth in 1516. While Chapuys' life is still substantially clouded in mystery, Mary Tudor's upbringing is well documented. After four failed pregnancies, Catherine's only living child was seen as a considerable relief not only to Henry but much of England. While Henry's hopes were for a son by which the Tudor line could be directly extended, and daughters seen even by royal families of the era as being somewhat of a liability due to the likelihood of having to provide a significant dowry for their marriage, it was nevertheless a better fate for royal parents to have a daughter than to be childless. By being delivered healthy and by simply surviving, however, Mary's existence gave her father higher expectations of the queen's ability to produce an all-important male heir. Only one more pregnancy is known to have followed, in 1518, and that again ended in the birth of a stillborn daughter. Loades notes that the string of failed pregnancies took a psychological toll on Catherine, whose, "habitual piety became increasingly pronounced" in her hopes for the conception and birth of a healthy baby boy. This is given credence by the findings of Ralph Houlbrooke, whose extensive research on English family life in the late Middle Ages and early modern period indicates that although children were seen as Godly gifts, the loss of children to death was not mourned as it would be today. Instead, parents and particularly mothers viewed these events more commonly that the infant had been taken to be with God in Heaven. Therefore, Catherine's increased expressions of piety were quite possibly the result of repeated instances of loss and the queen's ever-increasing need to feel grateful for God to taking her newborn and stillborn children to be with Him while she

simultaneously desperately wanted to provide Henry and England with an heir that could only, in her view, be supplied through God's grace.[20]

Although Mary spent considerable amounts of time away from court, she is also known to have spent more time with her parents than most children of aristocratic or royal birth in the era. Part of this is due to the statistical unlikelihood of her survival given the difficulties of Henry and Catherine in their pursuit of having children, but part of it also had to do with Henry's knowledge that she needed to be groomed to rule. Along with this plan to prepare Mary for leadership, it was a common humanist belief among the sixteenth-century aristocracy that parents should be more closely involved in the upbringing of their children than they had been in previous eras. In fact, Henry's own interest and involvement in Mary's youth also was more common than that of most aristocratic fathers of his era with their young children. He and Catherine agreed with the humanist notion, and the queen enlisted the aid of scholar and humanist Juan Luis Vives from Aragon in 1523 to aid in Mary's education. This maternal involvement in Mary's academic and religious education, however, was less common with children even among the aristocracy at the time, and was not more regularly seen until after the onset of the English Reformation and closer to the end of the sixteenth century.[21]

In 1523, Vives wrote *De Institutione Foeminae Christianae*, on the education of women. His ideas were advanced for the time, Loades writes, although he did not go so far as to suggest equality between men and women should exist in their schooling. In Vives' view, anything worth learning had to have a moral as well as an academic purpose. He also wrote a collection of proverbs designed to prepare Mary for her reign, entitled *Satellitium*, and a work called *Christiani Matrimonii*, which was a guide to being a wife and mother among the aristocracy.

[20] Ralph Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450-1700* (New York: Longman, 1984), 127-155.
[21] Houlbrooke, 146-148; Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 15-16.

Vives was not the only well-known scholar to play a hand in Mary's upbringing. Erasmus dedicated his *De Vidua Christiana,* an essay about the struggles of her cousin Mary, Queen of Hungary, to the princess, and Henry's daughter was so grateful for the writings that she wrote a letter to the author thanking him, and expressing her good will toward him.[22]

The first significant disruption of Mary's life came when she was moved to Wales in 1525, separating her from the protective shield provided by her mother at the age of nine. While there she saw her mother only on special occasions, although Henry made several special trips from London to visit with her. Her stay lasted until 1528 when, after a bout with smallpox, she was recalled to England. By this time, meanwhile, Henry's relationship with Anne Boleyn had progressed to the point that the king was making arrangements to limit and gradually eliminate Catherine's role in his life and that meant also diminishing the role of Mary. The princess' household staff that numbered 123 employees in 1525 had been reduced in 1528, the same year that Cardinal Campeggio arrived in England to hear Henry's case for a divorce. Campeggio knew what was at stake was far more than a simple annulment, the kind that popes had regularly granted to European leaders for centuries. Campeggio knew that if the king did not get what he wanted, it would mean the end of the Catholic Church in England.[23]

However, Henry's treatment of his daughter showed no outward sign of actually suffering through the late 1520s. In fact, she accompanied Henry and Catherine to mass on 2 January, 1530, and in early 1531 the princess visited the queen for a month though the conditions of their family unit were deteriorating rapidly. Henry banished his wife from court in July of that year, and moved Mary to Richmond. Still, the portrait of an imperiled and neglected Mary that

[22] Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 31-35. Erasmus to William Lord Mountjoy, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 5, Vol. 1, 1534-1535, 66-82.
[23] Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 50-54.

Chapuys was later to paint in his letters to Charles simply did not exist in reality. In fact, even later when Mary was moved into housing with the infant Elizabeth, it was not so uncommon of an occurrence. Remarriages were actually more common in early modern England than they are in the modern era, and the combination of households, even among the aristocracy, was not uncommon. A warrant written and sealed by Mary in September 1531 ordered Sir Andrew Wyndesor, master of the Great Wardrobe to deliver for her use the following: a gown of cloth of silver tissue also lined with cloth of silver, a purple velvet gown to also be silver lined, a black tinsel gown lined with silver, a crimson satin gown lined with gold tissue, and a gown of black velvet lukes. She demanded that each of the gowns be eleven-and-a-half yards and the list was just beginning. Numerous other dresses and accessories were included in the warrant, as well as eight ounces of lacing riband, three French hoods, various measurements of satin, an ermine night bonnet, a dozen lawn parteletts, ten thousand pins, sixteen pairs of velvet shoes and an equal number of pairs of hose, a pound of silk in "divers colors," and other "certain necessities." This is hardly a person who was in dire straits. However, the materialistic maintenance of her well-being did not cross over to intangible benefits like a close relationship with her family. The princess saw her mother just one more time before Catherine's death in early 1536.[24]

Chapuys' first mentions of Mary in his letters to Charles were limited to reports of potential matches being made for her. In fact, much of the correspondence between Chapuys and Charles regarding Mary was centered on Henry's search for a suitable and opportunistic husband for his daughter. The first time the ambassador ventured beyond minor speculation regarding the princess' prospective suitors came in November 1530, when Mary was fourteen years old. The suitor in this instance was King James V of Scotland, who was eighteen at the

[24] The Princess Mary. *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 5, September 1531, 199-217; Houlbrooke, *The English Family*, 215.

time. Chapuys' explanation of the situation made clear Mary's importance in foreign policy under her father. "Some suspect that a promise has been made, or some hope held out of a marriage of the young King (James) with the Princess (Mary), as it may divert the Scotch from any project of alliance with Your Majesty or any other power," Chapuys wrote, adding that he hoped to provide more information on the matter in his next letter. No such information came, although a letter from Rodrigo Nino to the emperor written 30 November mentioned another possible suitor for Mary, the Duke of Milan. Having already been betrothed to a number of continental suitors from an extremely early age, Mary remained fair game for Henry's political intrigues until her bastardization and the birth of Elizabeth in 1533 pushed her to the side. However, Elizabeth's birth and station as heir to the throne complicated Henry's mission in finding a husband for Mary, as will be explained in greater detail in Chapter Two.[25]

The princess and ambassador did not immediately begin correspondence and private visits with upon his arrival. However, as the king's pursuit of an annulment intensified and his relationship with his family became increasingly strained Chapuys began visiting the households of Catherine and Mary independently. Chapuys was already protective and almost defensive of Mary during his earliest dispatches, before he even knew her. It was as Mary became increasingly isolated from her father, however, that Chapuys' worldview and excitable nature began to find a welcome friend in the form of the princess.

[25] Eustace Chapuys to Charles V, *Calendar: Spain,* Vol. 4, No. 1, November 1530, 816-831; Rodrigo Nino to Charles V, *Calendar: Spain, Henry VIII,* Vol. 4, No. 1, November 1530, 816-831.

Chapter Two

The Boleyn Crucible

There are other reasons for Chapuys' obvious bias in favor of Catherine and, especially, Mary. As Loades notes, upon his arrival in 1529, everyone who disliked the Boleyn family was eager to talk to Chapuys. There was an already vocal and eager contingent that did not like the influence of the quickly rising family, and Anne was just a piece of the puzzle. Furthermore as it applies to Mary, Catherine gradually became so obsessed with her own role and fate that she was clearly putting her own interests ahead of those of her daughter. Even Bishop John Fisher had told Catherine to take the veil and retire to a nunnery, because it would give Henry what he wanted, it would not disgrace the Hapsburgs who Chapuys was representing, and it would help ensure Mary's legitimacy. At that point, which was prior to Chapuys' arrival, Henry was confident that he would have sons by Anne, and was not nearly as likely to disinherit Mary. The combination, therefore, of Henry's difficulty in acquiring an annulment and Anne's frustrations about that inability along with Catherine's ceaseless attempts to maintain her place as queen were likely what led to what Henry believed was a necessity in branding Mary illegitimate.[26]

As an example of Chapuys being a key figure in the proceedings in England at this time, the ambassador's letter to Charles dated 6 April 1533 stands above almost all else. By this time Henry had married Anne and, although at that time it was unknown to most, the new queen was pregnant with his child. In reaction to the pleas for help of Catherine and their shared concern for Mary's well-being, Chapuys wrote that, "I think it can hardly displease you to make an enterprise against this kingdom, considering the enormous injury done to your aunt." In this same letter, Chapuys argues that it is not only for the protection of Mary and Catherine but is

[26] Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 54.

also a religious matter. Also implicating Cranmer, he added that war against England would prevent the kingdom from alienating itself entirely from Catholicism and becoming Lutheran. Chapuys feared this result was given extra likelihood of coming to pass thanks to Henry's influence on the people and the work of Cranmer as Archbishop, which the ambassador believed was, "still worse." Chapuys wanted not only Charles to declare war on England, but for the Pope to "call in the secular arm," and endorse military action against the kingdom. Although the "secular arm" element of the letter is what is so often recalled by historians regarding Chapuys' appeal to Charles here, it is also later in the letter that the ambassador essentially pins his entire opinion of what should be done based upon what he fears and thinks of Mary and what he believes the rest of the kingdom feels for her. "It is very true, that if the Princess were not in such danger as I have said, and that if the people here did not see you take up this affair a little warmly, they would lose heart and affection," finishing by apologizing for his emotional outburst and noting, "Pray, pardon me, if I thus speak out of compassion for the Queen and the Princess."[27]

This passion for Mary's well-being reached almost absurdist heights at times, and gives historians such as Warnicke ample opportunity to question and even mock Chapuys, at least as a credible source of information about the period. Perhaps the best example of the phenomenon of Chapuys exaggerating the situation came in his reporting of Elizabeth's birth, which took place on 7 September, 1533. Three days later, Chapuys wrote that he had been told the baby was to be named Mary for the purpose of not only assuming the position of Henry's eldest child in the line of succession, but to complete the process by also stealing her name. The exasperation expressed in Chapuys' letter to Charles over this development is revealing in a number of ways.

[27] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers,* Vol. 6, April 1533, 1-10, 149-151.

First, it vividly illustrates how emotionally affected Chapuys could be by the prospect of Mary being disrespected, marginalized, or otherwise offended. It also shows that his ability to discern between credible information and rumor was subject to his emotional state. Furthermore, it indicates a possibility that perhaps Chapuys' affinity for Mary was such a well-known part of his personality that those from whom he gained information might have been having a little fun at his expense. There is no indication of Chapuys' reaction when he learned that Anne Boleyn's daughter was indeed named Elizabeth, though it is difficult to imagine that it would be lacking in either relief or embarrassment. His next letter to Charles, dated 15 September, simply states, "The daughter of the lady has been named Elizabeth, and not Mary." In the same letter, Chapuys explained how Mary had reacted to the developments herself, as well as to the assumption that Henry would further diminish her household in the wake of Elizabeth's birth. "Like a wise and virtuous princess as she is, she takes matters patiently, trusting in the mercy of God, and has written a comforting letter to the Queen her mother, which is wonderfully good."[28]

Soon after Elizabeth's birth, the inevitable showdown between Mary and her father took place in sparring that lasted more than a month, though never in a face-to-face confrontation, which Mary would have liked. Prior to the Parliament that met to deem Mary illegitimate and therefore out of the succession, the king sent the Duke of Suffolk, Charles Brandon, to meet with her to inform her of her new status. Mary was not merely indignant toward Brandon, but managed to remain self-assured in doing so, if Chapuys' account to Charles V can be taken as gospel. When Suffolk suggested Mary pay her respects to the Princess, Mary replied that she was the only princess, and at most would call her "sister." Mary further extended a request to Suffolk that he tell Henry that she begged to receive his blessing, but he refused, which led her to

[28] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 6, September 1533, 11-20, 468-469.

flee the scene in tears. Chapuys wrote that this exchange led Henry to scold Suffolk for not accomplishing his task of bringing Mary to Elizabeth, and then proclaim that he would one way or another break Mary of her prideful streak. Chapuys was enthusiastic as usual when Mary stuck up for herself in any manner that inconvenienced the Boleyn faction, yet as Loades notes, he "could see perfectly well what a dangerous course his protégé had embarked on." Loades' designation of Mary in this case is important. An earlier letter, written 10 October 1533, informed the emperor that Fisher had joined Chapuys in encouraging Mary to take action to complicate matters for the king, which seems curious given Fisher's earlier pleas to Catherine to simplify Henry's path and therefore indicates a change in the bishop's opinion how best to manage the situation. The common interpretation of this chain of events casts Chapuys as supporting more than Mary's simple defiance to the order, but as evidence of her opposing Henry's religious designation of himself as the head of the church.[29]

Catherine, meanwhile, had encouraged Mary to do the opposite of what Chapuys had encouraged. Although undated, a letter from Catherine to her daughter that is believed to have been written in mid-September 1533 beseeches Mary, "if this lady (Anne) do come to you, as it is spoken, if she do bring you a letter from the King, I am sure in the self-same letter you shall be commanded what you shall do. Answer you with few words, obeying the King your father in everything, save only that you will not offend God and lose your own soul." Catherine goes on to forecast a glorious life for Mary in the future should her daughter mind her father, follow the word of God and, "keep your heart with a chaste mind, and you body from all ill and wanton company, (not) thinking nor desiring any husband, for Christ's Passion." Catherine was doing everything she could to convince Mary that adherence to God would deliver her from whatever

[29] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 6, January 1535, 21-25, 23-28; Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 76; Duffy and Loades, *The Church of Mary Tudor* (London: Routledge, 2006), 17.

ill effects Henry's marriage to Anne were bound to cast upon her. The letter is a good indicator of how Catherine's increased piety had clouded her vision of a reality that Chapuys and even Fisher were arming her to deal with in more practical manners. The aforementioned letter of comfort that Chapuys described written by Mary to her mother indicates that at this point in the relationship it was perhaps Mary who had a better understanding of the situation and how to navigate it than the former queen. The comparison of Chapuys' description of Mary and Catherine's tone in addressing her indicate that it was also Chapuys who had gained the upper hand in influence on and guidance of the princess. It is apparent by this point in their relationship that Chapuys saw Mary as a pawn of the Holy Roman Empire in one way, and in another way as an impressionable young friend that for whom he felt a protective responsibility. He regularly gave exceedingly gratuitous reports to Charles about the devotion the English people retained for Mary even in the wake of Elizabeth's birth. It is evident in these writings that he, himself, had a significant affection for Mary, and by the record of her actions toward her father in the coming years, he also was having a significant influence on her actions.[30]

Chapuys, though he several times suggested that Charles go to war against England from 1533 to 1538 – in fact, earlier in his letter detailing Mary's refusal to accept news from Brandon of her being bastardized he directly urged Charles to take military action – most often remained professional and calm in his correspondence. That is, of course, as long as the subject was not Catherine or Mary. It was then that Chapuys' emotions rose to the forefront, and it was Mary's plight that upset him most of all. It is a telling characteristic of his relationship with the princess that of all the domestic and international political intrigue playing out all around him, the thing he was most moved by was the safety and well-being of a teenage girl who, by all accounts

[30] Catherine of Aragon to the Princess Mary, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 6, September 1533, 11-20, 472.

including those illustrated in the Chapter One, was in dire straits only when compared to others in the royal family.[31]

It is beneficial to look closer at the relationship Mary had with her father and to determine how, if at all, it differed from similar relationships of the era. Such information is useful in determining the nature of the relationship Chapuys had with her in her formative years, and is still difficult to assess given the communication between the two that is extant. It has been established that Mary actually had more contact with both her parents than most children of royal or aristocratic status, but at the same time her teenage years were spent in isolation from them both. In the case of her mother that isolation was forced by Henry's separating them into different households and barring contact between the two. It is the case of Henry's own relationship with Mary, however, that grew increasingly inconsistent as his own relationship with Anne evolved.

While aristocratic children generally spent more time away from their parents as adolescents and young adults there is considerably more evidence of the kinds of relationships older children had with their parents than the typical relationships between younger children and their parents from this era. The reason, Houlbrooke notes, is the ability of older children to correspond directly with their parents while not in their presence. Houlbrooke acknowledges that this phenomenon can only provide at best a generalization of relationships between parents and their older children because such a method, naturally, renders those who were unable to read and write or send their children away from home to attend school outside the group, but for the

[31] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers,* Vol. 6, January 1533, 21-25, 23-28; David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England,* 1553-58 (London: Routledge, 1991), 7.

purpose of this research the segment of the population for which it provides evidence is exactly what is needed.[32]

Of particular importance to this study, Houlbrooke points out that the relationship between father and daughter depended more on the child's compliance for its health than any other relationship in the family unit. This proved to be all too true for Mary in 1533 with the passage of the First Act of Supremacy, which she only later and at the behest of Chapuys begrudgingly swore allegiance to in the hopes of regaining favor with her father and, perhaps more importantly in the moment, save herself from possible prosecution as a traitor. Houlbrooke writes that the biggest source of contention in these relationships in early modern England was disagreement over marriage arrangements. How ironic that it held true in the case of Mary and Henry VIII, only that it was the king's marriages that was at the root of the strife, and that is even considering the significant number of suitors the king considered for his eldest daughter.[33]

The king was either remarkably inconsistent or had the majority of his closest men completely fooled about his plans for Mary, or a mixture of both. In a conversation with Thomas Howard, the Duke of Norfolk, in June 1532, Chapuys inquired about recent developments in marriage possibilities for Mary, which had of late focused on King James V of Scotland and William of Cleves, the younger brother of Henry VIII's fourth wife, Anne of Cleves. Norfolk explained to Chapuys that while William's father John, the Duke of Cleves, was thought at this time to be losing his sanity, the king would more likely marry his daughter to William, a protestant, than to the king of Scotland because James was too closely related to her. Mary was James' first cousin. Of course, neither marriage took place, but the core issue of this conversation was one that focused on Mary's place in the royal succession after Catherine's

[32] Houlbrooke, *The English Family* , 178.
[33] Ibid, 186-187.

banishment from court. Chapuys wrote Charles V of the conversation, relating that Norfolk told him, "The Princess would never be married except in high position, for she was still heiress of the kingdom; and when the great affair was settled in the King's favor, and he remarried, it was uncertain whether he would have male children, and if not, she would be preferred to other daughters. If any person ventured to say that she was illegitimate, he would have his head cut off." Chapuys, with good reason by this point, did not believe much of Norfolk's account at all.[34]

The pursuit of finding a husband for Mary had become increasingly more challenging with her bastardization. Although Henry did try to broker a marriage alliance with Cleves in his attempts to strengthen anti-Catholic ties with the duchies of Germany, there simply were not many continental kingdoms with whom he could afford to broker an agreement with because of the general opinion there of England's break from Rome and Mary's own insistence not to change her faith. While Mackay writes that it would be dangerous for Henry to marry her abroad because it would give a foreign power a reason to eventually stake a claim to the English throne through Mary's bloodline, there is another possibility. While Chapuys was regularly counseling Charles V to take up arms against England, there is every possibility that should Mary be married to a Catholic prince, it could potentially lead to that kingdom claiming a holy right to the throne as soon as Henry died, if not before he passed away. In fact, it could potentially provide a foreign, Catholic king enough motivation to declare war on England as soon as the marriage took place.[35]

Although not with a foreign power, Chapuys was involved in this process of playing matchmaker for Mary as well, and for the very purpose of possibly overtaking the English

[34] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. V, June 1532, 16-30, 504-505.
[35] Mackay, *Inside the Tudor Court*, 192-193.

throne. Not long after Elizabeth's birth and the Mary's reduction of status Chapuys, with obvious input from Mary and Catherine, suggested to Charles that Reginald Pole, the son of Mary's governess Margaret Pole who herself was the daughter of the former Duke of Clarence, George Plantagenet, was a fitting match for Mary. The said son was currently studying at the University of Padua, and if Charles was able to bring him into his service Catherine would gladly consent to have Mary marry him, "and the Princess would not refuse." Chapuys went on to explain to Charles that, "He and his brothers have many kinsmen and allies, of whose service your Majesty might thus make use, and gain the greater part of the realm. I beg you to take my bold advice in good part, which is only prompted by my desire to serve you." This underscores the difficulties Henry would have in finding a match for Mary, but it also shows both that Chapuys had effectively supplanted Henry as a father figure to Mary and Mary's complicity with that fact. Within six months, Charles V issued a policy that because of his earlier promise of protection of Mary that she should not be married without the consent of her mother and the Emperor himself. The move was largely ceremonial and part of a larger statement regarding Charles' distrust of English relations with France, but it nevertheless sent a message of sorts that since Henry VIII no longer appeared to care for the well-being of Catherine and his daughter, the Holy Roman Empire would gladly have them. Reginald Pole went on to succeed Cranmer as Archbishop of Canterbury during Mary's reign.[36]

Mary had been presented with a notice of her reduced status and illegitimacy by Lord John Huse in September 1533. In response, the King issued a statement the following month that spelled out in no uncertainty his displeasure with his now-bastard daughter. Henry chastised Mary via the statement, writing that she had forgotten her "filial duty and allegiance" in attempt

[36] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 6, September 1533, 26-30, 484-487; The Emperor's Policy, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, February 1534, 21-25, 89-90.

to "arrogantly usurp the title of Princess" from Elizabeth, and noting that Mary could not, in good conscience, believe that she is actually the King's lawful daughter, much less believe that Henry was in agreement with her. Henry also hinted that Mary knew how dangerous the ground was on which she was treading, and that it was punishable by law. As was common for the King, he did end the statement by extending a potential olive branch between him and his daughter, writing, "on her conforming to his will he may incline of his fatherly pity to promote her welfare." These documents provide excellent insight into determining what man actually desired to care for Mary, and also lend credence to Houlbrooke's findings about the importance of the compliance of a daughter in the creation of a positive relationship between Mary and her father during the era. The tension between Mary and Henry carried over well into the following years, of course. In January 1534 the king traveled to see Elizabeth, whose household was twenty miles from London. Mary was also living there in the infant's service, and although Henry spent time with his new daughter the same could not be said of him when it came to Mary. Although Thomas Cromwell was on hand in attempt to make Mary renounce her title as princess, Mary was not allowed an audience with the king. Afterward, seeing her outside on a balcony, Henry supposedly bowed in her direction and tipped his hat to her in recognition. The behavior of the king in the moment has done much to lead historians to consider that it was in fear of Anne that he had to keep any affection for his firstborn so understated.[37]

After months of gnashing his teeth over the situation and making no headway, Chapuys made an attempt to actually address Parliament regarding the treatment of Mary and the queen in February 1534. Although he told Charles he knew that Henry would not grant such a request, he appears to have asked in effort to be granted a lesser request as consolation. Based on his

[37] The Princess Mary, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 6, September 1533, 26-30, 491-492; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, January 1534, 16-20, 31-32.

previous conversations with the King on the matter Chapuys had hoped that in this process, Henry would lose his temper and confirm what Chapuys had already believed, that no representation would be given to Catherine or Mary as parliament heard the case for Mary's removal from the line of succession. To the ambassador's surprise, the Privy Council to which Chapuys submitted his request told him that Cromwell and Norfolk would like to hear what he had planned to say to Parliament before an answer was given to the ambassador. Though Cromwell could not attend a meeting regarding the matter, Chapuys told Charles that Norfolk could not disprove what Chapuys had argued but that he needed to pass on the ambassador's sentiments to those who knew the situation better than he did. In other words, Norfolk was passing the buck on the matter, although Chapuys spoke highly of him in the letter to Charles that reported the incident. The next day in Norfolk's chamber at court, where the duke, seemingly distraught, met him after speaking to Henry about the matter. Norfolk advised Chapuys to tread carefully when granted an audience with Henry, and it proved to be sage advice.[38]

This is one of the quintessential moments in Chapuys' tenure in England, as it displayed his knowledge of English history, understanding of ecclesiastical law, saw him face down Henry VIII, and all while defending the honor and rights of Mary. It also turned out to be the first instance in which Henry was so irritated with Chapuys that he made a less-than veiled allusion to revoking the ambassador's power in England. Not backing down, Chapuys told Charles he reminded Henry that, "All the Parliaments could not make the Princess a bastard, for the cognisance of cases concerning legitimacy belonged to ecclesiastical judges. Even if his marriage with the Queen were null, she was legitimate, owning to the lawful ignorance of her

[38] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers,* Vol. 7, February 1534, 26-28, 232.

parents." It is here that, seeing he was not going to get his way regarding parliament or having Mary and Catherine represented there, Chapuys simply asked Henry if it were possible for Mary to be allowed to live with her mother and to be better treated. The king replied that seeing as how he was Mary's father, he was better equipped to determine what was best for her and furthermore, he, "might dispose of her as he wishes, without anyone laying down the law to him, and without giving account to anyone."[39]

This proved to be the case in April 1534, when Henry and Anne were visiting Elizabeth's household. With the king's presumed consent Mary, who resided in the house, was kept in her chamber for two days during the visit so as not to be permitted to see her father. Mary was there along with a maid who, like Mary, had refused to swear to the Oath of Succession. The maid was taken to prison at the end of the visit. Apparently not believing that to be of great concern, Chapuys wrote that what happened to Mary during the visit was worse than prison. Anne's aunt, Anne Shelton, was Mary's governess and, according to Chapuys, told her, "the King her father did not care in the least that she should renounce her title, since by statute she was declared a bastard and incapable; but that if she were in the King's place, she would kick her out of the King's house for disobedience, and moreover the King himself has said that he would make her lose her head for violating the laws of his realm." This incident was quickly reported to Chapuys through Mary's physician, to whom Mary told of the incident in Latin so that no one else present could understand. Chapuys' own assessment of it was that he did not believe that Henry intended any harm to her himself, but that the Boleyn faction certainly did, and with the king being so under the influence and manipulation of Anne and her family there was certainly cause for concern.[40]

[39] Ibid, 233-234.
[40] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, April 1534, 21-25, 212-214.

There is frequent documentation of Mary being fearful for her life after her father's marriage to Anne, and especially after she was moved into housing with Elizabeth. It is true that Shelton and Mary did not get along, although it is fairly easy to understand why. When looking at both sides of the issue, however, and understanding how contemptuous Mary was toward anyone who was not actively helping her achieve her own ends, one cannot lay full blame for these interpersonal difficulties at the feet of Anne and Shelton, regardless of how driven and power hungry Anne might have been. Although Chapuys repeatedly wrote of plots being devised to end Mary's life, and never skipped a chance to either suggest or directly accuse of Anne of being the instigator, there was never direct evidence of such a plot. Naturally, with the new queen having given birth to a daughter instead of a son it continued to allow Mary to remain a potential issue in the line of succession, but there is no recorded evidence that Anne was ever part of a conspiracy to do Mary physical harm. The well-known showdown between the two, in which Mary insisted that her mother was the only person whom she would ever recognize as the queen, is reported by Chapuys as ending with Anne being, "very indignant, and intended to bring down the pride of this unbridled Spanish blood, as she said. She will do the worst she can." The problem with taking this as an accurate portrayal of what happened in the supposed showdown is that Chapuys leaves the issue there, and immediately in his next sentence to Charles, begins to write of Parliament's declaration that Catherine could no longer call herself queen and could not retain the items that had been bestowed on her as queen. This is an interesting issue in its own sake, although not particularly related to the subject matter here. That Chapuys took a new course in his report so quickly after suggesting that Anne Boleyn was trying to kill Mary leaves one to believe that although Chapuys might have feared that as a worse-case scenario, he did not consider it to be a grave enough threat himself to warrant further elaboration in the moment,

much less suggest a plan of defense. It therefore becomes another instance in which Chapuys might have let his emotions get the better of his objectivity. Until evidence is found that Mary was in physical danger, the notion that Anne Boleyn was out to harm her must be credited to Chapuys' fondness for the princess who was no longer a princess, and to his continued attempt in trying to build a case for military intervention in England on behalf of the Holy Roman Empire.[41]

In fact, later in the same month and after yet another reported confrontation between Mary and the Boleyn faction, in this case one of Elizabeth's traveling company, Chapuys regretted that he had urged Mary to be so forthright in her protests of her situation, and told Charles that he had consulted Catherine on the matter, wondering if he also might want to tone down his rhetoric, "for the honor and profit of the Princess," he wrote. Again, in the aforementioned instance it was Mary who turned what could possibly have been a simple act of courtesy and duty and created a scene. He had tried to put her in a carriage to move to a new household along with the rest of Elizabeth's staff, and Mary threw a tantrum. "She made a public protest of the compulsion used, and that her act should not prejudice her right and title." This is one of the few instances in which Chapuys seemed to recognize in writing that Mary had a tendency to overreact to situations, making them worse than they already were. That tendency followed her through her entire life, but Chapuys rarely made mention of it. In June of 1534, Mary penned a letter of protestation that she sent to numerous foreign officials, including Chapuys and Charles. Written in Latin, the letter included a sentence that, translated roughly by James Gairdner in 1883, said, "Plunder as a whole and the details of this Scripture we have, we say, our identity, we maintain, assert and protest of a mere fact of our knowledge and after mature deliberation on the testimony of my manual, a sign and a seal in my face." In other

[41] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, March 1534, 6-10, 127-129.

words, she was insisting to the world outside England that in no way was she about to renounce her title, and in no way intended to give in to the pressures to marry or enter a nunnery without the consent of her mother. This in itself could easily have been seen as treason enough to warrant her execution. The copy included with the *Letters and Papers* that was published in 1883 was found among a set of French papers in Brussels. As it turned out, the letter was written by Chapuys and given to Catherine to pass along to Mary to rewrite, copy, sign, and distribute ten months earlier. The same letter in which he acknowledges this to Charles he again passes on information that Anne intended to kill Mary in July, when Henry had planned a trip to France.[42]

It is, however, difficult to tell for certain how much of Chapuys' possible exaggeration of Mary's threatened condition was due to his own interpretations of events. Much of the added flair to his explanation of incidents could have come from Catherine, or at least his understandings of these events could have been made dire by Catherine's input. At issue is that little is known about the order in which news traveled between the three members of the party in question. There is little correspondence between Mary and her mother that is extant, but in a letter Chapuys wrote to Charles dated 9 February 1535, it appears that Catherine contacted Chapuys through her physician to inform the ambassador that, once again, Mary was being threatened with execution or lifetime imprisonment if she did not soon acquiesce and swear to the Oath of Succession.[43]

Such threats were mostly false rumors, as far as the historical record is concerned. Although it is not difficult to imagine Henry VIII placing his daughter in the Tower of London, or even having her executed for her refusal to obey his wishes with hindsight of his later actions

[42] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, March 1534, 26-31, 165; The Princess Mary, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, June 1534, 6-10, 309; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, June 1534, 21-25, 322-324.
[43] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 8, February 1535, 1-10, 66-74.

toward those closest to him, there is nothing in the record that he ever intended to take such drastic measures with her at that time. This makes it easier, especially with the benefit of 500 years of hindsight, to imagine that Henry would have Mary put to death. However, save for the reports of jealous and angry rantings from members of the Boleyn faction and especially by Anne who, if possible, was possibly more power hungry than Henry since she did not come by such power naturally, there is nothing in the record that indicates that such drastic measures were ever seriously considered by the king.

To that end, it is one of the more curious elements of Chapuys' embassy in England that Cromwell was likely his closest friend in the country other than Mary and Catherine. Although the men differed greatly in their opinions of policy, they nevertheless enjoyed each other's company and frequently shared free time together hunting, engaged in debate, or having drinks. One person they definitely shared was a distaste for Anne Boleyn, and in this Cromwell became a most unlikely ally for Mary, given his drive to please and improve the station of power for the king. In October 1534, perhaps frustrated with taking his complaints of Mary's poor treatment directly to Henry as often as possible, Chapuys decided to see if Cromwell could see any way to get through to the king to help this cause. "I made various representations to him for her good treatment, conjuring him by the affection he had formerly professed to her and his goodwill toward peace that he would do his best to save her from the torment of following the Bastard of renouncing her title and legitimacy, since such things, as the King might be well aware, could not affect his purpose, but might make her seriously ill," he wrote to Charles of this meeting, which was likely in secret as the two often sought secluded areas to spend time together lest they

draw suspicion of certain factions, namely the Boleyns. In this case, Chapuys wrote, Cromwell was willing to help as he may.[44]

Of course, Cromwell was not able to accomplish much of anything along this line, and there is little evidence he did anything at all. He might have had Henry's every confidence in terms of strengthening the monarchy's finances, borders, and the role of the king as a lawmaker, but there was little anyone showed they could do when it came to bending the king's will in regard to his private life except for those with whom he was intimately involved at those particular times.

Mary wrote to Chapuys in early 1535 begging him to help convince Henry to allow her to live with her mother by convincing Charles to ask the king. Several physicians who had attended Mary had come to the conclusion that her seemingly constant poor health were due to what we would call depression, and added that if she would be allowed to stay with Catherine, much of the situation would cure itself. Chapuys did try to intercede on her behalf himself, and Henry was reportedly gracious in hearing Mary's case through the ambassador. However, the king said he could not allow such a move, because as Mary was at this time betrothed to the Dauphin of France, the risk of Catherine having her taken out of England in secret to avoid this match was too great. Charles, meanwhile, said nothing to the king of the matter.[45]

[44] Mackay, *Inside the Tudor Court*, 196-197; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, October 1534, 21-25, 495-496.
[45] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers,* Vol. 8, February 1535, 21-28, 100-105.

Chapter Three

The Price of Reconciliation

Chapuys had considerable access to Mary, and by the middle of 1535 they were communicating on a daily basis, but could not come and go as he pleased. It is also during this period that Chapuys, writing to Holy Roman advisor Nicolas Perrenot de Granvelle, called the princess a "paragon of beauty, goodness, and virtue." A letter written to Charles dated 3 August, 1535 shows that his access, even after Mary had been bastardized, was controlled by the king. "I have not yet wished to go to the chase, nor do I know that leave would be given me to visit the Princess, seeing that the chase is round about her, and that I am not allowed to send my men to her," Chapuys wrote. Other times, such as in September 1535, Henry declined to grant Chapuys leave to visit her on account of the combination of her poor health and situations in the surrounding area. Cromwell wrote to Chapuys that month that the king would like the ambassador to defer his proposal until the plague then sweeping London had abated. Much of Mary's correspondence with Chapuys was passed in secret between the two parties and has unfortunately been lost to time. The clandestine communication shows that the relationship was important enough to both to risk the potentially harsh result of it being found out. It is not difficult to imagine that Henry, at this point, might have been tempted to charge his daughter with treason. It is definitely plausible that Mary believed such a charge could be a result of being found out, considering the influence the princess believed that Anne held with Henry and the opinion she had of Anne's ruthless personality. Mary wrote to Charles' sister, Queen Mary

of Hungary, a week later expressing her "haste and fear" in writing to thank Queen Mary for her support.[46]

Although Henry diminished her household and eventually moved Mary into a house she shared with Elizabeth, much to Mary's chagrin, the king was always mindful of his eldest daughter's physical difficulties, and though he forbade Mary and Catherine to correspond, evidence shows that he was not very keen on enforcing that order. Curiously, it was in this area of Mary's life that Chapuys also served as a conduit between the princess and her father. There were, in fact, fewer people better qualified by that point to intercede between the two. Chapuys wrote the emperor on 6 September 1535 that he, "sent lately a servant to request the King to send his physician to the Princess, both on account of a certain rheum, and to provide against a return of her ordinary complain(t), which she dreads, in the coming winter." Mary's menstrual problems that had plagued her since the onset of her adolescence, and by the time she was nineteen and had known Chapuys for nearly six years, she was comfortable enough with the ambassador to allow him, and his chosen representatives, to speak to her father regarding them. In one way, this is arguably the best example of how close the relationship between Chapuys and Mary had become.[47]

It was not the first time Mary's menstrual complications were the focus of conversation between Chapuys and the king. In fact, earlier in the same year Chapuys was called to visit Henry in private regarding Mary's health. When he arrived, Chapuys was informed by the Privy Council that Mary was seriously ill and the king wished for Chapuys to select one or two of Henry's own physicians to visit her in Greenwich, along with Chapuys' own physician so as not

[46] Chapuys at Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 8, March 1535, 21-31, 164-166; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 9, August 1535, 1-10, 5; Cromwell to Chapuys, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 9, September 1535, 26-30, 158-159; Princess Mary, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 9, August 1535, 11-20, 21.
[47] Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 64; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 9, September 1535, 6-10, 96-97.

to arouse any suspicion, presumably with Anne. It was perhaps unfortunate that Chapuys took this opportunity to chastise the council that if the king had listened to the ambassador about Mary's treatment earlier, perhaps she would not be so ill in the present. Chapuys refused to work with Henry's physicians but then Cromwell intervened, asking the ambassador to at least monitor Mary's condition closely, and should her condition worsen, at least send one of Chapuys' own physicians to attend to her. This is the likely root of Chapuys' familiarity with Mary's menstrual issues.[48]

In a letter she wrote to Chapuys dated October 1555, Mary recognized these ties, and asked the ambassador for more still. Of the aid she had received from Charles and Chapuys, Mary wrote,

> I should feel it as one of the greatest mishaps of my sad fortune, were I not allowed time and opportunity to acknowledge those which for a considerable length of time you have rendered to the Queen, my mother, and to myself. Now more than ever those services on your part are urgently required, considering the miserable plight and wretched condition of affairs in this county, which is such that unless His Majesty, the Emperor, for the service of God, the welfare and response of Christendom, as well as the honor of the King, my father, takes pity on these poor afflicted creates, all and everything will go to total ruin, and be irretrievably lost. For the Emperor to apply a prompt remedy, as I hope and trust he will, it is necessary the he should be well and minutely informed of the state of affairs in this country.

Mary was asking for military intervention from the Holy Roman Empire, and she was doing it by using the closeness she had developed with Chapuys to play on his emotions. Again we see that care and manipulation are not mutually exclusive. She went on to more clearly state her request that Chapuys, "dispatch forthwith one of your men, an able one and possessing such information, to the Emperor, and inform him of the whole, and beg him, in the name of the Queen, my

[48] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 8, February 1535, 1-10, 68-70.

mother, and mine, for the honour of God, and the considerations above mentioned, to take this matter in hand, and provide a remedy for the affairs of this country."[49]

While Chapuys spent most of 1534 working to assure Mary of receiving better treatment from her father, 1535 saw another option for improving her life enter the realm of possibility. Dr. Ortiz had first suggested sneaking Mary out of England and into what the Holy Roman faction deemed as safety in the previous year, and Charles relayed this idea to Chapuys in 1534. By March 1535, Chapuys had begun to make the earliest preparations for such an attempt by scouting the region for the best places to attempt such a bold move. The ambassador reported that if she were to reside at the Tower of London it would be relatively easy to simple to get her away, because "there would be no fear of the great ships here, because she could leave by the same wind as others did." As a request to change her lodgings away from Elizabeth's household was currently being considered, or had at least been requested, Chapuys advised Charles that they must wait to plan any such maneuver until it was known where Mary's long-term housing would be located.[50]

This is another area in which Cromwell could and would have been helpful to Chapuys' cause and, naturally, Mary's as well. The more Chapuys would have pushed for a favorable change of lodging for Mary, the more it would have, and did, alert Henry that something of which he would not approve was afoot. Cromwell's involvement, however, would have allowed Chapuys more leeway to plan such an escape attempt, and Cromwell does seem to have interceded on Mary's behalf, whether wittingly or otherwise. The general portrait of the shrewd chancellor that is known to most historians makes it difficult to believe that Cromwell did not know what information being given to Chapuys about the king's leanings on such matters would

[49] Mary Tudor to Eustace Chapuys, *Caendar: Spain*, Henry VIII, Vol. 1, No. 1, October 1535, 218.
[50] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 8, March 1535, 1-10, 130-131.

mean in helping the princess, perhaps against Henry's wishes. Though they were friends, Chapuys became increasingly suspicious of Cromwell during these times, often due to conflicting information he received that contradicted Cromwell's professed allegiances to Mary. Cromwell regularly gave Chapuys assurances that he was indeed in Mary's corner when it came to improving her welfare, but the ambassador gradually became suspicious of these claims because of the lack of action ever taken by Cromwell to justify his claims. One instance in particular annoyed Chapuys and he relayed the information to Charles. It had come to Chapuys' understanding that Henry had visited Cromwell and told the chancellor that he had heard good news and good reports of Mary's attitude toward the king and general progress in maturing. Cromwell contradicted the report that Henry had been lied to, then the chancellor progressed to speak to the person who had given the king such a report and ordered him to tell Henry that he had lied and beg the king's forgiveness.[51]

This was as much a part of the ceaseless chess match going on between Chapuys and his friend Cromwell as anything else, but it shows that Chapuys was genuinely perturbed to find that he did not know whether he could trust Cromwell to be honest with him although they were friends. If it is to be accepted that the two men were able to do their jobs and maintain a personal relationship that went beyond the boundaries of their defined duties, it gives greater weight to the notion that Mary was far more to Chapuys than a pawn of the Holy Roman Empire. There is not much fondness that Chapuys shows for any others that he dealt with regularly than Cromwell and Mary, in fact. Although he regularly extolled the virtues of Catherine, he was never as enamored with the queen as he was with his two aforementioned friends. In fact, as Loades has noted, Charles was not particularly fond of Catherine either, and that by the time Chapuys had

[51] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Henry VIII, Vol. 8, April 1535, 11-20, 209-211.

been sent to England the queen was essentially seen by the emperor as a family embarrassment. Regardless of his own devotion to his faith, it would have been difficult for Chapuys to not interpret Catherine's delusional hopes for divine intervention as folly.[52]

Though a successful attempt at escape from England for Mary might have been interpreted by Catherine as just such a kind of intervention, Chapuys actually wondered if Mary's being arrested and placed in the Tower might actually aid in such an attempt. "Pending the issue of affairs he would probably seize them and put the Princess in the Tower, and, if so, I imagine the Queen and Princess would not be so much at his command as he supposes, as the Captain seems to be a good servant of your Majesty and the said ladies," Chapuys wrote, referring to Sir William Kingston, who would have been in charge of their detainment. It began the first of several attempts to get Mary out of England, but with each foiled and subsequent plan Chapuys felt less confident that such a move could be accomplished without disastrous consequences. Before long Henry had become suspicious enough to move Mary inland by about twenty miles to Greenwich to make any such escape attempt significantly more complex and easier to detect.[53]

A plot to sweep Mary out of England in early 1536 was ironically called off due to the Catherine's death at the age of fifty, believed now to have been caused by a heart attack. Chapuys wrote that he feared for Mary's well-being in the wake of it, and relaying the news of the queen's death to Charles, Chapuys wrote that hearing the news himself, "has been one of the most cruel and painful that could reach me under any circumstances." However, his concern and grief were more for Mary than for anyone. "I am afraid the good Princess her daughter will die

[52] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Henry VIII, Vol. 8, April 1535, 11-20, 209-211; Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, 52.
[53] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 8, March 1535, 1-10, 129-131.

of grief, or else that the King's concubine will carry out her threat of putting her to death, which she will certainly do unless a prompt remedy be applied to counteract her wicked designs," he wrote. The importance of this passage from Chapuys' letter dated 9 January 1536 is not that Anne had designs to kill Mary, which most historians now agree she never planned to do. It is, however, that Chapuys believed it plausible enough to report to the emperor as if it were a very real threat. A common interpretation is also that this was another of Chapuys' attempts to illicit military intervention by the Holy Roman Empire in England, but it is equally as plausible that his affection for and devotion to Mary led him to sincerely believe the girl, at this time approaching her twentieth birthday, would succumb to her depression as a result of her mother's death. Chapuys actually suggested to Mary during this time that she become a nun in order to remove her from the stress she had long experienced and the dangers both she and Chapuys believed her to be living. He argued that doing so would put her out of harm's way as far as Anne and the Boleyn faction were concerned.[54]

Less than six months later, the execution of Anne Boleyn removed the direct source of tension between Mary and her father, but little else had changed. One week after the execution Mary wrote a pair of letters to Cromwell, saying in the first, "I would have been a suitor to you before this time to have been a mean for me to the King's Grace to have obtained his Grace's blessing and favor, but I perceived that nobody durst speak for me as long as that woman lived, which is now gone; whom I pray our Lord of His great mercy to forgive." She followed up on 30 May by begging Cromwell to serve as her petitioner for her to receive an audience with Henry, who she had not seen in more than a year, and she assured Cromwell that she would be as

[54] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 10, January 1536, 6-10, 20-22; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 10, January 1536, 26-31, 69-70; Eustace Chapuys to the Emperor, *Calendar: Spain*, Vol. 5, Part 2, January 1536, 1-10.

obedient to the king as could be expected. The, "as could be expected," element of her second letter to Cromwell indicated that Mary still held to her beliefs of papal authority, and that her mother's marriage was never invalid. Another week later, Mary took matters into her own hands and wrote to Henry, begging him for his blessing and telling the king she will submit to him, "humbly beseeching your Highness to consider that I am but a woman, and your child, who hath committed her soul only to God, and her body to be ordered in this world as it shall stand with your pleasure." She expressed congratulations to her father upon his marriage to Jane Seymour, and told Henry that she was prayed that Jane provide the king with a son. [55]

It is not clear whether Chapuys viewed the role in Mary's life as a fatherly one, but a piece of correspondence hints that he certainly did not agree with the notion put forth by numerous historians of Charles unequivocally being her father-by-proxy. In reporting to Charles the details of his meeting in Westminster with numerous officials including Cranmer, Cromwell, Norfolk, and John Fox, Chapuys said that he had begun to grow impatient with their stances regarding Mary and Catherine's refusal to recognize Henry as the head of the church. He told the group that if they wanted a continuance of peace they should be mindful of, "the great patience your majesty had so long shown being abused, seeing that you considered the Queen as a mother and the Princess as a sister or daughter." Mary might have claimed that Charles was her father by proxy, but that is no indication that Charles felt the same way, or that Mary actually believed that to be the case herself. Chapuys certainly was not sold on the idea, and as he was the man on the ground and in Mary's life on a far more regular basis than was her cousin, it is not difficult to imagine that he saw himself in that paternal role instead.[56]

[55] Princess Mary to Cromwell, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 10, May 1536, 26-31, 402; Princess Mary to Henry VIII, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 10, June 1536, 1-5, 424.
[56] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 7, May 1534, 16-20, 263-268.

Chapuys was there to represent the emperor, it is true, but to believe that he was merely a vessel of Charles V and did not offer advice and instruction of his own creation is absurd, yet it is suggested time and time again that it was Charles who wielded immeasurable influence in the development of Mary's character as a person and as a monarch. In their 2005 article, "Faith and Forgiveness: Lessons in Statecraft for Queen Mary Tudor," Lorraine Attreed and Alexandria Winkler begin with a list of key players in Mary's aforementioned development. Her mother is listed and so, too, is the humanist education given to Mary by Vives. Then, the writers skip ahead to the "most respected and consistent counsel," Mary received in her life, crediting this advice to Charles without a word about Chapuys.[57]

Attreed and Winkler did this in attempt to highlight the importance of another marginalized source of influence, Henry Parker, Lord Morley, of whom their article is essentially written. Thus, they have a motive to leave Chapuys in the shadows of heretofore uncredited sources of influence. To be fair, it is nearly impossible to concretely prove influence from one person to another without hard evidence from the person supposedly being influenced that supports such claims. Later, they credit Lady Margaret Beaufort with being the, "mother of Henry VII and founder of the Tudor dynasty." Giving birth to the dynasty's actual founder is surely noteworthy, but Margaret Beaufort was not present at Bosworth Field, the site of Henry Tudor's defeat of Richard III and the actual beginning of the dynasty. Elsewhere, however, the omissions and slights of Chapuys can most likely be the result of there being so little information about Chapuys available to past scholars that would enable them to better assess his character and therefore identify what would be in keeping with that character and what would be more in attributing to any direction from Charles. It is also given some credence in the fact that Henry

[57] Lorraine Attreed and Alexandra Winkler, "Faith and Forgiveness: Lessons in Statecraft for Queen Mary Tudor," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 36 (2005), 971.

was suspicious not of Chapuys' influence on his daughter, but rather of the interest that Catherine's nephew seemed to have in her. What is apparent from the correspondence that survives is that Charles did not commonly write to Chapuys about Mary. He received plenty of information about her from the ambassador, but from the lack of direct responses from the emperor in regard to her it appears that Chapuys often acted from his own conscience and in what he felt was in both her best interest and the interests of the Holy Roman Empire in his advisement of the princess. This important differentiation has gone almost entirely unaddressed by historians, who have been too passive in accepting an almost inconceivable notion that Mary and Chapuys had a living and fluid relationship, and that relationship allows us to see and understand more about the personality of each person. In some cases, the relationship between Charles and Mary has even been erroneously labeled. Judith Richards refers to Charles as Mary's uncle in an article regarding the gendering of the Tudor monarchy. Such inaccuracies can only further strengthen the notion that Charles was the most influential male in Marys' early life, as the emperor's actual role of being her cousin assumes far less authority than his would if he were actually her uncle.[58]

Perhaps the most important and lasting action Chapuys took in Mary's life was his convincing her to finally sign her name to a statement in June 1536 acknowledging her father as the head of the church and accepting her own existence as an illegitimate child. Chapuys, who had encouraged and even cheered her refusal to recognize Henry's religious authority and the king's notion that his first marriage was null and void due to its contradiction to biblical statues, had begun to see things differently. This was the result of a visit paid to Mary by Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex, and the Bishop of Chichester that sought her acquiescence to Henry's authority.

[58] Attreed and Winkler, 972; Judith M. Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy" *The Historical Journal* 40 (1997), 905.

When this took place on 15 June, Mary again refused, and this time – the first that she was formally confronted by officials to adhere to these oaths – her refusal officially made her a traitor. Even without the shadow of Anne Boleyn looming over Mary as a threat to her existence, Chapuys began to see that Henry was steadfast in his planned break from Rome and that it was not something that was going to disappear after Anne's removal from the picture, and he convinced her to sign the submission document on 22 June. For him to complete his mission and successfully reconcile Mary with her father and eliminate – or at least minimize – any chance that her life would be in danger should Henry's mood turn sour toward towards her and his temper get the best of him.[59]

The move actually did do a great deal in terms of rejoining Mary to the king, and their relationship began to thaw quickly after she signed. However, Mary saw it as virtually selling her soul, and felt guilty about giving in for the rest of her life. The Royal Supremacy was something she abhorred, although she would use it to her full advantage when she became queen in 1553. Meanwhile, his advice to Mary in this matter caused Chapuys a great deal of grief, and in signing Mary begged Chapuys to seek a papal dispensation to ease her conscience for what she had done. Neither Mary nor Chapuys were happy with how it was obtained, but the utilitarian view of it would say that it was the right move to make.

Mary made her final and permanent return to court under her father's reign in May 1541, and Chapuys notes somewhat curiously, that "the Queen also is agreeable" to Henry extending his invitation to his daughter to do so. Catherine Howard, who was Anne Boleyn's first cousin through her father's sister, was just seventeen years old at this time, and therefore roughly eight years younger than Mary. Although there is no record of animosity between Catherine Howard

[59] The Princess Mary's Submission, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 10, June 1536, 11-20, 478.

and Mary, it is possible that the queen's family ties led Chapuys to keep a keener eye on the relationship than he had done so with any of Henry's four wives that followed Anne Boleyn.[60]

By 1542, in fact, Chapuys was reporting news of Mary to Queen Mary of Hungary more frequently than to Charles. The emperor had turned over considerable authority in the Holy Roman Empire to his sister by then, and Queen Mary was not unfamiliar with the situation, having received updates from the princess herself since the younger Mary's teenage years. The common news within these letters are updates on Mary's health, which continued to give her problems throughout her life. However, the match between the princess and King Francis of France's son, the Duke of Orleans, was the most frequently shifting area of focus not just in correspondence between Chapuys and Queen Mary, but also to Charles. It is in this issue that Chapuys' view of the princess as a political pawn again reared its head. There are few updates of visitations between the ambassador and the princess during the 1540s, but updates on the negotiations for a potential wedding treaty are ever-present in Chapuys' letters from this era. The marriage never took place, and although the negotiations went on for a considerable time after the agreement was made to pair Mary with the Dauphin, it ended up being yet another failed attempt by Henry to procure a husband for his firstborn.[61]

Henry's marriage to Catherine Parr enabled Mary to enjoy continued good relations with her father, and as such, Chapuys' role in her everyday life diminished. Chapuys gave only periodic updates of the king's relationship with Mary in his final years of assignment in England. "The King continues his good treatment of the Princess, whom he has retained with the Queen, who shows her all affection," he wrote in August 1543. Parr, as noted elsewhere here, was much closer to Mary's age than to Henry's, and the two found each other's company quite enjoyable.

[60] Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 16, May 1541, 11-20, 400-401.
[61] Chapuys to Mary of Hungary; *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 17, April 1542, 26-30, 115.

It had seemed, at least by the end of his embassy, that although the mission to reconcile Catherine of Aragon's marriage failed, Chapuys' ambition to see that Mary was well cared for and in the good graces of her father had been a success in the long run. Mary even sat in court at Henry's side at the king's request in 1543, in the gap between the execution of Catherine Howard and his marriage to Catherine Parr.[62]

The fact of the matter is that once Mary's place in the succession was re-established and her safety all but guaranteed, there was little necessity for she and Chapuys to maintain such regular correspondence to see each other so frequently, at least in matters that were of any diplomatic importance. Not only that, but the birth of Prince Edward in 1537 shifted Henry's focus away from sorting out his daughters' places in a succession and onto the rearing of the heir apparent. Consequently, Mary begins to fade from the historical record in comparison to her earlier role in Henry's marriage drama. There is still periodic discussion of potential matches being made for Mary, but aside from that she is not part of Chapuys' regular course of issues that he reported to Charles V after 1537.

In September 1544 Chapuys received a letter from Prince Philip of Spain that requested Chapuys visit Mary on his behalf. The final piece of correspondence within the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII* in which Chapuys mentions Mary comes in May 1545. It is a small, seemingly insignificant passage that mentions he had a conversation with her and Queen Catherine Parr in a garden on 9 May. There is no mention of the content of the conversation. Near his retirement, Chapuys was approximately fifty-five years old at the time of their final meeting. He retired to Belgium, and set up a college in Savoy in 1548, and another for English

[62] Chapuys to Charles V; *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 18, Part 1, January 1543, 11-15, 26-32.

students in Louvain. He died 21 January, 1556. Mary was twenty-five when she last saw her longtime friend, and was eight years away from becoming queen.[63]

[63] Davies, https://dx.doi.org/10.1093%2Fref%3Aodnb%2F70785; Prince Philip of Spain to Chapuys; *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 19, Part 2, September 1544, 16-20, 127; Chapuys to Charles V, *Letters and Papers*, Vol. 20, Part 1, May 1545, 6-10, 358-359.

Conclusion

Eustace Chapuys had an immense amount of influence in Mary Tudor's immediate life during his time as ambassador to the court of King Henry VIII. How much of his influence lasted into her later life and her reign as Queen Mary I, however, is little more than speculative. Although it is almost universally accepted that particular decisions and events such as her execution of Thomas Cranmer were tied to her earlier life, they just as much could have been driven by any number of other factors, for without tangible evidence, the concept of influence is an intangible that can be debated for eternity. For example, Cranmer was one of the first officials to speak out in recognition of Lady Jane Grey when she was proclaimed queen in 1553. Such brazen support labeled Cranmer as an enemy to Mary from the very nascent moments of her reign.

However, Chapuys' relationship with Mary was truly one that is worthy of greater study for the impact it had on the life of the first female Queen Regnant in English history. The man was willing to start a war for the princess, and on several occasions attempted to convince his employer to heed his advice to do so. Chapuys' repeatedly suggested to Charles V that invasion would be a proper response to the way Mary and Catherine were treated in the wake of Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn. The personality of Mary that has been remembered throughout five centuries had its first contributions to the historical record under the direct supervision of Chapuys, and as such the ambassador's life and personality requires continued research as well.

The best way to describe Chapuys' role in Mary's life is to say that he was her father by proxy when she was between the ages of fifteen and twenty-nine. While Mary gave credit for this role to Charles V, such exaggerated statements made by a person who is eagerly courting the political support of someone much more powerful have been already diminished if not

disregarded by other historians. It is Chapuys upon whom this somewhat dubious honor should have been bestowed by the future queen, although the disparity in their status as well as her eagerness to call upon a familial power would likely have prohibited her from seeing it clearly herself.

To Chapuys' credit if he believed himself to be that important in her life, which he was, he commonly diminished his own role in at least a titular manner. He was quick to point out how much Mary depended on him, but apprehensive to state that it put him in any authoritative role in her life. In fact, although Henry was repeatedly hurtful if not purposely mean to Mary as she matured, Chapuys was always careful to not cast the king as the nemesis. That role, in Chapuys' view, most commonly fell upon Anne Boleyn until her death in 1536, and then later to Thomas Cranmer. If anything, Chapuys acted as an apologist for Henry's lack of action in his daughter's defense, often blaming Anne's influence with the king for things that he easily could have done otherwise for Mary's benefit, safety, and happiness.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Calendar of State Papers, Spain: Supplement To Volumes 1 and 2, Queen Katherine; Intended Marriage of King Henry VII To Queen Juana. Edited by G A Bergenroth. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1868. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/supp/vols1-2.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 3 Part 2, 1527-1529. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1877. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol3/no2.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 4 Part 1, Henry VIII, 1529-1530. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1879. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol4/no1.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 4 Part 2, 1531-1533. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1882. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol4/no2.

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*, accessed March 24, 2016, 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*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol5/no2.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 6 Part 1, 1538-1542. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1890. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol6/no1.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 6 Part 2, 1542-1543. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1895. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol6/no2.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 7, 1544. Edited by Pascual de Gayangos and Martin A S Hume. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1899. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol7.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 8, 1545-1546. Edited by Martin A S Hume. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1904. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol8.

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*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol9.

Calendar of State Papers, Spain, Volume 11, 1553. Edited by Royall Tyler. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1916.*British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/spain/vol11.

De Worde, Wynkyn. *The Maner of the Tryumphe of Caleys and Bulleyn and The Noble Tryumphant Coronacyon of Queene Anne, Wyfe unto the Most Noble Kynge Henry VIII*. FQ Books, 2010.

Foxe, John. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Bridge-Logos Publishers, 2001.

Foxe, John. *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online*, 1576 edition. Sheffield, UK: HRI Online Publications, 2011. http://www.johnfoxe.org

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 5, 1531-1532. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1880. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol5.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 6, 1533. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1882. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol6.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 7, 1534. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1883. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol7.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 8, January-July 1535. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1885. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol8.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 9, August-December 1535. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1886. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol9.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 10, January-June 1536. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1887. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol10.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 11, July-December 1536. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1888. *British History*

Online, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol11.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 12 Part 1, January-May 1537. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1890. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol12/no1.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 12 Part 2, June-December 1537. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1891. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol12/no2.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 13 Part 1, January-July 1538. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1892. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol13/no1.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 13 Part 2, August-December 1538. Edited by James Gairdner. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1893. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol13/no2.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 14 Part 1, January-July 1539. Edited by James Gairdner and R H Brodie. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1894. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol14/no1.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 14 Part 2, August-December 1539. Edited by James Gairdner and R H Brodie. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1895. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol14/no2.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 15, 1540. Edited by James Gairdner and R H Brodie. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1896. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol15.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 16, 1540-1541. Edited by James Gairdner and R H Brodie. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1898. *British History Online*, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol16.

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 17, 1542. Edited by James Gairdner and R H Brodie. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1900. *British History*

Online, accessed March 24, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol17.

Tudor and Stuart Proclamations 1485-1714. Calendared by Robert Steele Under the Direction of the Earl of Crawford.

Hughes, Paul L. and James F. Larkin. *Tudor Royal Proclamations Volume II: The Later Tudors 1553-1587*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1969.

Roberts, Jennifer Tolbert, John W. O'Malley. 1988. "On the Christian Widow / De Vidua Christiana". In Spiritualia: Enchiridon / De Contemptu Mundi / De Vidua Christiana, Volume 66, edited by John W. O'Malley, 66:177–258. University of Toronto Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/j.ctt2ttthn.6.

Secondary sources

Books

Baxter, Stephen. *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*. Berkely, Calif.: University of California Press, 1983.

Bernard, G.W. *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005.

Collinson, Patrick. *The Reformation: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2006.

Davies, C.S.L. "Chapuys, Eustache (1490/92-1556)". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/index/70/101070785/.

Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation (2nd Edition)*. State College, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Doran, Susan and Thomas S. Freeman, eds. *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Duffy, Eamon. *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010.

Duffy, Eamon and David Loades. *The Church of Mary Tudor*. (London: Routledge), 2006.

Froude, James Anthony. *The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon; the Story as Told by the Imperial Ambassador Resident at the Court of Henry VIII, in usum laicorum*. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Froude, James Anthony. *The Reign of Mary Tudor*. New York: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Houlbrooke, Ralph. *The English Family, 1450-1700*. New York: Longman, 1984.

Houlbrooke, Ralph. *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480-1750*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Loades, David. *Mary Tudor*. London: Amberly, 2011.

Loades, David. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1989.

Loades, David. *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545-1565*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Loades, David. *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England 1553-58*. London: Routledge, 2nd Edition, 1991.

MacCullough, Diarmaid. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603, Second Edition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

MacKay, Lauren. *Inside the Tudor Court: Henry VIII and His Six Wives Through the Eyes of the Spanish Ambassador, Eustace Chapuys*. London: Amberley, 2014.

McIntosh, Jeri L. *From Heads of Household to Heads of State: The Preaccession Households of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, 1516-1558*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Meyer, G.J. *The Tudors: The Complete Story of England's Most Notorious Dynasty*. New York: Bantam, 2011.

Prescott, H.F.M. *Mary Tudor*. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

Shagan, Ethan H. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Warnicke, Retha M. *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wernham, Richard Bruce. *Before the Armada: The Emergence of the English Nation 1485-1588*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.

Articles

Attreed, Lorraine and Alexandra Winkler. "Faith and Forgiveness: Lessons in Statecraft for Queen Mary Tudor." The Sixteenth Century Journal. Vol. 36, No. 4 (Dec. 2005): Kirksville, England: 971-989.

Beemer, Christy. "The Female Monarchy: A Rhetorical Strategy of Early Modern Rule." Rhetoric Review, Vol. 30, No. 3 (2011), p. 258-74. Accessed March 16, 2016. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2117/ehost/detail/detail?sid=17e94228-fb76-4685-8d49-58c20d745b90%40sessionmgr198&vid=0&hid=101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=61274710&db=aph.

Edwards, John. "A Spanish Inquisition? The Repression of Protestantism under Mary Tudor." Reformation & Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies, No. 4 (Dec. 2000), p. 62-75. Accessed March 16, 2016. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2117/ehost/detail/detail?sid=9481f1d0-85d8-4be7-8a1b-f11d1d58da2a%40sessionmgr111&vid=0&hid=101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=5444624&db=aph.

Evenden, Elizabeth. "Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives." Parliamentary History, Vol. 33, No. 2 (June 2014): p. 362-364.

Garcia, Alfredo Martin. "Divorce and Abuse in 16th, 17th and 18th Century Spain." Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 161 (December 2014): 184-194. Accessed February 7, 2015. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2239/S1877042814061357/1-s2.0-S1877042814061357-main.pdf?_tid=142ed2b2-6a05-11e5-93df-00000aab0f6b&acdnat=1443900755_84e25d945cbed1214a973d395c16f8af.

Haigh, Christopher. "The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation." The Historical Journal, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Dec. 1982), pp. 995-1007. Accessed March 22, 2016. http://journals.cambridge.org/jsp/cjo/common/icepdfviewer.jsp?fileName=S0018246X00021385&aid=3322288&fid=S0018246X00021385&filesize=863.

Haigh, Christopher. "Revisionism, the Reformation and the History of English Catholicism." The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 36, No. 3 (July 1995), pp. 394-406. Accessed March 22, 2016. http://journals.cambridge.org/jsp/cjo/common/icepdfviewer.jsp?fileName=S0022046900041166&aid=7796012&fid=S0022046900041166&filesize=823.

Haigh, Christopher. "Catholicism and anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts. Edited by Arthur Marotti." The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol., No. 4 (Sept. 2001), pp. 702-779. Accessed March 22, 2016. http://journals.cambridge.org/jsp/cjo/common/icepdfviewer.jsp?fileName=S0022046901651455&aid=93312&fid=S0022046901651455&filesize=504.

Haigh, Christopher. "A.G. Dickens and the English Reformation." Historical Research, Vol. 77, No. 195 (Feb. 2004), pp. 24-38. Accessed April 6, 2016. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2281.2004.00196.x/abstract.

Harkins, Robert. "Elizabethan Puritanism and the Politics of Memory in Post-Marian England." The Historical Journal, Vol. 57, No. 4 (Dec. 2014), pg. 899-919. Accessed March 3, 2016. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2111/ehost/detail/detail?sid=9fff0c99-3b19-4df2-

8843-1185721f7107%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4107&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=99385664&db=hia.

Loades, David. "The Reign of Mary Tudor: Historiography and Research." Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies, Vol. 21, No. 4 (Winter, 1989), pg. 547-558. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4049536.

Lowe, Ben. "A Short Reformation? A Case for Recalculating the Chronology of Religious Change in Sixteenth Century England." Anglican and Episcopal History, Vol. 82, No. 4 (Dec. 2013), pg. 409-447. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43049681.

Marshall, Peter. "The Other Black Legend: The Henrician Reformation and the Spanish People." The English Historical Review, Vol. 116, No. 465 (2001): 31-49. Accessed October 3, 2015. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2647/content/116/465/31.full.pdf+html?sid=8f98d524-78cd-447e-b197-4e84449c8bfe.

Mazzola, Elizabeth. "Schooling Shrews and Grooming Queens in the Tudor Classroom." Critical Survey, Vol. 22, No. 1: (2010): 1-26. Accessed October 3, 2015. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2111/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=7aa53bfc-fc01-4b33-b143-ba9a3efa9641%40sessionmgr4004&hid=4206.

Methuen, Charlotte. "The Church of Mary Tudor and Spirituality of Mary Tudor's Church." Ecclesiology, Vol. 4, No. 3 (2008): 356-362. Accessed October 3, 2015.

Milsom, John. "William Mundy's 'Vox Patris Caelestis' and the Accession of Mary Tudor." Music & Letters, Vol. 91, No. 1 (Feb. 2010), pg. 1-38. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.jstore.org/stable/40539092.

Montrose, Louis. "Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary." ELH, Vol .69, No. 4 (Winter 2002), pg. 907-947.

Oldenburg, Scott. Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England: The Queen's Royal Entry Circa 1533, the Interlude of Wealth and Health, and the Question of Strangers in the Reign of Mary I. ELH, Vol. 76, No. 1: (Spring 2009). Accessed October 3, 2015. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2197/journals/elh/v076/76.1.oldenburg.pdf.

Rex, Richard. "The Religion of Henry VIII." The Historical Journal, Vol. 57, No. 1 (March 2014): 1-32. Accessed October 3, 2015. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2289/download.php?file=%2F4450_D0EF00B26EC2C7F372BDF2E088C3BDB6_journals__HIS_HIS57_01_S0018246X13000368a.pdf&cover=Y&code=0ad012e02a9d026d67d2aaa56a4c8e16.

Richards, Judith M. "To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule": Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England. The Sixteenth Century Journal, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Spring 1997), pg. 101-121. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2543225.

Richards, Judith M. "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy." The Historical Journal, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec. 1997), pg. 895-924. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640128.

Streckfuss, Corinna. "England's Reconciliation with Rome: A News Event in Early Modern Europe." Historical Research, Vol. 82, No. 215 (Feb. 2009), p. 62-73. Accessed March 16, 2016. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2117/ehost/detail/detail?sid=1aa98d64-6616-4672-879c-1c49bd2efd69%40sessionmgr114&vid=0&hid=101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=36141866&db=aph.

Van Dyke, Paul. "Reginald Pole and Thomas Cromwell: An Examination of the Apolgia Ad Carolum Quintum." The American Historical Review, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Jul., 1904), pg. 696-724. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Historical Association. Accessed January 9, 2016. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1834095.

Whitelock, Anna and Diarmaid Macculloch. "Princess Mary's Household and the Succession Crisis, July 1553." Historical Journal, Vol. 50, No. 2 (June 2007), p. 265-287. Accessed March 16, 2016. http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2111/ehost/detail/detail?sid=3f9f5dce-2105-4ea9-84b5-1d8371e5bed0%40sessionmgr4001&vid=0&hid=4107&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=25558286&db=hia.

Vita

Education

2014	Bachelor of Arts, History	West Virginia State University Institute, WV 25112 Cumulative GPA 3.68
2014	Bachelor of Arts, Political Science	West Virginia State University Institute, WV 25112 Cumulative GPA 3.68

Work Experience

2015-Present	Assistant Sports Editor Charleston Gazette-Mail Charleston, WV 25301
2007-2015	Prep Sports Editor Charleston Daily Mail Charleston, WV 25301
2004-2007	Sports Writer The Exponent-Telegram Clarksburg, WV 26301
1998-2001	Sports Writer The Parkersburg News & Sentinel Parkersburg, WV 26101
1997-1998	Sports Writer/Photographer The Wetzel Chronicle New Martinsville, WV 26155

General Skills

Computer Skills: Proficient with Microsoft Office Suite, Adobe Photoshop, InDesign, and Quark Xpress.

Language Proficiency: Moderate fluency in Spanish.