University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

History Publications and Other Works | History

January 2010

Princess Mary as the de facto Prince(ss) of Wales, 1525

Jeri L. McIntosh
jmcintos@utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_histpubs

Part of the European History Commons, History of Gender Commons, Political History Commons, Social History Commons, and the Women's History Commons

Recommended Citation
McIntosh, Jeri L., "Princess Mary as the de facto Prince(ss) of Wales, 1525" (2010). *History Publications and Other Works.*
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_histpubs/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

"Princess Mary as the *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales, 1525"

In the winter of 1536, Robert Aske, one of the ringleaders of a grassroots rebellion against the Henrician Reformation, found himself subjected to an intense interrogation by government officials. The rebellion, known then and now as the 'Pilgrimage of Grace', had seriously alarmed king and government.[1] Officials questioning Aske in the aftermath of the rebellion's suppression and Aske's capture focused on his constitutional views of crown power and the royal succession.[2] One of the demands of the 'Pilgrimage' rebels was the restoration of the recently disinherited Princess Mary to the royal succession. When questioned about this rebel demand, Aske claimed that Henry VIII had placed the sovereignty of the English nation at risk by successfully pushing through Parliamentary legislation which disinherited his eldest daughter, Mary - recognized widely within England and Europe as the most credible claimant to the crown by right of blood.[3] For Aske, the issue hinged on Henry VIII's right to declare the next successor the crown. As Aske pointed out, no other monarch ever had such prerogative and no other person in the realm had the power to overturn common law when it came to the inheritance of real property.[4] If Mary was disinherited and the king's younger daughter, Elizabeth was derided by many in Catholic Europe as illegitimate, then the way was open for the Scottish king (the 'alien' as Aske called him), the nephew of Henry VIII, to make a credible

---

[1] For large-scale studies that focus on the rebellion, see M. Bush *The Pilgrimage of Grace: A Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* [Manchester UP, 1996] and R.W. Hoyle, *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Politics of the 1530s* [Oxford UP, 2003]

[2] M. Bateson, "Aske's Examination", *English Historical Review*, Vol. V, No. 19 (July, 1890): 550-573

[3] The Second Act of Succession, 28 Hen. VIII c.7 ; Bateson, "Aske. . .", 564

[4] Bateson, "Aske. . .", 563-4

claim to the English throne.[5] While most Englishmen could accommodate a Scottish succession in 1603 after the death of Elizabeth I, in 1536 the English polity was not yet supportive of such a political future. Aske's enthusiasm for Mary's succession rights derives in part from this fear of Scottish succession and his belief in her legitimacy as the issue of what he likely considered the legitimate union of her parents, Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII.

This essay will argue that there was another element factoring into Aske's and the rebels' support for Mary's succession rights: her status as the *de facto* (rather than *de jure*) Prince(ss) of Wales. Evidence for Mary's status during the late 1520s-30s (before the birth of the future Edward VI) is found in household documents relating to her vice-regal household in the Welsh Marches in 1525-7, in a printed representation of her Welsh court by her French tutor, Giles Duwes, and in her household accounts of the mid-1530s.

The demand by the 'Pilgrimage' rebels for Mary's restoration to the crown, therefore, may have been more than a nostalgic longing for the king to return to his original family (Catherine of Aragon and the Princess Mary). The demand may also have been an astute recognition of the current political reality: Mary was too firmly identified in the public mind as the next English sovereign to be replaced by anyone not the king's undoubted legitimate male offspring. As Robert Aske pointed out during interrogation, to undermine Mary's legal status, [after her tour of duty in the Welsh marches], meant putting national security at risk.[6] I argue

---

[5] For an explicit identification of Mary's legitimacy as a preventative measure against a Scottish succession, see item 3 in Pontefract Articles of the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' in A. Fletcher, *Tudor Rebellions* [London, 1973]:128; For one of many attempts to present the infant Elizabeth as a marriage prospect to European royal houses. All such marriage negotiations failed, *LP*, VII, 191

[6] Bateson, "Aske. . .", 564

here that Mary became a positive historical irony before the birth of her half-brother, Prince Edward in 1537. Until that time her stint in the Welsh marches as the *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales meant that her technical status as 'heiress presumptive' (normal for female heiresses who were usually little more than place-holders for unborn male heirs) was belied by her real status as 'heiress apparent', i.e. the next sovereign of England after Henry VIII.

II

Space does not allow here for a full elucidation of the historical context of Henry's decision to send Mary to the Welsh marches in the style of previous princes of Wales. In brief, it was to Henry's advantage for a short period in 1525 to support very ostentatiously Mary's status as his successor after the victory of her betrothed, Charles V, at Pavia.[7] This political context for Henry's uncharacteristic support of a female succession had evaporated by the time Mary left for the Welsh marches in August 1525 (when Charles V repudiated the betrothal and married Isabel of Portugal) but by then the household had been assembled.[8] Moreover, there was a distinct lack of crown representation in Wales following the death of Sir Rhys ap Thomas in South Wales and the recall in North Wales of Charles Brandon, duke

---

[7] For fuller consideration of the historical situation prompting Henry to send Mary to the Welsh marches, see J.L. McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State* . . . [Columbia UP, 2009], pp.30-1, also available online via the Gutenberg-e website at: http://www.gutenberg-e.org/mcintosh/chapter1.html#s1.4

[8] *LP*, IV pt.1, p.621, 1391

of Suffolk.[9] As the Instructions for Mary's household made clear, from the English crown's viewpoint, Wales needed its English prince(ss) in order to be governed properly:

> Inasmuch as by reason of the long absence of any Prince making continuall residence eyther in the principalitie of Wales or in the marches of the same, the good order quiet and tranquilitie of the Countreyes thereabout hath greatlie bene alterd [sic] and subverted and the due adminstracõn of Justice by meanes of sondry contraireties hitherto hindered and neglected. . .The kings highness therefore by mature deliberac[i]on and substanciall advise of his counsayle hath determined to send at this tyme his deerest most beloved and onely doughter the Princesse accompained and esteblished with an honorable, sadd discreete, expert counsayle to reside and remayne in the Marches of Wales. . .[10]

Mary's household was not simply lavish, it was intended to serve as a vice-regal court. Mary's household cost the king nearly £4,500 per annum.[11] This was nearly three times what her household normally cost the king.[12] As this essay will detail, the nine-year old princess presided over more than simply a well-appointed manor house(s). It was a royal vice-regal court with jurisdictional, tenurial, and cultural authority. Mary was invested as the nominal head of a privy council whose jurisdictional authority in the marches was second only to the king's bench in Westminster. Mary's household council was also her royal privy council. Henry granted to this council sweeping jurisdictional authority within Wales and the nearby marches.[13]

---

[9] S. J. Gunn, "The Regime of Charles, Duke of Suffolk, in North Wales and the Reform of the Welsh Government, 1509–1525," *The Welsh History Review*, 12/4 (December 1985): 461–495 and R.A. Griffiths, *Sir Rhys ap Thomas and his Family: A Study in the Wars of the Roses and Early Tudor Politics* [Wales UP, 1993]

[10] BL Cotton Vitellius, C.i., fols. 7v-8r

[11] BL Royal 14 B. XIX, 5324, unbound manuscript, no folio numbers

[12] LP, III, 337; McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State* . . . , pp.18-37 [First edition]

[13] BL Cotton Vitellius C.i, fols. 7r-18v (mss misnumbered on fol.17) [old numbering: fols.23r-35r]

It is worth pausing here to note that Mary's status as the *de facto* 'prince(ss) of Wales' was unique in English history. Other female heirs apparent like Princess Charlotte, the daughter of George IV or Princess Elizabeth (future Elizabeth II), daughter of George VI did not enjoy a similar status to Mary,.i.e. they never did a tour of duty as if they were Princes of Wales as Mary did in 1525. Most other English princesses had to content themselves with being sisters to the 'Prince of Wales'. For instance, Mary's half-sister, Elizabeth, never enjoyed an household and consequent status approaching that of Mary's household in 1525. Elizabeth's most lavish household was the one Henry conferred on her soon after her birth in 1533 but even in this instance, she had to share the establishment with the now-demoted Mary.[14] Later in 1558, Elizabeth would complain to the Spanish ambassador, that she never had the landed or household revenues sufficient to her rank.[15] Before her accession, Elizabeth never presided over a vice-regal court as Mary did in 1525.

As a nine-year old child, and a female one at that, Mary's ability to wield actual authority was severely compromised. She was the nominal head of her privy council but it was John Vosey, bishop of Exeter who was the president of the 'princes[s'] council'.[16] Another very significant aspect that placed Mary essentially in wardship to her nominal authority was her title to landed estates granted to her by the king. That Mary was a landed magnate from the age of nine has been obscured by the failure of patent rolls from the 1530s to survive for scholars to consult. However, the instructions issued for Mary's household make clear that she did, in fact,

---

[14] BL Cleopatra, E. VI, fols. 325r-328r for privy council orders to establish Elizabeth's household and regulate Mary's. Insight into the infant Elizabeth's material existence can be glimpsed in Anne Boleyn's accounts, see : E. W. Ives, *Life and Death of Anne Boleyn: The Most Happy* [Oxford 2004], pp. 253–254.

[15] M. J. Rodgríguez-Salgado and S.Adams, "The Count of Feria's Dispatch to Philip II of 14 November 1558," *Camden Miscellany*, 4th ser., vol. 28 [London, 1984], p.323

[16] BL Cotton Vitellius C.i, fol. 7r; for later reference to the council as the "princes[s'] council" see *LP*, V, no.99

hold crown estates in her own name and title. The instructions, preserved in the Cotton collection in the British Library, clearly state that Mary held title to lands 'for the support and maintenance of the charges for the estate and household of the said Princess'.[17] According to these instructions, Mary's long-serving household treasurer, Richard Sydnor, would also serve as royal surveyor. Part of his duties, as detailed in the instructions was to survey the lands 'nowe assigned to the lady Princess'.[18] The term 'assigned' puts the matter beyond doubt since land grants were often referred to as 'assignments'.[19] Further, the Instructions helpfully identified the estates Mary held as the counties of Bromfield, Yale, and Chirkland.[20] These were counties were traditionally granted to the Prince of Wales in addition to the principality (which Mary as a female could not officially receive as a formal grant from the crown).[21]

That Mary received a grant of estates, especially these counties, is significant. These lands were, traditionally, reserved for the king's eldest son, the Prince of Wales, who served his political apprenticeship by holding court on the Welsh marches and exercising authority as a landed magnate. Although Mary's scope was much more limited than males formally invested with the Welsh principality, she did have direct, albeit (in practice) nominal, authority over the tenants and clients associated with the counties of Bromfield, Yale, and Chirkland just as her male predecessors had.

---

[17] BL Cotton Vitellius C.i, fol. 7r ; spelling and usage modernized

[18] BL Cotton Vitellius C.i, fols. 17r-18r

[19] As an example, see Edwardian privy council discussions of Henry VIII's will and landed assignments. APC, II, p.43

[20] BL Cotton Vitellius C.i, fol. 17r

[21] F. Jones, *The Princes of Wales and Principality of Wales*, [Cardiff, Wales UP, 1969], pp.93-7 and T.P. Ellis, *The first extent of Bromfield and Yale. . .*[London, 1934], p.4

Others, before Mary, who had held these lands as a landed magnate rather than as Prince of Wales and yet were charged by the crown with implementing policy and justice originating in Westminster. The last person to hold these counties (though only in stewardship to the crown) was Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk in his bid to become the crown agent in North Wales.[22] After Mary's tenureship of the counties, Henry VIII granted them to his bastard son, Henry Fitzroy. Fitzroy held these counties from 1529 until 1536 the year of his premature death.[23] As with Mary, the king later granted these estates to Fitzroy possibly in an attempt to lend credibility to a potential heir (Fitzroy) who could never hold the title of Prince of Wales.

Mary's status as a landed magnate during her tour of duty in the Welsh marches is highly significant. Although it is unlikely that, as a nine year old, Mary wielded little more than nominal authority over her tenants, she did, nevertheless, have tenants. Her tenants were under her direct nominal authority. Moreover, the tenants of these particular counties - Bromfield, Chirkland, and Yale - traditionally acknowledged the overlordship of the king's designated agent, the Prince of Wales, or the next heir to the English throne (though on occasion these counties would pass out of crown hands usually to an agent representing crown interests).[24] By entrusting these particular counties to Mary, the king was sending the strongest signal possible given Mary's gender that she was, nevertheless, the next sovereign of England. Although Charles V's repudiation of Mary as a bride and Henry's decision to annul his marriage to

---

[22] S.Gunn, "The Regime of Charles, duke of Suffolk, in North Wales", *Welsh History*, 12/4 (December, 1985), p.486

[23] S. Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* [Manchester UP, 2002]: 294

[24] An example of this was when Elizabeth I granted these estates and/or castles to Ambrose and Robert Dudley. S. Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* [Manchester UP, 2002]: 295

Catherine of Aragon with the aim of disinheriting Mary undermined the king's original intention of bolstering Mary's status as his heir, Mary's credibility as a future ruler had been permanently reinforced by this grant of estates. She was from this moment more than just the king's daughter, more than a stand-in for a male Prince of Wales, she was now also a landowner. Like her male contemporaries (including her half-brother Henry Fitzroy), the young princess enjoyed the political status that automatically came with land ownership in this period. As will be discussed below, young as she was, Mary apparently grasped at the time that her position as estate holder and *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales endowed her with patronage opportunities and significant political status. In 1525, Mary was more than simply the next sovereign-in-waiting. She was the actual overlord of Bromfield, Chirkland and Yale. She was the vice-regal figure appointed by the crown to administer the Welsh Principality. As the next section of this essay will detail, she also was at the center of a rich court culture as were many other contemporary sovereigns, rulers and princes.

III

The household, like other courts of rulers, was more than just a centre of jurisdictional authority it was also a stage of political theatre. A set of instructions drawn up for Mary's household stipulates that all those who attended Mary's household court should 'by meanes of good hospitality [be] refreshed'.[25] And apparently, they were treated to all the hosptitality that one could expect at a royal court. Like all such courts, Mary's household was expected to host lavish Christmastide festivities. A letter survives from John Vosey, president of Mary's privy

[25] BL Cotton Vitellius, C.i., fol.7v

council to Cardinal Wolsey asking Wolsey just how lavish were the Christmas through Twelfth Night festivities were supposed to be.[26] Wolsey's reply does not survive.

The young Mary would, of course, have been at the centre of these festivities. As a child, her activities may have been limited but the festivities and the court were convened in her name. When present, Mary would have been the object of elaborate political ritual that would likely have impressed onlookers. As specified in the Instructions, Mary's privy chamber attendants were to conduct themselves 'sadlei, honorable, vertuously and discreetly in words, co[u]ntenance, gesture, [and] behavio^{r}' toward their young mistress.[27] Moreover, Mary's attendants were to treat her with humble 'reverence' as 'due and requisite' to her station as Prince(ss) of Wales and, all things being equal, the next sovereign of England.[28]

The elaborate deference that the Instructions stipulated should characterize how household members treated Mary also found expression in a literary culture specifically associated with this household. Mary's French tutor, Giles Duwes, published a seemingly innocuous French language manual in 1534, *An Introductory for to Learn to Read, to Pronounce, and to Speak French . . .*[29] It was much more than a language manual. It was heavy with

---

[26] BL Vespasian, F. XIII, vol. 2, fol.240r (formerly fol.134) transcribed with idiosyncratic use of modern spelling in *LP*, IV, pt.1, 1785

[27] BL Cotton Vitellius, C.i., fol.8v

[28] BL Cotton Vitellius, C.i., fol.8v

[29] Du Wes, Giles, *An Introductory for to Learn to Read, to Pronounce, and to Speak French [1532?]* ed. R.C. Alston, Facsimile [Manson, U.K., 1972] In this useful facsimile edition, Alston assigns a highly speculative date of 1532. The *Revised Short-Title Catalogue* assigns a date of 1533. The confusion probably arises from the book containing two sections clearly composed at different times with separate dedications; the first half, dedicated to "Mary of England", suggests a pre-Boleyn marriage period whereas the second half of the book is dedicated to Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, and Princess Elizabeth suggesting a date of 1533 or later [see S4^{v}-T1^{r}]. This internal

political intent. At a time when Henry VIII had started a new family with Anne Boleyn and had overseen the disinheritance of his elder daughter, Duwes printed a book in which the disgraced Mary was portrayed as the animating and sovereign center of an important, international court. Duwes was conjuring the Welsh household of the mid-1520s for his readers in 1534, on the eve of the 'Pilgrimage of Grace'. Duwes, however, was no martyr for the Aragonese cause. To counteract the political implications of the manual, Duwes dedicated it to the new queen, Anne Boleyn. In a further attempt to undermine the implied political agenda of the piece, Duwes claimed he had little choice but to publish it since Mary had commissioned it. In a wonderfully disingenuous ploy to disclaim any particular loyalty to Mary, Duwes stated that he had little choice but to obey: 'bycause of myn obedience/than by any seruice or sacrifyce that to her I may do/fulfyllyng her most noble and gracious comandement. . .' [30] While ostensibly avoiding any political rip tides generated by the Boleyn marriage, Duwes nevertheless assigned to Mary an inexorable royal prestige at odds with her demoted status in relation to the Princess Elizabeth. As if this endorsement of Mary as the princess of England was not enough to broadcast Duwes' political orientation, the manual contained a purported lesson on the importance of the Latin mass offered to Mary by her almoner.[31]

It is clear from the manual's contents that Duwes was presenting to his readers a depiction of Mary at the height of her pre-accession power and status as the *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales. He referred to household members like the "karver", John ap Morgan, who served in

---

evidence suggests to me a publication date after Elizabeth's birth in September 1533 but before Duwes' death in 1535, hence the 1534 date used here. Hereafter, cited as "Duwes"

[30] Duwes., A4^{r}

[31] Duwes, Dd2^{r}; BL Harley 6807, fol.3v

Mary's household only during her tour of duty in the Welsh marches.[32] The scale of the household depicted by Duwes was much more suggestive of the Welsh household than Mary's pre-accession households before or after the mid-1520s.[33] The international situation that Duwes portrayed as forming the topic of conversation between Mary and her privy chamber ladies also suggest the 1520s when Mary was a much-sought after prize on the royal marriage market - a status she would lose after the Boleyn marriage.

In fact, it is the erudite and courtly conversations that Duwes emphasized. In its use of dialogue form and its portrayal of Mary as a princely ruler, the Duwes manual may have represented an early English response to Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*, printed in Italy in 1528.[34] Space does not allow for a consideration of the dissemination of the manual. The argument made here is that the content alone reflects Mary's status not that Duwes' readers learned of Mary's court through reading his manual – though this may well have been true in some instances. The strongest similarity between Duwes' manual and *The Courtier* was the idea that erudite and polite conversation can (and should) function as a vehicle for the acquisition of virtue (*grazia*).[35] Duwes depicted various conversations in which the young prince(ss) sought

---

[32] Listed in Mary's 1525 household (BL Harley 6807, fol.3v) but not listed in Mary's 1533 household, see BL Harley 6807, fol.7v

[33] See fn.13

[34] Although *The Courtier* did not appear in an English printed edition until 1561 (tr. Thomas Hoby), there is evidence to suggest that educated people in England were reading it in Italian, see D. Starkey, *Reign of Henry VIII*, [London, 1985]: 33 and, by the same author, "The Court: Castiglione's Ideal and Tudor Reality; Being a Discussion of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Satire Addressed to Sir Francis Bryan", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 45, (1982): 232-239

[35] Castiglione's concepts of grace (*grazia*) as a gift from God and the deliberate human cultivation and consequent (seemingly) artless display of it (*sprezzatura*) were subtle distinctions not always appreciated by his contemporary readers. Duwes' manual concentrates on erudition as the path towards understanding and virtue rather than the ontology of virtue. For extended discussions of Castiglione's philosophy, see L. V. Ryan, "Book Four of Castiglione's Courtier: Climax or Afterthought?", *Studies in the Renaissance*, Vol. 19, (1972):156-179; E. Saccone,

enlightenment on topics such as the nature of the soul, the definition of love, and how to achieve optimum physical health. Duwes was not starry-eyed about his native language, rather he took a hard-eyed humanist view in this manual: French was a skill, a tool. Duwes depicted Lady Maltravers advocating this view when she urged Mary to learn French so she would not need to employ a 'minion' to translate her speech to her future husband 'were he either kyng or emperour'.[36]

Although Duwes presented French as a tool, a vehicle rather than a virtue in and of itself, he depicted Mary's Welsh household as a royal court engaged in the erudite pursuit of virtue. Duwes appeared to bridge the gap between *The Courtier* and the "Mirror for Princes" genre. Despite Duwes portraying Mary as the interlocutor seeking enlightenment, the topics rarely concern ruler- or governorship. Nor did Duwes provide advice to aspiring courtiers. The intended audience for this French manual was *everyone*. Anyone who wanted to learn French could, in Duwes' view, derive benefit from this manual. The topics that Duwes selected also furthered the pursuit of learning and virtue. Duwes' decision to use dialogue form meant that those who could not read could, nevertheless, have the dialogues read or, even better, performed for them; the latter probably being closer to Duwes' original intention.

The egalitarian orientation of Duwes' manual very much accorded with the question that Duwes portrayed Mary as asking about the utility of the Latin mass for those who did not know Latin. Duwes depicted Mary as asking her almoner how can non-Latin speakers derive benefit

---

"*Grazia, Sprezzatura, Affettazione* in *The Courtier*" from *Castiglione: The Ideal and the Real in Renaissance Culture*, eds. Hanning and Rosand [Yale UP, 1983]: 45-67; J. Richards, "Assumed Simplicity and the Critique of Nobility: Or, How Castiglione Read Cicero", *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Summer, 2001): 460-486

[36] Duwes, T3^{v}

from the mass: "what shall do they whiche understand it nat"?[37] This question along with the dialogue form and concentration upon language situated the manual within a humanist context. Nevertheless, the manual was not entirely innocent of political or social ambition. Duwes' highly flattering depiction of Mary as a princely ruler at a time when she was being demoted in favor of her half-sister Elizabeth, was nearly an incendiary commentary on Henry VIII's decision to disinherit Mary. Indeed, one suspects that Duwes took the risk because he hoped his advanced years (and final illness?) and long record of service would save him from Henry's wrath and it appears that this was the case as Duwes died in his bed in 1535.[38]

The egalitarian orientation meant that, like *The Courtier*, there was an implicit criticism in Duwes' manual of the ideal that only the nobility could acquire the necessary virtue to advise rulers. Throughout the manual, Duwes presents mainly non-noble courtiers offering learned examinations on the soul, love, St. Augustine, the mass, the body among others to the princess. Nobles or high-ranked office holders like Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury or John Vosey, bishop of Exeter barely make an appearance in the manual. The most common interlocutors with Mary are the lawyer and almoner, Peter Burrell, Richard Sydnor the treasurer of Mary's privy chamber, and Duwes himself as her French tutor and gentleman waiter of her privy chamber. Duwes, as was common practice of the time, did not refer to these men by name but by office. Lest the office title should obscure the non-noble status of people like her almoner, Peter Burrell, and, to a lesser extent, Sydnor, Duwes explicitly referred to the non-noble status of these household/privy council officers when he depicted Mary referring to Burrell as a 'lawyer' and to

---

[37] Duwes, Dd2^{v}

[38] For more information on Duwes (who was also a lutenist), see Andrew Ashbee, "Groomed for Service: Musicians in the Privy Chamber at the English Court, c. 1495-1558", *Early Music*, 25, 2 (May 1997): 185-197, pp. 188-89

Sydnor as 'a doctour and well lettred'.[39] Duwes referred to himself in the manual as Mary's 'unworthy servant'.[40] Duwes also depicted Mary's Welsh carver, John ap Morgan, as participating in this erudite culture via a letter that Duwes attributes to ap Morgan. According to Duwes, the carver's letter was in French and sprinkled with classical allusions.[41]

Duwes portrayed the royal court as one characterized by thinly disguised sexual banter. Perhaps following Castiglione's lead, Duwes overlaid the ostensible sexual tension with Platonic philosophy. This is especially welcome given that the court of Duwes' depiction was that of the then nine-year old Mary (she would have been eighteen by mid-1534, the likely date for publication of Duwes' manual). The best example of the sexual and Platonic tenor of the conversations was one that Duwes portrayed between Mary and her treasurer of the privy chamber, Richard Sydnor.[42] In a custom that Mary herself would continue in her later households, Duwes alluded to Mary's active participation in the practice of drawing for valentines.[43] Duwes depicted Mary drawing Sydnor one year as her valentine and referring to

---

[39] Duwes, Ee1^{v} , Bb2^{r}

[40] Duwes, Bb1^{v}, U3^{v}

[41] Duwes, U4^{r}

[42] Identifying who's who in Duwes is not a straightforward undertaking given that there exists two variant lists of officers for Mary's household in 1525; one is in BL Cotton Vitellius C i, fols.7r-18v [formerly 23r-35v] and the other is in BL Harley 6807, fols.3r-6r. Furthermore, there is a distinction between the Lord Treasurer of the Household and the Treasurer of the Privy Chamber. BL Cotton Vitellius C. i lists Sir Ralph Egerton only as "Treasurer" and Sydnor as "suveyor" whereas BL Harley 6807 [dated July 17, 1525] lists Sydnor as treasurer of the privy chamber. I myself managed, at an earlier date, to confuse Egerton and Sydnor when discussing Duwes' "treasurer" in my book, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State*. . .[Columbia UP, 2009]: 75-76; also accessible online via Gutenberg-e at http://www.gutenberg-e.org/mcintosh/chapter2.html#s2.3

[43] F. Madden, *The Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary*, [London, 1831], *passim* from BL Royal 17 B.xxviii with divergent folio numbers because the mss was renumbered after Madden consulted it, also Madden leaves out Mary's totals in her own hand.

him as her "husband adoptive". [44] In this depiction, Duwes portrayed Sydnor as suffering from the gout, which caused him to miss some days in his attendance upon Mary. According to Duwes, Sydnor's sick leave earned a swift reprimand from the young princess: 'ye take great care of your goute. . .than ye do of your wyfe'. In a startling (to modern eyes at any rate) reference to marital relations, Duwes depicted Mary further commenting that Sydnor's retirement to a sickbed should have resulted in him 'visiting' his wife (Mary) 'oftener' rather than in absenting himself 'specially beyng so nygh of her'. Leaving aside the unsettling portrayal of a pre-teen girl flirting with a servant old enough to suffer from gout, this exchange was likely intended to showcase Mary's wit and facility with word play more than her pubescent sexuality.

Duwes depicted Mary archly continuing the exchange by commanding that Sydnor 'declare me what it is of loue/ for ye be a doctour and well lettred/ with that that a good husbande ought to teche his wyfe'. What undercuts the age situation in Duwes' portrayal was not only the word play and classical allusions that liberally pepper this lengthy exchange between the princess and her treasurer but also the seeming inversion generated by social station. The young Mary was the "fair lady" accepting homage from a lovesick "knight" in name only. While Mary's gender is acknowledged in this long disquisition on the nature of love, she was not depicted according to the contemporary notions of universal womanhood. Duwes here was not presenting a gendered advice manual similar to Juan Luis Vives, *On the Education of a Christian Woman*.[45] Rather, Mary had issued a command to Sydnor whom Duwes depicted as responding

---

[44] The following description of and all quotations from Mary and Sydnor's conversation is all from Duwes, Bb2^{r-v}

[45] J.L. Vives, *A very frutefull and pleasant boke called the Instructio[n] of a Christen woma[n]*. . .(2nd edition) [London, 1529]

to her order promptly 'nat be wyllyng to disobey you'. Although Mary was playing the role of 'wyfe', she was not adhering to the subordinate status wives were supposed to adopt towards their husbands advocated in contemporary prescriptive literature.[46] No matter what games she played or roles she assumed, the princess never forgot her station nor allowed others to forget it.

Duwes depiction of Mary's combining the officially subordinate role of wife with that of rulership anticipated John Aylmer's much later defence of female sovereignty. Refuting John Knox's charge in *First Blast Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* [1558] that the divinely-ordained subordination of wives to their husbands was incompatible with a married woman wielding sovereign authority since a wife would not even possess sufficient authority to command her husband, Aylmer pointed out that a married female sovereign could command her husband by virtue of her 'office'.[47] In other words, socio-political hierarchy could overturn the 'natural' order of things on occasion. Duwes shared Aylmer's view that marriage need not compromise a woman's ability to govern. Later, the marriage settlement between Queen Mary and her real husband, Philip of Spain would protect her sovereign prerogative.[48] Mary would employ the language of subjection towards Philip as Duwes portrayed her doing with Sydnor but in both instances Mary's explicit consciousness of her rank destabilized the rhetoric of subjection.

---

[46] A representative example would be W. Gouge, *Of domesticall duties. . .* (2nd edition) [London, 1622]

[47] John Aylmer, *An harborovve for faithfull and trevve subiectes agaynst the late blowne blaste . . .*[London, 1559] set forth this argument at length, see C4^{v}, G1^{r}-3^{r}

[48] For extended discussion on contemporary views on female sovereignty and marriage, see J. M. Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1997): 895-924 Glyn Redworth argues that Philip was able to exercise considerable political influence in " 'Matters Impertinent to Women': Male and Female Monarchy under Philip and Mary", *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 112, No. 447 (Jun., 1997): 597-613

IV

The exchange with Sydnor on the nature of love was not the only instance that Duwes depicted Mary as well aware of the privileges 'due and requisite' to her as princess. When her almoner, Peter Burrell, absented himself from her table one night, the young Mary reminded him that he was promised 'a good benefyce' by Henry VIII and queen Catherine if Burrell would help Mary to attain fluency in French.[49] Duwes depicted Mary as anxious to immerse herself in the language by speaking it at dinner with Burrell to supplement her lessons with Duwes. Mary linked Burrell's receipt of the benefice to her favorable report to her parents on how Burrell was (or was not) helping her to learn French. Duwes depicted Mary as drily noting that, under the circumstances, Burrell could not afford to neglect her dinner table since her progress in French, 'of the whiche me thynketh that ye ought to do some by dylygence', will determine how favorably Mary reports to her royal parents and, thus, whether Burrell will obtain the benefice.[50]

Throughout the manual, Duwes portrayed Mary's household staff as adhering to the Instructions to behave always towards Mary 'with reverence. . . as to so great a princess doeth appertaine'.[51] Duwes depicted a literary court culture in which Mary's servants addressed her in

---

[49] Duwes, Aa4^{v}

[50] Duwes., Bb1^{r}

[51] BL Cotton Vitellius, C.i., fol.8r

highly reverential terms: 'most soverayn', 'right hygh/right excellent. . .My right redouted lady/ my lady Mary of England/my lady and mastresse', and 'Trewly madame there is nothyng in my power that I ne dyd for the honour of you' being some of the more ornate declarations.[52] These highly deferential forms of address are sprinkled throughout the manual and echo some of injunctions of the king's instructions that Mary's staff treat her reverently. As the rest of the essay will detail, there was a great deal of agreement amongst Mary's contemporaries that Mary had attained, in 1525, a status as the *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales that merited the panegyric forms of address found in Duwes' manual.

Duwes' manual was not the only indication that Mary, as *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales, had acquired a special status that heralded her suitability for future sovereign rule. In the Additional manuscript collection in the British library, there survives a poem signed by William Newman and dated by him to 1525.[53] It has been bound in vellum with documents contemporary to the fifteenth century. However, the poem clearly centers on Mary as the *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales or, as the poem referred to her 'of rose and pomegranate [sic] the redolent princesse'.[54] According to the poem, Mary's noble bloodline, deriving from the Spanish and English Royal houses, rendered her worthy to one day rule 'the state Imperyall' of England.[55] Not only did Newman consider her worthy by blood and nature to rule but he noted that she was serving her political apprenticeship in Welsh marches as 'cheff governure betwene

---

[52] Duwes, U3^{r-v}, U4^{r}, Aa2^{v}, and Aa4^{v}

[53] BL Additional 11, 814, fols. 26v-29r

[54] BL Additional 11, 814, fols. 26v-29r

[55] BL Additional 11, 814, fol. f.27r

strange realmys'.[56] Indeed, the poem was likely intended to mark the commencement of Mary's tour of duty in the Marches.

Mary's tour of duty ended in 1528. Yet there were interesting legacies and echoes of her time there, which persisted up to the start of her, reign in 1553. The culture of reverence specified in the Instructions for Mary's 1525 household, as seen in the works by Duwes and also by Newman, was evidently a feature of Mary's later households. In 1536, one of Mary's attendants, Lady Anne Hussey, was arrested and interrogated by the state for referring to Mary as "princess" after Mary had been forced to yield the title to her half-sister Elizabeth.[57] Her privy council continued to operate under the title "the princes[s'] council" until 1536 when it assumed the title more in keeping with its function, the Council of the Marches.[58] Furthermore, at least one member of Mary's 1525 household continued to receive wages as such until 1532.[59] Evidently, the official story was that Mary's household was only in temporary abeyance. In fact, Mary's household accounts from 1536-1543 indicate that she received the Welsh symbol of leek on the Welsh holiday of St. David's.[60] Most worrisome from Henry VIII's viewpoint was that a yeoman of his own guard presented Mary with the leek in March 1536, a few months before the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' rebellion[61] One of the more surprising evocations of young Mary's Welsh household comes from a poem celebrating Catherine of Aragon as *The Second Grisild* [1553]

---

[56] BL Additional 11, 814, fol. 27v

[57] BL Cotton Otho X, fols. 260r-262v

[58] *LP*, V, no.99; quoted in *Tudor Wales*, eds. T.Herbert, G.E. Jones, [Wales UP, 1988]:147

[59] BL Stowe 141, f.13r; D.M. Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* [Oxford, 1989]: 46–74

[60] Madden, *The Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary*, pp. 61, 152

[61] Madden, *The Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary*, p. 61

penned by William Forrest in which he refers to Catherine pining for Mary in 1525 when the latter was at Ludlow ruling her court in Ludlow as a 'sovereign princess'.[62]

Given that the memory of Mary's household lingered until 1553, the vice-regal council continued to govern Wales in her name until 1536, she retained the estates of Bromfield, Yale and Chirkland - part of the landed endowment traditionally granted to male Princes of Wales - until 1529, and that one of her former attendants Anne Hussey (who was also, significantly, wife to one of the noble figureheads of the 'Pilgrimage of Grace') could not break the habit of reverence towards Mary, it is hardly surprising that the rebels in the 1536 'Pilgrimage of Grace' regarded Mary as a credible successor to the throne. Traditionally, the demand by the rebels for Mary's restoration to the succession has been viewed as part of a package of demands to restore the socio-economic-religious and political apparatus in place before Henry VIII's and the Reformation Parliament's break with the Roman Catholic church.

I suggest here a supplementary consideration may have played a role in this particular demand. As the daughter of the discarded queen, Catherine of Aragon, Mary was, in 1536, undoubtedly a nostalgic symbol of the old order. But there is, perhaps, a case to be made for taking Robert Aske at his word when he stated, under interrogation, that he believed that Mary's restoration to the succession was the best means to prevent an 'alien' (Scottish) succession to the crown after Henry VIII's death. Rather than indulging in nostalgic wishful thinking, Aske may have been making a practical assessment of the political situation as it existed in the autumn and winter of 1536. Mary had been groomed for sovereign rule as a *de facto* Prince(ss) of Wales.

---

[62] W. Forrest, *The History of Grisild the Second: A Narrative, In verse, of the Divorce of Queen Katharine of Aragon* (1558), ed. W. D. Macray [London, 1875]: 86

Her household had functioned as a court characterized by an erudite, humanist, literary culture of reverence towards herself as evidenced by Duwes' French manual, the poem by Newman and the crown Instructions for her household staff. The resonances of this household and its reverential culture centered on Mary persisted long after she left the marches as evidenced by Anne Hussey's arrest, the continued payment of wages to her Welsh household staff until 1532 and William Forrest's poem. Aske may have been shrewdly gambling that no foreign national, even an adult male Scottish king, could command more loyalty within the English polity than the "redolent" Mary whether officially demoted or not. Jane Grey and the duke of Northumberland may have done well to remember in 1553 what Aske and the 'Pilgrimage' rebels knew in 1536 - that when it came to a choice amongst various candidates for the throne, be they adult male kings (James V) or the designated heirs of dead kings (Grey), that the English polity would support the rights of the person who had already served a political apprenticeship on Welsh marches and so was ready to assume the sovereign reins of power: Mary Tudor, the redolent 'sovereign princess'.

When Mary acceded to the throne in 1553, she was already an experienced ruler. She had recently been overlord to the tenants and clients associated with the Howard affinity in East Anglia. It was this affinity, which had served as her core support in her successful campaign to repel the challenge posed by Jane Grey and John Dudley, duke of Northumberland. Like her half-sister, Elizabeth, before her accession, too had acted as overlord to her tenants and clients associated with her landed patrimony., Unlike Mary, Elizabeth had never presided over a vice-regal court. This may, perhaps, account for their different governing styles, aside obviously from personality differences. Mary was used to commanding her household officers as a 'great

princess' and so it appears she expected absolute obedience from her privy councilors and subjects. Whereas Elizabeth was lucky as a teenager to furnish her household from things that Mary had turned down, had trouble securing legal title to her primary residence (Hatfield), securely holding her borders, and was unable to maintain her household with her landed revenues.[63] When she came to throne in 1558, Elizabeth was not nearly as regal and autocratic a figure as Mary had been and this may have resulted in a greater willingness to take advice and consult her subjects on issues such as her marriage. This argument cannot be pushed too far since there were many variables involved but one variable that should be considered when trying to comprehend the difference between England's first two crowned female monarchs is their pre-accession careers as heads of household: Elizabeth was an underfunded and underage landowner overshadowed until November 17th, 1558 by her half-sister Mary who had spent most of her life as a sovereign princess.

[63] For discussions of Mary's larger patrimony and allocation of royal furnishings as well as Elizabeth's problems retaining Hatfield and her lands, see McIntosh, *From Heads of Household to Heads of State. . .*, pp.51, 120,126-144 [First edition]