

# Introduction

There is something about Mary that has stubbornly resisted the best efforts of scholars over the last three decades to offer a more balanced historical account of her life and achievements. The fundamental problem is that her reign is deeply intertwined with two stories that are fundamental to English national identity and history: the Reformation and the British Empire. On one hand, penal laws introduced against Catholics during Elizabeth's reign and not repealed until the nineteenth century, and the direct military threat to her from the papacy, produced religious polemic and political propaganda that forged a powerful and lasting association between the patriotic and the anti-papal and anti-Catholic, which has shaded all too easily into the anti-Spanish and anti-Marian.<sup>1</sup> Linda Porter's lively biography concludes that the 'blackening of Mary's name began in Elizabeth's reign and gathered force at the end of the seventeenth century, when James II compounded the view that Catholic monarchs were a disaster for England. But it was really the enduring popularity of John Foxe which shaped the view of her that has persisted for 450 years... vilification of Mary has obscured the many areas of continuity between her rule and those of the other Tudors.'<sup>2</sup> Spain was the country that came to embody this objectionable papistry most fully; at the forefront of converting millions in the New World, its monarchs 'Catholic', presenting the greatest direct military threat to England – embodied in the attempted invasion by the Armada in 1588 – and less independent from Rome than France, while many other parts of Europe were riven by their own sectarian conflicts. The Black Legend of an intellectually enervated, repressive and superstitious religion underlying the tyrannous and cruel oppression of indigenous peoples around the world under the Spanish Empire first emerged in England towards the end of Elizabeth's reign and was consolidated in the eighteenth century, when Britain justified its own imperial adventures through negative exemplification, in contrast to Spain.<sup>3</sup>

English Protestants and nineteenth century English liberals gladly accepted the 'Black Legend', depicting Philip as a 'monster iniquity', which had been created by William the Silent's *Apologia* (1580). This hostile presentation of Philip can be traced in all the Protestant historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and then in Robert Watson's *History of the Reign of Philip II* (1777) and through the influential works of the nineteenth century such as those of J. A. Froude, J. L. Motley and W. H. Prescott.<sup>4</sup>

The problem with Mary is in many ways a problem with Philip. It is true that '[b]ecause of her marriage to the Spanish Habsburg Philip, Mary also became the godmother of the association between popery and arbitrary (foreign) power', but this *ex post facto* construction dates from long after their reign.<sup>5</sup> The Marian period thus has the misfortune of lying right across the two major fault lines in England's story; an indigenous religion recognised in the creation of a national Protestant church and divergence from European historical tradition.

The culturally inflected nature of Mary I's historical reputation is nowhere more apparent than in the contrast between her place in British history and in other European traditions. Perhaps unsurprisingly, in Spain, whose capital has a tube station named after her (no such honour is accorded her here), she is renowned as pious and wise, something underlined by the assertion in María Jesús Pérez Martín's 2008 biography that she was 'the most majestic of English queens'.<sup>6</sup> The frame for understanding her as a historical figure is apparent from chapter headings that take us from her 'duro calvario' to 'Gólgota', echoing Christ's passion, reinforcing her saintliness and the providential significance of her sufferings. While this work is overly reliant on nineteenth-century sources like Agnes Strickland's *Lives of the Queens of England*, it does make an important contribution to rehabilitating Mary, exposing the 'systematic blackening of the memory of the deceased'; Pérez Martín hopes the biography will 'break down the wall of hate erected against Mary Tudor'.<sup>7</sup> In his follow-up to his Yale biography, part of Penguin's Monarchs series, John Edwards expresses the hope (like Pérez Martín) that Mary's motto, *veritas temporis filia* [truth is the daughter of time], will prove prophetic in her case and that the truth about this queen will out, despite centuries of accretions, building on the efforts of her half-sister's Protestant establishment to entomb her within their religiously inspired opprobrium.<sup>8</sup> Pérez Martín is clear that Mary was forced to combat 'the fanaticism and intransigence of radical Reformers' from the first and is still locked in that conflict; a reversal of the familiar tale.<sup>9</sup>

Just how religiously controversial the events of the Tudor period carried on being into the twentieth century can be judged from the fact that as late as 1970 members of the British Council of Protestant Churches, led by their general secretary, the Reverend Brian Green, mounted a protest against a public act of penance by 300 Catholics for the burning of Protestants under

Mary, despite the fact that they were joined by 200 Anglican counterparts in a gesture of reconciliation. Green apparently stated that '[r]eparation towards the dead is not sufficient. Reparation toward God is needed. In other words, the Roman Catholic Church has not changed its doctrines.'<sup>10</sup> Indeed, in popular culture these negative, anti-Catholic associations abound to this day. In a review of Trevor Nunn's film *Lady Jane* (1985), starring Helena Bonham-Carter, one reviewer described Mary as 'Edward's half-wit sister', picking up on Geoffrey Elton's infamous assessment of the first Tudor regnant queen as rather stupid.<sup>11</sup> More recently, in Shekhar Kapur's two films on 'good queen Bess', *Elizabeth* (1998) and *Elizabeth: the Golden Age* (2007) – some of the most widely disseminated public representations of Tudor history – the image of Mary and Philip reinforces many of the myths that recent historical work has overturned. Their varying historiographical fortunes are encoded aesthetically in casting Kathy Burke as Mary I, opposite Cate Blanchett's Elizabeth. In the first film, a hysterical and neurotic Mary moves around a dark, torch-lit world, with her brooding, uncomfortable consort clearly disinterested in her. This reflects the claim made by Sir Francis Hastings in 1598, in *A Watchword to all religious true hearted Englishmen*, that the marriage 'could not drawe the least sparke of true loue from him to this noble Queene, who so louingly made choice of him to be her husband'.<sup>12</sup> Mary is still seen largely as a tragic figure, on the basis of the idea that Philip was unenthusiastic about their marriage and for this reason largely absent. The BBC History website describes her as '[c]hildless, sick and deserted by Philip'.<sup>13</sup> The problem is that there is no evidence to support this idea. The representation of Philip by Jordi Mollà in the second film is very much in keeping with the idea of the king blinded by religious zealotry, but as John Guy, for example, has argued, the Philip of this period was a Renaissance prince, rather than the Counter-Reformation fundamentalist of legend, an impression confirmed in Geoffrey Parker's recent biographies. Although of a precocious religiosity, all the evidence supports a vision of a pragmatic and tolerant ruler, sensitive to the problems presented by cultural and religious difference, who for a year between 1550 and 1551 'ate and drank, danced and josted, hunted and talked with Lutherans, and his surviving letters to Lutheran rulers from this period exude warmth'.<sup>14</sup> In representations of the reign in the half-century after its end, there is little of the image that has come down to us. In plays by Thomas Heywood (*If you know not me you know nobody* (1605)) and Thomas Dekker, John Webster (*Sir Thomas Wyatt* (1607)), it is Philip who saves Elizabeth from Stephen Gardiner's plot to have her put to death. Mary is represented in the latter play with a nun's wimple, praying:

I haue forsaken for a rich prayer Booke.  
The Golden Mines of wealthy India, ...

This little volume inclosed in this hand,  
Is richer then the Empire of this land.<sup>15</sup>

The sacramental focus of her piety positioned her deliberately in relation to the critical doctrinal issue underlying the Reformation.<sup>16</sup> The personal and theological were inextricably intertwined for Mary, who was the more intransigent, principled and less pragmatic of the two monarchs, although not noted for her piety until after 1547 and the persecution she suffered under Edward.<sup>17</sup> Criticising her zealous religiosity only makes sense because she chose the ‘wrong’ religion. Moreover, these criticisms were not true of either monarch in this period. The most striking example of the persistence of negative judgements of Mary is the London Dungeon’s exhibition ‘Bloody Mary: Killer Queen’, complete with the smell of burning flesh, whose advertising was actually banned for being too frightening: depicting a seated queen who transforms into a screeching zombie. By contrast, in Radio Televisión Española’s major series *Carlos Rey Emperador* (2015), continuation of the hugely successful *Isabel* (2012), Mary I, played by Ángela Cremonte, is presented as self-possessed and powerful, the political and aesthetic equal of her husband. The series reflects the uncomfortable confusion of the sexual and political in dynastic politics and explores a series of questionable commonplaces from the writing about their co-monarchy, from his unhappiness with the marriage contract to her unreciprocated devotion to him.<sup>18</sup>

Much recent writing on Mary has returned to critique the judgements of nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians that have led here, but seem to continue to haunt the present, without our being able to fully exorcise them.<sup>19</sup> More sympathetic assessments of Marian England originally appeared in the nineteenth century, from the Catholic John Lingard and Agnes Strickland, the latter denounced as a ‘papistical sympathiser’.<sup>20</sup> Lingard, the first historian to consult original documents in Simancas and the Vatican, is simultaneously and unsurprisingly sceptical about the notions of an indigenous antique church, a papacy encroaching on English sovereignty and the Reformation as a movement of national liberation, characteristic of mainstream historical tradition. The tendency to study British history in contrast to European history has entrenched the nationalist and isolationist bias implicit in Protestant historiography. Lingard and Strickland overturned the image of Mary I as a cruel tyrant (Bloody Mary). But to explain without condoning the burnings, they emphasised her personal misfortunes and minimised her agency. James Anthony Froude’s characterisation of Mary’s rule as a ‘barren interlude’ has been perhaps the most influential of all. As late as 1970, E. H. Harbison concurred: the ‘reign of Mary has been called a “barren interlude” in Tudor history, and so it undoubtedly was’.<sup>21</sup> Froude’s Mary was hysterically deranged

if not mad, desolated by Philip's departure and her failed pregnancies.<sup>22</sup> At the beginning of the twentieth century Albert Pollard, influenced by Froude, wrote '[s]terility was the conclusive note of Mary's reign':

in default of royal or ministerial leadership there could only be stagnation... the whole nation malingered in diverse degrees. Debarred from the paths it wished to pursue, it would not follow in Mary's wake. A blight had fallen on national faith and confidence, and Israel took to its tents.<sup>23</sup>

He claimed 'a dim consciousness that their affairs were being administered, and their resources exploited, in Philip's interests estranged the English people from the Spaniards and from Mary's rule': in spite of attempts to prevent 'Philip from converting his titular dignity to anti-national purposes... no safeguards could control Mary's affection for her Lord, or compel her to follow the wishes of her privy council'.<sup>24</sup> For the first time since 'England had attained to national consciousness', it was controlled by a foreigner.<sup>25</sup> As we will see, the issue of whether Philip obtained real power and authority in England goes on being controversial. There is a delicious irony in the fact that it was precisely Froude's historical judgement of Philip II as 'the personification of the intolerant spirit of Catholic Europe' that provoked Julian Juderías at the beginning of the twentieth century to write the book often taken to have coined the term 'Black Legend': 'the iniquitous legend created around Philip II seems fine to him [Froude], because it is aimed at discrediting Catholicism'.<sup>26</sup> The image of an emotionally hysterical queen beset by tragedy exculpates the Tudor monarch, in order to reassign agency and blame to Catholics and foreigners.

Froude's and Pollard's language closely echoed each other's, in its providentialism and imagery of infertility. The judgement that in terms of our nation's destiny 'Mary's reign had been a palpable failure' relies on seeing the Reformation as a form of manifest destiny.<sup>27</sup> According to these whiggish interpretations, 'Mary represented the failed past, while the Protestant Henry VIII and Elizabeth I stood for the glorious future'.<sup>28</sup> In 1950, Stanley Bindoff judged the Marian 'interlude': '[p]olitically bankrupt, spiritually impoverished, economically anarchic, and intellectually enervated, Marian England awaited the day of its deliverance'.<sup>29</sup> Geoffrey Elton's assessment of Mary in 1977 was no better, describing her as 'arrogant, assertive, bigoted, stubborn, suspicious and (not to put too fine a point upon it) rather stupid... devoid of political skill, unable to compromise, set only on the wholesale reversal of a generation's history'.<sup>30</sup> For him it was truly a barren interlude: 'positive achievements there were none'.<sup>31</sup> In their major reassessment of the mid-Tudor period in 1980, Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler described the reign of Mary I as bedevilled by 'the liberal and Protestant shibboleths of

the Asquithean era'.<sup>32</sup> Despite the wealth of subsequent academic scholarship 'the basically Whiggish and ultimately Protestant view of things is still a potent influence', albeit in diluted, residual and secularised form.<sup>33</sup> The trouble with Mary and what makes the Marian period fascinating are two sides of the same coin.<sup>34</sup> The official view of the British past is built around an understanding of the Reformation in which Mary is necessarily antipathetic; an investment in the image of the Tudors riding on the back of popular anti-clericalism and turning their backs on a papacy which had systematically encroached and trespassed on the liberties and independence of the English church and state during the medieval period. The concept of the Reformation as a movement of national liberation, restoring England to an original sovereign independence and laying the foundations for the nation's 'divinely appointed role as the "elect nation", destined to lead Protestantism in the old world of Europe and in the new world of the widespread colonies abroad', makes any recuperation of Mary atavistic.<sup>35</sup> Many scholars have begun to question this picture and, while there is still a certain cautiousness about lauding England's first regnant queen, the woman who blazed a trail for her half-sister, that achievement is increasingly recognised.

Mary's childlessness was linked from the period itself to the Catholic restoration, stillborn as a result of her death.<sup>36</sup> Eamon Duffy has criticised the connection of Mary's 'bitter preoccupation with the past and her tragic sterility', which rest on the notion of the Catholic church as 'backward-looking, unimaginative and reactionary'.<sup>37</sup> In polemic and anti-monarchical writing, Mary's gender and natural body were consistently attacked. Anthony Gilby, in *Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to repentance* (Geneva: 1558), claimed that England had been desolated by 'one crafty Gardiner, whose name was Stephen, having wolf-like condition, [who] did maintain many a wolf, did sow a wicked seed in the garden, and cherished many weeds to deface the vineyard. And his said Marie, who after was his mistress, now married to Philip'.<sup>38</sup> In the first year of her reign she had been subject to rumours that she was carrying Gardiner's illegitimate child.<sup>39</sup> Arguments that in marrying Mary gave up her most powerful propaganda tool, chastity, and exposed herself to vilification on the grounds of her sexuality, are highly paradoxical, apparent from their being supported by noting the invocation of her purity by her supporters in the absence of alternative 'Catholic' female iconography: 'long after her marriage, Marian propaganda still needed to hark back to a lost virginity', on her death 'the poet George Cavendish still praised her accession as a virgin':<sup>40</sup>

To a virgin's life which liked thee best  
 Professed was thine heart, when moved with zeal

And tears of subjects expressing request,  
 For no lust but love for the common weal,  
 Virginitie's vow thou diddest repeal.<sup>41</sup>

In Pole's oration at Westminster prior to the reunification with Rome, the legate described how Mary 'being a virgin, helples, naked, and unarmed prevailed, and had victory over tyrantes'.<sup>42</sup> Mary's image has always been caught uncomfortably between the poles of the virginal and saintly and the dangerously sexualised. The housewifely or matronly has been almost entirely displaced by the image of an unnatural stepmother or a sexual betrayer and whore. Even the biblical and mythological figures with which she was compared by the Genoese community in London at the time of her coronation, Judith, Tomyris and Pallas Athene, were ambivalent sexually, either aggressive viragos or symbolic, as the tag beneath Pallas Athene on the triumphal arch stated, of 'invincible manly virtue'. Seeing Mary's childlessness as the key to her failure is not without irony. She is most often denigrated through on-going and wilfully unfavourable comparison to her sister Elizabeth, who similarly failed to provide an heir, but is not cast as a failure as a queen: 'virginal Elizabeth and her impenetrable realm become naturalized as the satisfying consequence of, as well as contrast to, Catholic decay, which was fated to be superseded'.<sup>43</sup> Anna Whitelock's sympathetic biography begins with the emblem of Mary and Elizabeth's joint tomb in Westminster Abbey, '[p]artners both in throne and grave, here rest we two sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, in the hope of one resurrection', noting how symbolically Mary is buried beneath: for Whitelock she was 'a complex figure of immense courage and resolve'.<sup>44</sup> At the outset of her reign Elizabeth's virginity was more likely to have been seen as monstrous and anomalous, because in Tudor times marriage was considered to be the natural state for non-religious women. Mary, more than Elizabeth, can be rightly celebrated for her chastity and virginity, qualities highly prized in women in the era. A whiff of scandal surrounded Elizabeth on more than one occasion. It is clear the moniker acquired in her later years, the Virgin Queen, would have appeared risible in the 1550s. As Paulina Kewes has shown, there were many continuities between the reigns of the Tudor half-sisters,<sup>45</sup> not least in their struggles to find an iconography of female power to legitimate their rule. The very different expectations in England and Spain of female rule and rulers may, then as now, have muddied the waters about how the marriage should be read. Spain had the outstanding example of a regnant queen in Mary's grandmother, Isabel la Católica, as well as a long history of regnant and ruling queens, and female members of the royal dynasty pressed into service to govern distinct territories in the absence of male dynasts; from Philip's sister Juana, who ruled Spain in his absence, having been recalled weeks after being widowed

and giving birth to her first child, to Charles' aunt, Margaret of Austria, and sister, Mary of Hungary. Isabel's marriage to Ferdinand II of Aragón was consciously emulated in the contract and treaty of Philip and Mary.<sup>46</sup> By 1523, the dynastic problem that would assail England for the rest of the sixteenth century, brought to an end only with the accession of the Stuarts in 1603, was clear: Catherine's inability to give Henry a longed-for, legitimate male heir. Catherine responded by preparing her daughter Mary for rule, commissioning humanist educational treatises from her countryman Juan Luis Vives.

David Loades, the most important modern historian of Marian England, someone whose many works necessarily influence anyone writing on this subject, agrees that 'the picture painted by Froude and endorsed by Pollard was a grotesque caricature'.<sup>47</sup> But he remains 'unrepentantly sceptical of the attempts which are sometimes made to claim that Mary's death at the relatively early age of forty-three deprived England of a great catholic queen'.<sup>48</sup> The grounds for his position are that her reign 'did not command the same consensus of support as that of Elizabeth – or even the level achieved by Henry in the last years of his life'.<sup>49</sup> The comparison to two monarchs who reigned for over three decades is telling, however. Who would doubt that Mary would have forged doggedly ahead into old age, had disease not cut her reign short? A growing number of scholars have offered more positive readings. John Edwards, whose brilliant biography has restored Mary and her reign to its European context, both in a political and a religious sense, making fuller use than anyone previously of Spanish archives and sources, concludes that 'her personal and specific contributions to her country's history went well beyond institutional efficiency and continuity... she was an active cultural patron... gave vital help to Oxford and Cambridge... and although her restoration of the link with Rome seemed to end with her death, it has never left the ecclesiastical, or even secular, agenda'.<sup>50</sup> Most importantly, he recognises that the marriage was 'an epoch-making strategic alliance for England, with a major European power'.<sup>51</sup> England's profound entanglement with Spain throughout the sixteenth century, for better or for worse, hinges on this alliance.

The visual emblem that perhaps best summarises the argument of this book is the *Queen Mary Atlas*, produced by Diogo Homem in 1558–9, probably commissioned by Mary for Philip, to appeal to his well-known fascination for geography. The Iberian peninsula and British Isles are depicted together on the opening map. To the left of the Tudor armorial device a blank space lies, where Philip's coat of arms has been scratched off (see Plate 1).<sup>52</sup> Mary's premature death forced Homem to rededicate the atlas to another royal patron, but its original context is clear. This historical vandalism is the first act in a centuries-long campaign to obscure the Spanish marriage and erase the memory of England's Spanish king. It is a palimpsest of the attempt to set England apart



from Europe and its Spanish past. The atlas contains a unique depiction of Pizarro's soldiers in Peru, and across its pages consistently emphasises Spain's global importance, undermining Portuguese claims to the Spice Islands in the far east by prominently situating Spain's coat of arms there. France is depicted surmounted by an open, non-imperial crown, dismembered in accordance with the belligerent objectives of the Anglo-Spanish axis that declared war in 1557.<sup>53</sup>

David Loades wrote in a review of historiography and research on the period: 'Philip as king of England remains a shadowy figure, and his relationship with Mary appears less straightforward the more it is investigated'.<sup>54</sup> The marriage of Philip and Mary has been interpreted by historians as underlying her ultimate failure as a queen: the 'Spanish marriage was unpopular' and 'did nothing to help Mary'; although royal authority weathered this particular storm and proved 'effective even in the hands of a woman of no political experience', 'the extent to which her Catholicism was an asset or liability will continue to be debated'.<sup>55</sup> This book aims to open up a space for alternative interpretations of the Spanish marriage, not by making a claim for its unqualified success, but rather by showing the fundamental lack of evidence for judging it, as all too often it has been judged, in personal terms.

In terms of contemporary expectations of dynastic alliances, and given the European political context, it is hard to see the alliance as anything other than a success. Panegyric and pamphlets about the marriage swept Europe in a slew of celebratory publications that outshone anything produced for a domestic audience. Importantly, according to a wealth of recent research, far from failing 'to discover the Counter Reformation', 'the Marian church "invented" it'.<sup>56</sup> Clerical education and recruitment, restocking parishes and churches with liturgical objects, preaching, along with a 'formidable body of catechetical and hortatory material making a positive case for catholicism' made considerable strides towards the wholesale reversal of the previous twenty years' radical religious changes and were fundamentally reflective of what most people wanted.<sup>57</sup> Remarkable work has been done on the hugely influential figure of Bartolomé Carranza, who composed a monumental new catechism with which to complete the re-Catholicisation of England. It is telling that the Great Bible of 1539 was never officially withdrawn and remained in parishes throughout the period.<sup>58</sup> Repugnant as the burnings were, although perhaps inevitable in the Europe of the period (Philip's government in the Low Countries burned a similar number over a slightly longer period), even they achieved the policy's intention, with the numbers defiantly refusing to conform, especially among social elites, tailing off by the end of the reign.<sup>59</sup> Two further books on the Marian church demonstrate how fruitful an area for recent research this area has been.<sup>60</sup> The epithet 'bloody' was not applied to Mary until 1658, of course,

a century after her death, and only gained currency in the reigns of Charles II and James II.<sup>61</sup> One of the most positive aspects of reconsiderations of her reign is the move away from the dour and isolated figure towards the enthusiastic hunter, dancer, lover of cards and gambling, jewellery and fine clothes, the accomplished musician and linguist, the humanist engaged in theological discussion with intellectuals at her court such as Cardinal Reginald Pole. At least in popular culture, Mary will probably go on being someone we love to hate, a villain. But this tells us more about historical writing and its relationship to national identity than it does about her or her reign.<sup>62</sup>

Philip was not an absolutist ruler; rather, he faced the monumental task of ruling a global empire, whose composite monarchies made him more used than English monarchs to negotiating complex legal, political, social and cultural differences. The affability and courtesy that he displayed, judicious use of self-fashioning in portraiture and courtly displays, his clothing, patronage of books, maps and other objects, did win him widespread acceptance, even popularity among his English subjects. The generous pensions he distributed among privy counsellors and went on paying into the Elizabethan period oiled the wheels. One of the central contentions of the argument is that the Hispanophobia that so many have seen as defining the reign was ultimately political, more concerned with jealousy born of intensely personal relationships than some form of patriotic resistance. It was driven by a need to ensure the English part of the new Anglo-Spanish global empire got its fair share. Elizabeth Russell has suggested that in England the ‘allegation of insuperable domestic opposition and strong anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish feeling’ was specifically exploited by Mary to obtain greater concessions from the imperialists over the treaty of alliance, by exaggerating the weakness of her position.<sup>63</sup> We might question similarly how disinterested was what William Paget, First Baron Paget reported to the bishop of Arras, during negotiations in Brussels on 14<sup>th</sup> November 1554, concerning the weakness of the government and divisions in the Council over Pole’s coming to England:

It seemed to him that the only way to correct this evil, given the Queen’s gentle character and inexperience in governing, would be that the King should take over the task himself with the assistance of the best qualified Englishmen in Council... At the same time, it must be remembered that the English had a natural hatred for foreigners and were not without some hostility towards Spaniards. These feelings were much stronger among the people than among the nobility.<sup>64</sup>

This representation was flattering of Philip’s authority, while underlining the need for the best qualified to represent him, presumably including Paget himself. The allegation of xenophobia and hostility to the Spanish was laid at the

door of the people rather than the nobility. But in reality much of the tensions between groups when Philip came to England originated from the precincts of the palace itself. Documents written by Philip himself demonstrate that not only did he have no sinister or hidden intentions but more importantly he felt insulted by the suggestion that *his* wars had resulted in specie being exported from England: 'I did not wish to have a single *real* from this kingdom, but have spent there the amount you well know'.<sup>65</sup> England gained immeasurably from the presence of Philip on her shores, in terms of science and navigation, experiencing cultural marvels from the Tunis tapestries to the paintings of Titian, witnessing the magnificence and style of Europe's most prestigious court as well as providing the military experience of the last major entanglement in a war on the mainland, with the successful siege of Saint Quentin.

John Guy has written recently that far from 'sterility being the keynote of this decade... many fertile and enduring reforms were discussed or initiated in the 1550s. Among the most significant was the switch in the theory of taxation.'<sup>66</sup> In addition one might point to the reform of the navy, overseas exploration, the restoration of the church, the recoinage, a thriving and vibrant court culture and the stability of the regime in the face of both famine and epidemic disease. Mary's own musicianship and patronage of court musicians supported the careers of the most outstanding composers of her age, including Thomas Tallis and William Byrd. Penry Williams has commented, in relation to the debate about Mary's Catholicism, that the 'one thing that can be said with certainty about England in 1558 is that it was not yet Protestant'.<sup>67</sup> Perhaps the most outstanding example of the new vision of Mary, as humanist princess, courageous and successful queen, is Judith Richards' magisterial biography that argues that 'she ruled the country with some success at a very difficult and divided time'.<sup>68</sup> It may or may not be true that '[i]n terms of her own ideas and purposes, Mary Tudor was a failure, and nothing can conceal that fact'.<sup>69</sup> But given what Mary did achieve in the short time given to her, she is a figure who deserves to be celebrated.

Too much of Mary's posthumous reputation has been based on the perceptions and reports of foreign ambassadors; especially the imperial envoy, Simon Renard, who Philip's court sidelined as soon as the match had been concluded.<sup>70</sup> The fact that Renard's intelligence came largely from Mary herself should arouse suspicion. The transition between the reigns of Charles V and Philip II was the central fact of European politics in this period, brilliantly contextualised in Mia Rodríguez Salgado's broad, synoptic study of the polycentric empire.<sup>71</sup> The Habsburgs were well used to balancing the competing demands of their different kingdoms. The multilingual, composite nature of the Habsburg monarchy has furthermore posed linguistic and physical difficulties to scholars working on the period. The sources are dispersed

through archives all over Europe – Brussels, Paris, Vienna, Rome, Madrid, Simancas – leading to a misleading reliance on Victorian translations and summaries of documents calendared by Royall Tyler and others. The danger of this is pointed out in a number of instances where fundamental mistranslations have formed the basis for significant historical distortions.

The Spanish sources for this period suffer by comparison as a result of the loss of Philip's chancellery documents on the return to Spain, meaning that the Spanish side is less well-documented than others. The most frequently used source on the marriage and co-monarchy of Philip and Mary is the group of documents collected together by Cesare Malfatti in *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as related in Four MSS of the Escorial*.<sup>72</sup> These derive from two extant volumes, manuscript copies of contemporary materials that the royal chronicler Florián de Ocampo gathered together during his lifetime; *Noticias de varios sucesos acaecidos, 1521–1558*.<sup>73</sup> Ocampo's function as royal historian included the compilation and gathering together of written records on the events of the day. They date roughly from the time of his release from his ecclesiastical duties in 1555.<sup>74</sup> They provide a fascinating insight into Ocampo's correspondents and sources of information, his prioritisation of materials and equally the problems they posed for him if they were ever to be redeployed in a contemporary imperial chronicle. The miscellanies were interspersed with what look like *relaciones*, brief notices about important events. For the year 1548, there were accounts of the movements of the Turkish fleet, its assault on Malta, letters from Rome, personal letters from courtiers and news from the sessions of the Council of Trent. However, for the historian the more interesting material is that which fills the gaps; highly specific and personal first-hand accounts of a myriad of incidents from the Mediterranean to England, by a set of informants and correspondents, some of whom had Zamoran connections, others of whom had an unknown relationship with Ocampo. His local contacts provided him with rich sources of information. He obtained copies of a letter sent from Vélez-Málaga to the Zamoran *corregidor* Francisco Carrillo, and another from the bishop of Zamora to his brother Alonso del Aguila about his journey to Germany in the company of Maximilian, king of Bohemia, as well as Diego de Azevedo's fascinating account of the arrival and wedding of Philip to Mary for his wife back in Zamora.<sup>75</sup> Azevedo arrived in England before Mary's entry into the city, writing to his wife on 1<sup>st</sup> August from London. His account, found in Ocampo, has not been cited before in any of the major accounts of the marriage. He later served as Philip's *caballerizo mayor* and remained at post in England probably until 1557, when we know he returned to Spain from the last letter in the volume from Hernando Delgadillo, a source in Valladolid, who wrote: 'a post passed through Salamanca with the news of Don Diego de Azevedo's disembarkation; the archbishop of Toledo and Regent Figueroa also

arrived with the fleet'.<sup>76</sup> Ocampo had also managed to acquire transcriptions of letters from Juan de Barahona, now in the library at El Escorial.<sup>77</sup> The second set of sources is reprinted in the great nineteenth century *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España (CODOIN)*.<sup>78</sup> These require an important caveat. They are mostly by Philip's favourites, Ruy Gomez da Silva and Juan de Figueroa, who inevitably provided positive assessments of the king's statesmanship, as power slowly slipped from his father Charles V's grasp. Tensions between the emperor and his son had been apparent for years and this was the moment when Philip began to seize the reins of power. Their highly positive accounts of England need to be read in light of the fact that these men were themselves attempting to displace an old guard of Charles' servants, headed by the duke of Alba, so inevitably underlined their master's political success and competence.

This book emphasises the fundamental nature of commercial and economic links between England and Spain throughout the sixteenth century and how the marriage fitted into a set of strategic interests central to both countries that had been reflected by dynastic marriages stretching back into the medieval period and Eleanor of England's (1161–1214) marriage to Alfonso VIII. In tracing how Philip and Mary's marriage came about, it challenges the notion that Charles' concessions came as a surprise to Philip, given the presence of his familiars and favourites at the courts in Brussels and in London throughout the period of negotiations. Furthermore, the treaty closely followed precedents he and his advisors would have been familiar with. The infamous *ad cautelam* document he drew up as he signed the matrimonial capitulation may have had as much to do with the realistic prospect that he might find himself trapped in an infertile marriage. With only one living heir, he needed a spare. If Mary had lived as long as Elizabeth, their marriage might have lasted over twenty years. This book focuses on the ways in which ceremony and material culture, particularly dress, were used to ameliorate the legitimate anxieties about Philip and Mary's co-monarchy in practice and underline Mary's continuing precedence, contrary to typical expectations of a woman in marriage. Her coronation and accession were hailed by many observers as nothing short of miraculous. Nevertheless, it is clear that she was well prepared to mount a bid for the throne and had been prepared for rule both through her education and early experience, and through being one of the richest magnates and land owners in the realm. The problem of female rule is considered in depth, both in terms of legislation like the 'Act for the Queen's Regal Power' and how aspects of the treaty responded to problems with the political law in relation to women. In terms of dynastic politics, she negotiated for herself a glittering match with the most powerful prince in Europe, in the face of first domestic opposition and then a potentially serious rebellion. The book explores the

analogy between the Wyatt and *comuneros* revolts, both of which produced a rash of political writing around legitimate authority and the limits of royal power. By going back to many of the original Spanish documents, it challenges a series of distortions that have grown up around the marriage and its alleged success or otherwise. Fundamentally, it is demonstrated that there was no abrogation of English sovereignty as a result of the marriage, but that the marriage catalysed an incipient constitutionalism.

Detailed analysis of the provisions of the treaty demonstrates how closely they followed the example set by Philip's grandparents, the Catholic monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella, and how the Marian exiles continued to allege insuperable domestic opposition, based on deep-rooted xenophobia and Hispanophobia. This historiographical assumption is challenged in an exploration of what Englishmen might have thought of the Spanish in 1554, the extent to which the Black Legend had reached their ears from the Low Countries. There is no doubt that Protestants throughout Europe were intensely aware of the reputation of the Spanish kingdoms in both Italy and Germany. Their propaganda repeated verbatim the denunciations by Luther of Charles V's troops in the Holy Roman Empire. This book also unpicks the association between the marriage and malign Catholic and foreign influence. Firstly, it discards the assumption that Catholic restoration was antipathetic to the majority of English subjects, and secondly, it shows that the careful negotiation of reconciliation by Philip meant that the English church's independence from the papacy was assiduously maintained and enshrined in statute and the holders of ecclesiastical property assured in their possession of dissolved monastic lands. Philip and Mary's role in the government of England is analysed to show that both were involved in making fundamental decisions. Mary was not overawed by her husband, nor was Philip uninterested in the government of his newly acquired kingdom. There were numerous startling cultural achievements also associated with the marriage, not least the first Spanish-English language-learning textbook and dictionary.

First and foremost, this book seeks to highlight the positive achievements of the reign and offer a balanced assessment of the glittering dynastic union of England and Spain, which for a time sat at the heart of early modern Europe.

### Notes

- 1 Perhaps the most influential text linking Catholicism and the unproductive in the twentieth century is Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (London: Routledge, 1992).
- 2 Linda Porter, *Mary: The First Queen* (London: Portrait, 2007), p. 418.
- 3 There is a brilliant account of the definition, birth and development of the Black Legend in Italy, the Low Countries and Germany in Antonio Sánchez Jiménez's *Leyenda negra: la batalla*

- sobre la imagen de España en tiempos de Lope de Vega (Madrid: Cátedra, 2016). See the discussion of Robert Watson's *The History of Philip II* (London: Strathan and Cadell, 1777), note 4.
- 4 Edwin Jones, *The English Nation: The Great Myth* (Thrupp: Sutton Publishing, 1998), p. 190.
  - 5 David Loades, *Mary Tudor: The Tragical History of the first Queen of England* (Richmond: The National Archives, 2006), p. 8.
  - 6 María Jesús Pérez Martín, *María Tudor: La gran reina desconocida* (Madrid: Rialp, 2008), pp. 499–500: 'la más majestuosa de las reinas inglesas'.
  - 7 Pérez Martín, *María Tudor*, p. 867: 'sistemático ennegrecimiento de la memoria de la difunta' and 'ayudar a romper ese muro de odio erigido contra María Tudor'.
  - 8 John Edwards, *Mary I: The Daughter of Time* (London: Allen Lane, 2016), p. 79.
  - 9 Pérez Martín, *María Tudor*, p. 510: 'el fanatismo y la intransigencia de los radicales reformistas'.
  - 10 Reported in '300 Catholics make penance for deaths', *Los Angeles Times*, 26<sup>th</sup> January 1970, p. A10.
  - 11 Barbara Lovenheim, 'Nunn's story: a challenge in *Lady Jane*', *Los Angeles Times*, 17<sup>th</sup> February 1985. See Alex von Tunzelman's rightly corruscating review of this 'simpering romance', awarded a D+ for History, *The Guardian*, 26<sup>th</sup> August 2010: [www.theguardian.com/film/2010/aug/26/reel-history-lady-jane-grey](http://www.theguardian.com/film/2010/aug/26/reel-history-lady-jane-grey) [Accessed 30<sup>th</sup> October 2014]. Full quote from Elton is given in the text relating to note 30.
  - 12 Sir Francis Hastings, *A Watchword to all religious true hearted Englishmen* (London: Felix Kingston for Ralph Jackson, 1598), sig. G3r.
  - 13 BBC, 'Mary I (1516–1558)', [www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic\\_figures/mary\\_i\\_queen.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/mary_i_queen.shtml) [Accessed: 30<sup>th</sup> October 2014].
  - 14 Geoffrey Parker, *Imprudent King: A New Life of Philip II* (London: Yale University Press, 2014), p. 40. The other, lengthier tome is *Felipe II: La biografía definitiva* (Madrid: Planeta, 2010).
  - 15 Thomas Dekker and John Webster, *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, ed. John Farmer (Amersham: Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1914), sigs A3r–A4v.
  - 16 On Lord Morley's gift 'An Account of the Miracles Performed by the Holy Eucharist', see Lorraine Attreed and Alexandra Winkler, 'Faith and forgiveness: lessons in statecraft for Queen Mary Tudor', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 36 (2005), 971–89. Also discussed extensively in 'Triumphs of English' Henry Parker, *Lord Morley Translation to the Tudor Court: New Essays in Interpretation*, ed. Marie Axton and James Carley (London: British Library, 2000).
  - 17 John Guy, 'Conference style' review of *Talking Peace 1604* exhibition and Rosemary Mulcahy, *Philip II of Spain: Patron of the Arts*, *Times Literary Supplement*, 10<sup>th</sup> September 2004, p. 17.
  - 18 [www.rtve.es/alacarta/videos/carlos-rey-emperador/carlos-rey-cap16/3455288/](http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/videos/carlos-rey-emperador/carlos-rey-cap16/3455288/) [Accessed: 5<sup>th</sup> February 2019].
  - 19 See Anna Whitelock, 'Mary Tudor: the first queen of England' in Liz Oakley-Brown and Louise Wilkinson, eds, *The Rituals and Rhetoric of Queenship: Medieval to Early Modern* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2009), pp. 59–60; Thomas Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary: perceptions of Mary Tudor from the Restoration to the twentieth century' and Judith Richards, 'Reassessing Mary Tudor: some concluding points' in Susan Doran and Thomas Freeman, eds, *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 91–100 and 206–24.
  - 20 Richards, 'Reassessing Mary Tudor', p. 207.
  - 21 E. H. Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1940, repr. 1970), Preface, p. vii.
  - 22 J. A. Froude, *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (London: Continuum, 2009), p. 15. Consternation at the nineteenth-century Catholic revival influenced his writing; see Ciaran Brady, *James Anthony Froude: An Intellectual Biography of a Victorian Prophet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
  - 23 A. F. Pollard, *The History of England From the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547–1603)*, *The Political History of England*, 12 vols (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1915), vol. 6, p. 172.
  - 24 Pollard, *The History of England*, vol. 6, p. 158.
  - 25 Pollard, *The History of England*, vol. 6, p. 158.
  - 26 Julián Juderías, *La Leyenda Negra: Estudios acerca del concepto de España en el extranjero* (Madrid:

- Editora Nacional, 1960), p. 234: 'la personificación del intolerante espíritu de la Europa Católica' or 'la leyenda inicua creada en torno a Felipe II le parece bien, porque va encaminada a desprestigiar al catolicismo'.
- 27 Pollard, *The History of England*, vol. 6, p. 173.
  - 28 Jones, *English Nation/Great Myth*, p. 226.
  - 29 S. T. Bindoff, *Tudor England* (London: Penguin, 1950), p. 182.
  - 30 Geoffrey Elton, *Reform and Reformation: England 1509–1558* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), p. 376.
  - 31 Geoffrey Elton, *England under the Tudors* (London: Longman, 1964), p. 214.
  - 32 Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler, eds, *The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540–1560* (London: Macmillan, 1980), p. 1.
  - 33 Jones, *English Nation/Great Myth*, p. 239.
  - 34 Elizabeth Russell, 'Mary Tudor and Mr Jorkins', *Historical Research* 63 (1990), 263–76, p. 263.
  - 35 Jones, *English Nation/Great Myth*, p. 192.
  - 36 Thomas Betteridge, 'Maids and wives: representing female rule during the reign of Mary Tudor', in Doran and Freeman, eds, *Mary Tudor*, p. 139.
  - 37 *London Review of Books*, 7<sup>th</sup> February 2008, p. 27.
  - 38 Anthony Gilby, *Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to repentance* (Geneva: 1558), sigs liiii, liiii v, reprinted in John Knox, *The History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland* (Glasgow: J. Galbraith and Co., 1761), p. 459.
  - 39 Kirk M. Fabel, 'Questions of numismatic and linguistic signification in the reign of Mary Tudor', *Studies in English Literature* 37 (1997), 237–255, p. 244. See John Strype, *Memorials especially Ecclesiastical*, 3 vols (London: S. Richardson, 1721), vol. 1, p. 456.
  - 40 Glyn Redworth, 'Matters impertinent to women: male and female monarchy under Philip and Mary', *English Historical Review* 112 (1997), 597–613, p. 599.
  - 41 Untitled poem by Cavendish in Emrys Jones, *The New Oxford Book of Sixteenth-Century Verse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 132.
  - 42 John Elder, 'Letter describing the arrival and marriage of King Philip, his triumphal entry into London, the legations of Cardinal Pole, etc.', Appendix X in J. G. Nichols, ed., *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of two years of Queen Mary and especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, Camden Society XLVIII (London: The Camden Society, 1850), p. 157, conventionally known and cited henceforth as *Tower Chronicle*.
  - 43 Sabine Lucia Miller, 'Ageing out Catholicism: representing Mary Tudor's body', in Oakley-Brown and Wilkinson, eds, *Rituals and Rhetoric*, 238–51, pp. 242 and 247.
  - 44 Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), pp. 1 and 4.
  - 45 Paulina Kewes, 'Two queens, one inventory: the lives of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor' in Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker, eds, *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 187–207.
  - 46 Alexander Samson, 'Power sharing: the co-monarchy of Philip and Mary', in Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt, eds, *Tudor Queenship* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 159–172, pp. 161–3.
  - 47 David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England 1553–1558* (2nd edn, London: Longman 1991), p. x.
  - 48 Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. x.
  - 49 Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. x.
  - 50 John Edwards, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (London: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 348–9.
  - 51 Edwards, *Mary I*, p. 346.
  - 52 British Library Add. Ms. 5415 A.
  - 53 See Peter Barber, *The Queen Mary Atlas: Commentary* (London: Folio Society, 2005), pp. 45 and 63–4. Homem had fled to England in 1544 and appears to have remained until 1559 when the atlas was probably completed.



- 54 David Loades, 'The reign of Mary Tudor: historiography and research', *Albion* 21 (1989), 547–58, p. 556.
- 55 Loades, 'Historiography and Research', pp. 556–7.
- 56 Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 1 and 207.
- 57 Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, p. 78.
- 58 See the fascinating collection of essays on his legacy in John Edwards and Ronald Truman, eds, *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: The Achievement of Friar Bartolomé Carranza* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), and esp. David Loades, 'The English Church during the reign of Mary', p. 41.
- 59 Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, p. 7.
- 60 William Wizeman, *The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor's Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) and David Loades, *The Religious Culture of Marian England* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2010).
- 61 Freeman, 'Inventing Bloody Mary', p. 81.
- 62 We might see as a sign that this is shifting the fact that 'A Wicked History' ends with a chapter entitled 'Wicked?', and states 'Mary was said to be a kind and generous woman': Jane Buchanan, *Mary Tudor: Courageous Queen or Bloody Mary?* (New York: Franklin Watts, 2008), p. 119. Or the 'Thinking Girl's Treasury of Dastardly Dames' book by Gretchen Maurer on *Mary Tudor: 'Bloody Mary'* (Foster City, Cal.: Goosebottom Books, 2011), which ends with a section, 'Good Queen Mary?' that describes her as 'brave, truthful and compassionate... Her entire family had blood on their hands, yet their nicknames are not at all bloody like Mary's', p. 26.
- 63 Russell, 'Mary Tudor and Mr Jorkins', p. 271.
- 64 *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain*, vols 11–13, ed. Royall Tyler (London: HMSO, 1916–54), 13, pp. 88–9 (hereafter, *Cal. Span.*).
- 65 Parker, *Felipe II*, p. 307: 'Yo no he querido aver un real dese reyno, sino gastado en él lo que vos sabéis'.
- 66 John Guy, *The Oxford History of the Tudors and Stuarts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 263.
- 67 Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 465.
- 68 Judith Richards, *Mary Tudor* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 11.
- 69 Loades, *Mary Tudor*, p. 8.
- 70 The lack of preparation by the ambassadors was a cause of consternation amongst Philip's entourage, Figueroa writing to Granvelle the day after the wedding: 'aunque no querría culpar a nadie, los embaxadores... ninguna cosa tenían proveyda de lo neçesario'; transcribed in María Pascual Ortega, 'El matrimonio entre Felipe II y María Tudor en la correspondencia de Granvela', unpublished PhD thesis (University of Valencia, 2017), p. 303, from Biblioteca del Palacio Real MS II 2285, fols 70–1. See David Loades, *Intrigue and Treason: The Tudor Court 1547–1558* (London: Pearson, 2004), p. 180.
- 71 María Rodríguez Salgado, *The Changing Face of Empire: Charles V, Philip II and Habsburg Authority, 1551–1559* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- 72 Cesare Malfatti, ed. and trans., *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial* (Barcelona: Sociedad Alianza de Artes Graficas y Ricardo Fontá, 1956).
- 73 Escorial Manuscript V.ii.4, mostly in the hand of Florián de Ocampo, item 39 – 'Nuevas de España, guerras de Siena y Francia, Relaciones de la ida a Inglaterra del Principe D. Felipe y su casamiento con la reina Doña María. Año 1554', fols 439–56, at fols 444–9 is 'Relación del viaje del Principe D. Felipe quando se fue a casar a Inglaterra', by Juan de Barahona, published in *Colección de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España*, ed. Fernando Navarete, 113 vols (Madrid: 1842–95) (hereafter: *CODOIN*), vol. 1, pp. 564–74. There is also the anonymous printed account of her coronation, *La coronacion de la inclita y serenissima reyna doña Maria de*

*Inglaterra, que oy reyna bienaventuradamente en aquel reyno: con todos los autos, solenidades y ceremonias que se hizieron el día de su coronacion y la manera como fue jurada y alçada por reyna en primero de octubre, año de mil y quinientos y cinquenta y tres años* (n. p., n. s., 1553) between fols 436–8. Then Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial V.ii.3, item 43: ‘Relación de las cosas de Inglaterra en tiempo de sus reyes Enrique VIII y Maria, su hija’, fols 483–8, handwriting Antonio Gracián.

- 74 There are extensive discussions of provenance and composition of these manuscripts in Georges Cirot, ‘Florian de Ocampo, chroniste de Charles-Quint’, *Bulletin Hispanique* XVI (1914), 307–36, who usefully discusses the main manuscript sources and other extant letters; and Marcel Bataillon, ‘Sur Florian Docampo’, *Bulletin Hispanique* 25 (1923), 33–59.
- 75 He is mentioned in Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor*, p. 145: ‘A cinco de agosto sus magestades salieron de aqui [Windsor Castle] y mandaron por don Diego de Azeuedo que quedase aqui a recoger todos los cauallos y la gente española de la corte por que por los castillos donde yban no abia aposentos para todos los cortesanos’. He was *caballerizo mayor* to Philip.
- 76 BNE MS 9937, fol. 212v: ‘pasó un correo para Salamanca con la nueva de como es desembarcado Don Diego de Azeuado, viene en esta armada el Arçobispo de Toledo, y el Regente Figueroa’.
- 77 BNE MS 9937, fols 126–54. These letters were reprinted by Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor*.
- 78 See note 73 for citation.