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1. Abstract and Keywords/ Resumen y Palabras Claves

The aim of this B.A is to present the possible influence exercised by *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523), both by Juan Luis Vives, in the education of Mary Tudor (1516-1558).

In relation to the objectives of my dissertation, first I intend to corroborate whether or not these treatises were really followed in the real education of Mary Tudor. Also, I will try to clarify if these works were actually composed with the intention of providing real advise in politics and government for a woman destined to be Queen. I will start by contextualising Vives’s works, so as to offer the reader an overlook on the mindset of Humanism, in the specific aspect of women’s education. Necessarily, some biographical information about Mary Tudor and the Spaniard is also presented.

In the conclusion, I show that in most of the aspects that can be verified in the education of Mary Tudor, Vives’s views were not implemented: either because of personal circumstances or because Mary’s royal status. As to Vives’s purpose in the elaboration of these two treatises, it may be stated that most recommendations were moral and religious, rather than political in their nature.

**Keywords:** Juan Luis Vives, Mary Tudor, Humanism, *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524), *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523).
El objetivo de este Trabajo de Fin de Grado (TFG) es exponer la posible influencia ejercida por *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524) y *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523), ambos textos de Juan Luis Vives, en la educación de María Tudor (1516-1558).

Con respecto a los objetivos de mi TFG, primero intentaré confirmar si se siguieron estos tratados a la hora de educar a María Tudor. Por otra parte, también intentaré clarificar si estos textos fueron realmente escritos con la intención de verdaderamente proporcionar recomendaciones sobre política y gobierno a una mujer que estaba destinada a ser reina. Empezaré contextualizando los trabajos de Vives, para que el lector tenga así disposición una visión general sobre la actitud del Humanismo, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la educación de las mujeres. Inevitablemente, también se hace necesario presentar información sobre la vida tanto de María Tudor como del humanista español.

En la conclusión, indico que las opiniones de Vives no fueron aplicadas en la mayoría de los aspectos (aquellos que se conocen al menos) de la educación de María Tudor: ya sea por las situaciones personales de la Princesa o bien por su estatus de miembro de la realeza. Sobre el objetivo de Vives al escribir los dos tratados, se puede decir que la mayoría de las recomendaciones son de carácter moral y religioso, más que de carácter político.

**Palabras clave:** Juan Luis Vives, María Tudor, Humanismo, *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524), *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523).
2. Introduction.

In this section of the dissertation, I offer a summary of what is the topic of my dissertation, the objectives I intend to accomplish, the method I will follow in order to achieve them and finally, I explain the structure that the essay has.

2.1. Summary.

This dissertation about Juan Luis Vives’s works *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523) presents their content and also relates it with Mary Tudor. Both works were intended to help with her education because they were commanded by her mother, Queen Catherine of Aragon. The importance given to the education of the Princess was due to the prospects of her being the Heir of England. Even if Vives’s treatises are mainly conservative and not quite focused on the instruction on how to govern for the future Queen, the works written by Juan Luis Vives were quite progressive for his period. They defended that women were capable of reason, that they could be taught as men – even if not be given the same knowledge as men –. Even the fact that the treatise was directly addressed to women was a progressive move. Consequently, the treatises of the Valencian scholar are relevant because they were the testimony that the consideration of women’s education started to change little by little.

2.2. Objectives.

The two objectives I pretend to achieve in my dissertation are:

- Were Vives’s treatises *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* and *De ratione studii puerilis* followed when educating Mary Tudor?
- Did Vives actually write them while thinking about a future ruling Queen, as it was expected by Catherine of Aragon?

2.3. Methodology.

The processes used to achieve the mentioned objectives are:

- Contextualise Vives’s works by presenting information about Humanism and what Humanists considered important in education, paying special attention to their contributions to the topic of feminine education. In addition to the development of Humanism, I will also focus on the Humanistic presence in Spain – Juan Luis Vives’s
and Queen Catherine’s homeland – and England – Mary Tudor’s homeland –. Moreover, I also present the biographies of Juan Luis Vives and Mary Tudor.

- Analysing the contents of Juan Luis Vives’s works: *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* and *De ratione studii puerilis*.
- Comparing the content of Juan Luis Vives’s works about the education of a Christian woman with the life of Mary Tudor.

### 2.4. Structure.

My TFG is divided into different parts: an introduction, the “Background” section, the “Mary Tudor’s education” section and the conclusion. First of all, the introduction part, which offers to the reader the summary of my dissertation, the objectives that I pretend to fulfil with it, the way I will do it and the structure.

The second section, called “Background” offers the context for the works I am going to analyse in this TFG. It is also divided into different sections: “Humanism, Education and Women in Early Sixteenth Century”, where I offer an overview of the cultural situation of the period, with special attention about the influence of Humanism in education and women’s education – especially in Spain and England. The following part “Mary Tudor’s Biography” is, as its name indicates, display a brief summary of the Queen’s life. The same is done in the section “Juan Luis Vives’s Biography” with the life of the Valencian scholar.

The third section, “Mary’s Tudor Education” is the commentary of Vives’s *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523) and the comparison of those propositions with the life of the Princess. This commentary and comparison is organized by topics – which correspond to the sections of this part –, starting with the “Prefaces”, then “The Christian Woman’s Virtues and the People in Charge of the Education”, after that “Education, Leisure Time and Personal Care.”, followed by the last topic: “Social Life: Social Gatherings and Love.”

Finally, in the conclusion part, I recap the main points of the dissertation, I analyse if the objectives of the TFG were achieved and I propose new lines of research that this TFG could have opened.
3. Background.
In relation to the context of *De institutione feminae Christianae* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523), several points are to be taken into consideration. The first topic is to define Humanism, as it is the cultural movement that encompasses the two works, and how it affected education, and more especially women’s education, as both are pedagogical documents. It is also important to know who was Mary Tudor and Juan Luis Vives and for this reason, their biographies are also present in this section.


To understand how the situation in Europe, and especially in England, was when Mary Tudor was educated, it is important to consider several points. First of all, it is important to define what Humanism was, since it was the intellectual movement predominant at the time. Then, it is also crucial to consider how this movement affected the previous medieval ideas about education and, to be more precise, how it affected the idea of women’s education. Finally, I will explain how Humanism influenced two important kingdoms for our matter: Spain and England.

The Early Modern English period is normally established from “the end of the fifteenth century, coinciding with the Tudor (1485-1603) and the Stuart (1603-1714) monarchy” (Weiner, 2012). Within its period, the most important movement is Renaissance Humanism or simply Humanism, which is defined as:

a European intellectual movement or climate of thought from the 14th to the 16th cent.,
which was characterized in scholarship by attentiveness to classical Latin (and later Greek), in neo-Latin and vernacular literature by the creative imitation of ancient text, in education and public life by the promotion of some or all of the wide range of cultural ideals which these texts were supposed to transmit, and in the fine and applied arts by creative response to Roman and Greek artefact or principles (O.E.D³).

The origins of Humanism are found in Italy with the figure of Petrarch² in the 14th century (Hickman, 2016, p.18) and it was a reaction against the rigidity and conservatism of the medieval knowledge of the previous period (Hickman, 2016, p.17). Humanists started to search for answers that were not found in monasteries (the places of erudition during the Middle Ages)

---

² Francesco Petrarca (1304-1374) was an Italian writer, poet and scholar. He is considered the first Humanist of the Renaissance because he rediscovered the letters of Cicero in the 14th century. His most well-known work is *Il Canzoniere*, a collection of lyrical compositions that reshaped the conception of love poetry in Europe.
but in Classical texts. In addition, this knowledge should be used to improve society and to create a moral individual (Perkins, 2007).

This wish of having a good morality supports Perkins statement that, even if Humanism is commonly related with secularization, it would be better said that “the focus of learning was directed from the clergy to the laity” (2007, p.5) since, in many cases, humanist were still religious people, but they defended that God gave human being intelligence and understanding in order to create a better world.

As Humanism was mainly an academic movement (Hickman, 2016, p.18), it is logical to think that it influenced in a crucial way the education of the time. Per contra, in the beginning, it had to battle with the Scholasticism\(^3\) which was predominant in the medieval universities and quite rooted in Logic, as it will be illustrated in Juan Luis Vives’s experience in the University of Paris when we approach his biography. This concept of University\(^4\) was considered “insular” (Perkins, 2007, p.5) because it did not offer practical everyday knowledge, and was mainly aimed to educate the future clergy. Humanism influence changed the situation and the education was not considered something only directed for future clergymen but essential to the sons of all important families (Perkins, 2007, p.6).

The change from Scholasticism to Humanism provoked a change in what was taught. Humanism pledged for a broad knowledge based on the \textit{studia humanitatis} that was composed by Grammar, Rhetoric, Poetry, Philosophy and History (Perkins, 2007, p.4, 6). Owing to the fact that the foundations of these disciplines were found in Classical works, humanists also considered of immense importance to learn Latin and Greek (Perkins, 2007, p. 7; Hickman, 2016, p.18). Latin became so necessary that pupils started to learn it at a young age, something that caused the apparition of the grammar schools for boys (Hickman, 2016, p.18).

Then, Humanism changed in a notable way the education of young privileged boys. However, the role of women in relation to education started also to be considered. The first discussions about the topic are to be encountered in the same Classical sources that were highly regarded by the humanists (Hickman, 2016, p.17). In the Classical period, there are two main

---

\(^3\) Scholasticism was a method of critical thought that was used in the universities from 1100 to 1700 approximately. It was based on the dialectical reasoning used to extend the knowledge by the use of inference (the use of premises) and to solve contradictions.

\(^4\) The one following Scholasticism.
points of view about women education: Plato’s and Aristotle’s. On the one hand, Plato supported the idea that women were equally capable of being educated as men as he exposes in his *Republic*: “[M]en and women alike possess the qualities which make a guardian; [...] the same education which makes a man a good guardian will make a woman a good guardian, for the original nature is the same” (370BC, p.144). On the other hand, Aristotle, as he expresses in *Politics* (1957), thought that the only role that women had was to have offspring and that they were naturally inferior to men (Hickman, 2016, p.19) It is true that he believed that, as the first educators of their children, women should have some education (Hickman, 2016, p.20).

Both sides of this argument that were developed during Classical antiquity were stopped during the Middle Ages. The belief that was currently extended in the Middle Ages and persisted at the beginning of the Early Modern Period was that the only education that women needed was the one their mothers could give to them and, after being married, the moral and religious teachings of their husbands. They were also the ones in charge of teaching their wives about how to take care of the household. This was the only knowledge they would need because they, as opposed to men, were not to engage in public life (Cousins, 2004, pp.213-214).

With the emergence of Humanism, the role of women started to be again discussed and some literary works began to be published. These sources suggested that aristocratic women could be educated as men were (Hickman, 2016, p.19). In the 14th century, Giovani Boccaccio wrote *De claris mulieribus*, translated in English as *Concerning Famous Women* and it focused on reporting the lives of women that were considered chaste, good wives or mothers, and of exceptional high morality and virtue. (Hickman, 2016, pp.17; 21-23). About the same topic was Geoffrey Chaucer’s incomplete *The Legend of Good Women* (c. 1386) (Greenblatt, 2006,

---

5 Plato (428/427 or 424/423 – 348/347 BC) was a Classical Greek philosopher and the founder of the Academy of Athens. He is considered the pillar figure for the foundation of the Western thought next to Socrates, his mentor, and Aristotle, his disciple. One of his most important works is *Republic* were he exposes his ideal system of society. 

6 Aristotle (384-322 BC) was a Classical Greek philosopher and scientist. He was the disciple of Plato and he studied in his Academy in Athens. He wrote about many and varied topics: physics, biology, metaphysics, logic, ethics, literature, rhetoric, economics... Some of his works are *Metaphysics*, *Poetics*, and *De anima*.


8 Giovani Boccaccio (1313-1375) was an Italian writer and poet and another important figure of the Italian Renaissance Humanism, next to Petrarch. In the literary canon, he is well-known because of his narrative work *The Decameron*, written in vernacular Italian.

9 Geoffrey Chaucer (c.1343-1400) is considered one of the greatest English poet and author of the Middle Ages. He was a courtier, a diplomat and a civil servant under the reign of Edward III. His most famous work is *The Canterbury Tales* (1400).
Years later, in 1405 in France, Christine de Pizan\textsuperscript{10} wrote \textit{Le Livre de la cité des dames}, in English, \textit{The Book of the City of Ladies}. In her book, Christine de Pizan reacted against the representation of women in the previous literary tradition and also she conferred importance to female education (Hickman, 2016, pp.17; 24-25). That same year, in Italy, Leonardo Bruni\textsuperscript{11} did not only defended the education of women, but he went beyond that by creating a study programme for women, which was dedicated to a learned woman, Baptista di Montefeltro\textsuperscript{12}. This programme was done in the form of a letter and it was published as \textit{De studiis et litteris} (1424).

Although the fact that some humanist started to believe that female education was important, we should not think it was generally assumed that women should be educated as men were. As Hickman articulates, the humanist of the time thought that:

Their [women’s] education must be strictly controlled because of their weak minds. Any education they complete must be for the sole purpose of enhancing their roles as wives and mothers. It must enhance their morality and virtue to protect their chastity. [...]. Their education must not result in any kind of public role or public voice. Essentially, women must keep any education private, within the home. (2016, p.20).

Indeed, the belief that women were weaker in body and mind was quite rooted in Classical texts, like we have seen in Aristotle’s opinion about the question of female education, in the Bible and in the medieval sources (Perkins, 2007, pp.8-9). Therefore, it is predictable that humanists, whose main references were Classical texts, had the same opinion.

Perkins is even more cautious than Hickman (2016) in expressing the impact that Humanism had in its beginnings on female education. She declares that the humanist influence in the schooling of girls was slower than in the teaching of boys, for the same reason that they were not expected to have a public life outside the household (2007, pp.7-8). However, a careful education kept girls busy and prevented them from turning into vice and consequently, in the

\textsuperscript{10} Christine de Pizan (1364-1430) was an Italian and French writer, as she was born in Italy but her family moved to the court of Charles V of France, having him offered Pizan’s father as work as astrologer. de Pizan wrote many different works: love ballads, \textit{L’Épistre de Othéa a Hector} (1400), that can be considered a treatise about government, \textit{Le Livre des fais et bonnes meurs du sage roy Charles V} (1404), which was a chronicle, and one of her most famous works \textit{Le Livre de la cité des dames} (1405).

\textsuperscript{11} Leonardo Bruni (1370-1444) was an Italian important humanist, the first modern historian and statesman. He wrote what is considered the first modern history book titled \textit{Historiarum Florentini populi libri XII} and a biography on Cicero called \textit{New Cicero}, next to other biographies of more contemporary figures like Petrarch and Dante.

\textsuperscript{12} Baptista di Montefeltro (c.1384-1448) was an Italian Renaissance poet and orator. She was educated at the humanistic form, studying philosophy and languages.
15\textsuperscript{th} century, more girls from the privileged families started to learn how to read, even if only a few learned how to write (Perkins, 2007, p.8).\textsuperscript{13}

Humanism spread through from Italy to the courts of France and Spain, and later on to England (Hickman, 2016, p.17). Within the Royal courts, Humanism started to be crucial to give an image of power and illustration. Kings and noblemen began to be interested in education and in the same way, the queens and noblewomen wanted their sons to have the best instruction possible. Moreover, daughters were also desired to have a good formation even if it was in a less intense way (Hickman, 2016, p.29). For the interest of our subject matter, I will mainly focus on women education in the courts of Spain and England, leaving aside the French court.

The way women’s education was managed in the court of Spain is important for two reasons: the influence that Queen Isabella I of Castile\textsuperscript{14} had in Juan Luis Vives when writing *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524), as a model of a chaste woman who was also a ruler. The other reason is the impact of the Queen in her daughter Catherine of Aragon\textsuperscript{15} who later would be Queen of England, continuing to the development of female education in that country.

When Isabella was a princess, she did not receive a deep and comprehensive education. She learnt to read and write in Castilian and she was taught housework. She was not instructed on how to govern, as a woman was not expected to reign (Hickman, 2016, p.33). When she was already a regnant queen, Isabella detected a lack in her education that was by no matter fitting a queen who had decided to govern by herself, so she decided to learn Latin as an adult (Hickman, 2016, p.34). For this reason, she got for herself a tutor, Beatriz de Galindo, whose nickname was La Latina (Bel Bravo; Watson, 1912, p.35). The Castilian queen’s interest in education and culture was also reflected in her pleasure in collecting books (Watson, 1912, p.6). She is said to have had a considerable personal library (Hickman, 2016, p.34). Furthermore,


\textsuperscript{14}Isabella I of Castile (1451-1504) was the regnant Queen of Castile. Her marriage with Ferdinand II of Aragon unified the Spanish kingdoms under a single crown in their descendants. Isabella and Ferdinand put an end to the Reconquista by conquering the Kingdom of Granada from the Muslims. They also financed the travel of Christopher Colombus that meant the ‘discovery’ of America, thus allowing Spain to become a global potency.

\textsuperscript{15}Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536) was the daughter of Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella I of Castile. She was betrothed with prince Arthur of England. However, Prince Arthur died short after their marriage (1501). When Henry VII died, the new king Henry VIII decided to marry her. From this union just a daughter was born: Mary Tudor. The lack of a male heir was one of the reasons for which Henry wanted to annul his marriage with her, provoking a schism with the Pope. After the annulment, she lived at Kimbolton Castle and died on 7\textsuperscript{th} January 1536.
she founded a library in a convent in Toledo and she contributed to the expansion of the collection of El Escorial’s library (Watson, 1912, p.6).

It can be assumed that the awareness of her scarce education as a princess influenced her thoughts about how to educate her daughters. Queen Isabella gave them a thorough education, even if it was not to be as intense as her son’s. Apart from domestic skills, her daughters were taught also Latin, Theology, History, some Classical literature and Music; their tutors were the best scholars she could get: the Italians brothers Alessandro and Antonio Geraldini (Hickman, 2016, p.35).

This interest in education influenced not only the court but also the whole country. Ferdinand and Isabella started a period heavily influenced by Renaissance education (Watson, 1912, p.5). Isabella was decisive as a sponsor of many Spanish humanists like Antonio de Nebrija. The Queen asked the scholar to translate his Latin Grammar (1481) so that women could learn Latin by themselves (Hickman, 2016, pp.34-35). This interest in female education even allowed noble born women to access the University (Bel Bravo); two of them were even chosen as lecturers: one of Latin at the University of Salamanca, and the other of History at the University of Alcalá (Watson, 1912, p.7).

This was the setting in which Catherine of Aragon was educated before going to England. She believed that a queen should entangle with politic issues and for that reason she believed that women should be educated (Hickman, 2016, p.36). The Queen’s ideas did not find any opposition from part of her husband. Henry VIII had also been carefully educated by professionals tutors chosen by his father Henry VII. Moreover, he experienced from first-hand the possibility of women education as his grandmother, Margaret Beaufort was an intelligent

---

16 Alessandro (1455-1524) and Antonio Geraldini were two Humanist scholars at the service of the Catholic Monarchs. They were the tutors of the princesses and actually Alessandro travelled with Catherine of Aragon to England. He was also the Bishop of Vulturara e Montecorvino and later he travelled to the American Spanish colonies where he was named Bishop of Santo Domingo.

17 Antonio Nebrija (1444-1522) was a Spanish Humanist. He is the writer of the works that helped to establish the Spanish as a language of culture. He wrote the first Spanish Grammar in 1492, a Spanish dictionary in 1495 and the first Spanish set of orthographic rules in 1517.


19 Henry VIII of England (1491-1547) was the second Tudor king. He is most well-known by his multiple marriages, as he had six wives, and by being the founder of the Anglican Church after the schism with the Catholic Church of Rome because of his wish to achieve an annulment of his marriage with Catherine of Aragon.

20 Henry VII of England (1457-1509) was the first Tudor monarch after the end of the War of Roses that confronted the York and the Lancaster families for the throne.

21 Margaret Beaufort (1441/3-1509), Countess of Richmond and Derby was the mother of King Henry VII. She was a crucial figure in the War of Roses, helping hers son to achieve the throne. During her son reign, she was addressed as the Queen Mother and she enjoyed legal and social independence, despite her status as a married
woman who was quite implicated with education in general\textsuperscript{22}. It is interesting to point out that, since Henry was not the expected heir, he was educated alongside his sisters (Hickman, 2016, p.36). This bringing up made that Henry VIII allowed Catherine to play an active role in his government (Hickman, 2016, p.36-37).

For these reasons, it is not surprising that this new Renaissance view that was starting to emerge in England during the reign of Henry VII (Perkins, 2007, p.4), persevered in the court of Henry and Catherine, as both supported humanist scholars (Hickman, 2016, p.41; Perkins, 2007, p.12). In fact, Catherine exploited the friendship and sponsoring she offered to some humanists (Watson, 1912, p.20) to ask them for works that could help with the education of her daughter Mary. She did not only requested the task to Juan Luis Vives, who answered by writing *De institutione fœminæ Christianæ* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523) – works that will be commented in more detail below – but she also asked the same task to Erasmus of Rotterdam\textsuperscript{23}, who wrote *Christiani Matrimonii Institutio* (1526) (Hickman, 2016, p.60). Truly, the implication of Erasmus in the education of the princess is an interesting case because he was not especially attracted to the idea of women being educated. However, the Dutch humanist reconsidered this idea when he met Thomas More’s\textsuperscript{24} daughters, who enjoyed a meticulous education which not all girls – even if they were from the aristocracy – experienced in England\textsuperscript{25}. Erasmus was especially surprised by Margaret More\textsuperscript{26} (Hickman, 2016, p.49) and she is thought to be the inspiration of one of his *Colloquies* called ‘The Abbot and the Learned Lady’, as the lady is called Magdalia (Hickman, 2016, p.60).

---

\textsuperscript{22} For more information about the figure of Lady Margaret Beaufort and her influence on English Humanism and education see Olivares Merino, E. (2001) ‘Lady Margaret Beaufort and Margaret More Roper: Similarities and Differences’. “So long lives this, and this gives life to thee”

\textsuperscript{23} Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466-1536) was a Dutch humanist and one of the most important scholar of the northern Renaissance. He was a prolific writer and a great percentage of the book published in the Early Modern period are his. Among his works, it is important the Latin and Greek editions of the New Testament that influenced both the Protestant Reform, even if he will remain Catholic all his life, and the Counter-Reformation. Other works are *Institution principis Christianis* (1516), and *Praise of Folly*.

\textsuperscript{24} Sir Thomas More (1478-1535) was an English humanist, statesman, lawyer, social philosopher and author. He also was Lord High Chancellor from 1529 to 1532. His major literary works are *History of Richard III* (1514-1518) and *Utopia* (1516). More was executed as he was condemned for high treason after refusing to take the oath of the Act of Succession of 1534.


\textsuperscript{26} Margaret More Roper (1505-1544) was the elder daughter of Sir Thomas More. She was considered one of the most learned women of her period as she was a writer and a translator. Her most well-known work was the translation into English of *Precatio Dominica* by Erasmus.
Related with the education of Thomas More’s daughters, it is important to mention that in his household “he developed an extraordinary school [...] for his son and three daughters, and also some of the children in his circle of family and friends” (Hickman, 2016, p.47). In his ‘school’, More’s children received the same education; truth to be said, his daughters seemed to be more advanced than his son: “If you will teach something of this sort, in addition to their lesson in Sallust – to Margaret and Elizabeth, as being more advanced than John and Cecily – you will bind me and them still more to you” (More, 1518?, p.2). It was this kind of education which allowed Margaret Roper to translate Erasmus’s Precatio Dominica from its original Latin into English, as A Devout Treatise upon the Paternoster in 1524 (McCutcheon, 1987, p.460). In addition, in the preface of her translation, Richard Hyrde27 praised and defended the education of women in the same way he did in his translation of Vives’s work De institutione fæmineæ Christianæ.

It was in this context where Mary Tudor was brought up and educated, at least while her parents’ union was in most part peaceful. The Princess of England was at the heart of one of the most humanist courts in Europe, she was the daughter of the most Renaissance educated Monarchs, who were both dedicated and interested into giving her the most careful instruction possible, even if they had different thoughts about the aim of the education of their daughter. On the one hand, Henry VIII’s interest in her daughter’s education was simply to improve her marriage prospects (Hickman, 2016, p.42; Pierret Perkins, 2007, p.36); on the other hand, Catherine, knowing that for the time being, Mary was the only heir to the throne, was quite interested in her daughter’s education, as she might herself Queen one day.

3.2. Mary Tudor’s Biography.

In order to create a biographical profile of Mary I of England, two works have been mainly used: Loades (1989) and Whitelock (2009).

Mary Tudor was born on 18th February 1516 in Greenwich, London. It was a joyous event because Catherine had already suffered some miscarriages and the death of a son after seven weeks after birth. Nevertheless, she was a girl, hence she did not guarantee the stability of the throne. In any case, Henry VIII was hopeful that there would be more births: “The queen and I are both young [...] and if it is a girl this time, by God’s grace the boys will follow” (Loades, 1989, p.14). Still, Henry VIII’s wish did not become true and Mary was considered the heir of

27 Richard Hyrde (? – 1528) was an English humanist scholar, translator, tutor and also believed to be physician. He studied in the University of Oxford and he was quite close to the Mores.
England. As a matter of fact, Mary’s recognition as the heir was crucial for the Anglo-French alliance: one of the arrangements was to marry Mary, who at the time was two years old, with Francis I’s the future Francis III.\footnote{Francis III of France (1518-1536) was the son of Francis I and the Duchess Claude of Brittany. As his brother Henry, he spent some time as hostage in Spain as a guarantee that his father would keep the Treaty of Madrid (1526) between the king of France and Charles V. He died when he was eighteen by what was suspected to be poisoning.} This betrothal, followed by another one with Mary’s cousin, Charles\footnote{Charles I of Spain and V of Germany (1500-1558) was the Holy Roman Emperor and the King of Spain, which at that time included the Asian and American colonies, Duke of Burgundy and Archduke of Austria. He was the first of the denominated major Habsburgs and he was the first one considered to rule “the empire on which the sun never sets”.}, started a period in which the princess’s hand was the decisive piece of either an alliance with France, an alliance with the Empire or even a way of achieving the peace with Scotland.

In 1525, Mary was sent to the marches of Wales, that was the territory of the Principality of England. Nevertheless, her period at Ludlow Castle was short because, even if according to Loades, the princess’s “movements were very difficult to track” he hazards that the princess was called back to the Home Counties in 1528 (1989, p.39). The reasons are not clear since it could be either the useless expense of keeping Mary there without any urgent need (Loades, 1989, p.42) or because of the start of Henry VIII’s marriage matter.

A year before, the King had started to seek the annulation of his marriage with Catherine, justifying his wish on the grounds of the incestuous nature of it, as Catherine had been married to his deceased brother Arthur.\footnote{Arthur Tudor (1486-1502) was the Prince of Wales, Earl of Chester and Duke of Cornwall. He was the eldest son of Henry VII. He was married which Catherine of Aragon but he died soon after the wedding.} From 1527 to 1533, the so-called ‘king’s great matter’\footnote{For more information about the process of the divorc\ae between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon see Harpsfied, N. and Pocock, N. (1878) \textit{A Treatise on the Pretended Divorce Between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon.} London, United Kingdom: Longmans.} was unsolved as Pope Clement VII,\footnote{Pope Clement VII (1478-1534), born as Giulio di Giuliano de’ Medici, was Pope from 1523 until 1534. During his papacy, he had to confront many religious problems: the growing of the Protestant Reformation in the North of Europe, the conflicts between Charles V and Francis I, the Turkish invasions and the breaking of England from the Catholic Church.} quite influenced by the power of Charles V, neglected to concede the annulation of the marriage. For this reason, in 1533, Henry would separate the Church of England from the power of Rome, and Thomas Cranmer\footnote{Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556) was the leading figure of the Reformation of the Church of England and he was named Archbishop of Canterbury. He helped Henry VIII on his divorce from Catherine of Aragon. However, on Edward VI’s reign, he was the precursor of the drastic changes in the Church promoting the changes in the services into a more Protestant way. He was executed for heresy in 1556 under the rule of Mary I.} proclaimed him Supreme Head of the New Ecclesia Anglicana. With this new power, he could annul his marriage and
officially marry Anne Boleyn.\textsuperscript{34} The king’s great matter ended with Catherine refusing to accept the annulment and the dispossession of the title of Queen, with Mary separated forever from her mother and with Henry and Anne having a daughter on 7\textsuperscript{th} September 1533, Elizabeth Tudor.\textsuperscript{35}

The birth of Elizabeth was the breaking point of Mary’s situation, as her father commanded Mary’s servants to stop calling her princess and to Mary herself to renounce to the title; but she refused to obey. On December 1533, Mary was ordered by the king to leave her home in Beaulieu and to join Elizabeth’s household in Hatfield, to enter at the service of Princess Elizabeth. In 1534, even if Pope Clement VII had declared Henry and Catherine matrimony to be valid, the Act of Succession declared that “the succession was now transferred to Henry’s male heirs by Anne or any subsequent wife. In default of a male heir, the throne would pass to Elizabeth” (Whitelock, 2009, p.79). After the passing of the Act, Catherine and Mary were informed and ordered to take an oath accepting it, though neither of them did. In the case of Catherine, it lasted until her death on 7\textsuperscript{th} of January 1536 and in the case of Mary, she would commit to her father wishes on 22\textsuperscript{nd} June 1536. Actually, that was a year of many changes in the royal house. After Catherine’s death, Anne Boleyn was again pregnant but she suffered a miscarriage of a boy, to Henry’s disgrace. This caused the disgrace of Anne too. The king started to put his attention on Jane Seymour\textsuperscript{36} and many nobles preferred her as a Queen to Anne Boleyn. Eventually, this favoured Anne’s accusation of high treason to the King, and also of adultery with her own brother. Anne Boleyn was executed on 19\textsuperscript{th} May 1536.

Henry and Jane Seymour were married (30\textsuperscript{th} May 1536) and Jane started to intercede on Mary’s restoration, while she herself began to approach her father, believing that the main obstacle to making peace with him had been Anne. In spite of her efforts, her attempts were fruitless. As her life was in danger again, on 22\textsuperscript{nd} June Mary consented to her father’s wishes and “she acknowledged the illegitimacy of her mother’s marriage, her own bastard status and her father’s Supreme Headship of the Church of England” (Whitelock, 2009, p.107). From that moment until Henry VIII’s death, Mary will be in the King’s grace and will live in peace: she

\textsuperscript{34} Anna Boleyn (1501-1536) was Queen of England and the second wife of Henry VIII. She had a daughter with Henry VIII, Elizabeth but she did not gave him his long-desired son. She was accused of High Treason in 1536, arrested to the Tower and executed.

\textsuperscript{35} Elizabeth I of England (1533-1603) was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. She ascended to the throne after the death of her half-sister Mary I in 1558. Elizabeth restored again the Church of England. She decided to remain without marring, act that gain her the name of The Virgin Queen.

\textsuperscript{36} Jane Seymour (c.1508-1537) was the third wife of King Henry VIII. She had been the lady-in-waiting of Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn. She and Henry were married on 30\textsuperscript{th} May 1536, shortly after Anne’s execution. She gave Henry a son, Edward VI, but she died after the birth.
was the godmother of her brother Edward;\textsuperscript{37} Furthermore, the other marriages of his father – with Anne of Cleves\textsuperscript{38}, Katherine Howard\textsuperscript{39} and Katherine Parr\textsuperscript{40} – did not affect her directly in the same way the previous ones had. The only important change in her life during this period was the Third Succession Act in 1543 “where she took place behind Edward, the heir of his body, and any son who might be born to Catherine Parr” (Loades, 1989, p.120). On 28\textsuperscript{th} January 1547, Henry VIII died and in his will, the position of Mary as the heir of Edward (should he not have heirs on his own) was reinforced. Mary was also allowed to have properties and a yearly income that made her one of the most powerful ‘statesmen’ of England.

Despite this new power, Mary’s life would again be in tension. Her brother Edward was proclaimed as King (Edward VI) on 31\textsuperscript{st} January. The young king was educated in the Protestant faith and in 1549 the Act of Uniformity established Protestantism as the official religion of England while forbidding the previous Catholic rites. However, Mary did not renounce to her Catholic faith and she, disobeying the law, kept the Catholic Mass in her household. The hostility on the religion matter will be kept during all the reign of Edward VI, as Mary would not renounce to her faith. The circumstances rose to such a degree that the Imperial ambassador at the time, Van der Delft, feared for Mary’s life. She and the ambassador even planned an escape from England for 30\textsuperscript{th} June 1550 but in the last moment, Mary decided to remain. Fortunately for her, Henry II of France declared again the war to Charles V in 1551 and Edward VI decided to help the French. This event deviated attention from her to war. Shortly after (1552), Edward felt ill. As there were no hopes of his recovery, Edward rushed to establish the succession to avoid both his half-sisters to heir the throne. He arranged his heir to be his cousin Lady Jane Grey,\textsuperscript{41} and her future descendence. Edward VI died on 6\textsuperscript{th} July 1553.

While in London Jane was proclaimed Queen, Mary proclaimed herself Queen. Even if Mary was prepared for battle and the Duke of Northumberland reunited his forces to defend Jane and his son’s right to the throne, Queen Jane’s Privy Council deposed her and proclaimed

\textsuperscript{37} Edward VI (1537-1553) was the King of England and Ireland. He was the son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour. After the death of his father, he was crowned at the age of nine. He was raised as a Protestant and by the Act of Unification, he established that religion as the official one of the country. He died by an illness at the age of fifteen.
\textsuperscript{38} Anne of Cleves (1515-1557) was the fourth wife of Henry VIII. They married the 6\textsuperscript{th} January 1540 but the 9\textsuperscript{th} July 1540 the union was annulled on the motive of non-conssummation of the marriage as Henry did not find her attractive.
\textsuperscript{39} Katherine Howard (c.1523-1542) was the fifth wife of Henry VIII from 1540 to 1541. She was executed under the accusation of adultery with Thomas Culpeper.
\textsuperscript{40} Katherine Parr (1512-1548) was the sixth and last wife of Henry VIII, from 1543 until his death in 1547.
\textsuperscript{41} Jane Grey (c.1537-1554), also called “the Nine Days’ Queen” was the granddaughter of Princess Mary, Henry VIII’s sister. She was proclaimed Queen of England the 10\textsuperscript{th} July 1553 and she acted as such until her deposing on 19\textsuperscript{th} July. She was imprisoned in the Tower for high treason. However, even if Mary I pardoned her life in that moment, she was executed in 1554 for his father involvement in Wyatt’s rebellion.
Mary as Queen, without the need of any conflict. On 3rd August 1553, Mary, with a numerous crowd and alongside her sister, arrived in London and took official possession of her kingdom. On 1st October she was officially crowned in Westminster Abbey, being the first regnant Queen of England.

Two issues will mark her five years of reign. The first issue was the restoration of the Catholic religion in England. At the beginning of her rule, Mary did not want to rush the changes: she restored the Catholic rites and provided to the Churches with the required supplies for that little by little; although, she was still the Supreme Head of the Church and she did not mend the ties with the Church of Rome and she did not force the Papacy authority on England. In a way, the state of the Church was the one during her father’s reign, and it was popular among the majority of the population. The major complainer of this situation was Cardinal Reginald Pole, who sent letters to Mary disapproving her slow pace on restoring Papal authority in England. Anyhow, Pole’s wishes were finally met and on 30th November 1554, the Parliament’s members declared themselves “very sorry and repentant of the schism and disobedience committed in this realm and the dominions of the same, against the said See Apostolic” and to be “in unity and perfect obedience to the See Apostolic” (Whitelock, 2009, p.303). Furthermore, the restoration of Papal authority came along with the restoration of heresy laws against the Protestants, even if both Mary and Pole preferred them to enter into the Catholicism than to be burned at the stake. This was the start of the religious persecution that would damage Mary I’s reputation among the Protestants, which would create her name for the future generations: Bloody Mary.

The other issue was her marriage with Philip II of Spain, the son of Charles V. It was a matter quite discussed on the Parliament as some would have preferred her to commit to a domestic marriage with Edward Courtenay. But Mary decided to marry her cousin’s son. She defended that her union with Philip would be more beneficial to England than marrying

---

42 Reginald Pole (1500-1558) was Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church and he also was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1556 to 1558. His antagonism to the divorce of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon caused him to have to be in the exile for many years. In 1536, he was appointed Cardinal and he was one of the three Papal Legates to preside the Council of Trent. During Mary I’s reign, he could go back to England in 1554 and he was the one who reconnected England with the Papal authority. He died the 17th November 1558.


44 Edward Courtenay (c.1527-1556), first Earl of Devon, was an English nobleman. He and his family were imprisoned in the Tower because his father was accused of having plotted against Henry VIII by planning a Roman Catholic revolt. Meanwhile his father was executed, Edward was left imprisoned during Henry VIII and Edward VI’s governments. It was Mary I who released him from the Tower. Nevertheless, he was believed, next to Elizabeth, that he participated in Wyatt’s Revolt so he was exiled.
Courtenay. Despite her reasons, the English were afraid that Philip would actually rule England, so they established some conditions: “In the event of Mary’s dying first, without heirs, Philip would have no claim to England. He was to observe all the laws and customs of the realm, not intrude his own servants into English offices, and not involve England in the perpetual Habsburg struggle with France” (Loades, 1989, p.210).

Even if their conditions were accepted, there were still English noblemen that would not accept the matrimony and this displeasure caused Wyatt’s rebellion⁴⁵, an uprising to depose the Queen – it was suffocated fast. After the adversities, Philip and Mary got married on 25th July 1554 at Winchester. It was not a marriage in the best terms as Philip was considered a consort with little real power and, even if Mary was happy to be compliant as a wife, she would not put Philip’s wishes before England. For this reason, Philip did not spend much time in England during their marriage. From their union, Mary suffered two false pregnancies due to her concern about giving an heir to avoid her sister Elizabeth to rule.

This two matters affected the reputation of the Queen among her subjects. In addition, the last year of her rule was marked by the bad harvests – nearly reaching famine – and the epidemics. In this context, Philip II came back to England in March 1557 with the purpose of asking his wife’s Privy Council for help for the war against the French. This time Mary wanted to content her husband and she ordered her council to support him. Therefore, they offered men and money, but Philip also wanted the English declaration of war to France. The counsellors denied him this. However, when on 23rd April 1557 an English Protestant exiled attacked England with the help of a French ship, they had no other option than to declare war to France. The conflict seemed to be ended with the conquest of Saint-Quentin⁴⁶ but as vengeance, the French troops occupied Calais, the last English territory in the continent.

After her second false pregnancy, in August 1558, Mary fell ill with influenza and she would not recover completely. In November, knowing she was to die, the Queen set all her matters in order and confirmed that her heir was her half-sister Elizabeth. On 16th November 1558, she died in St. James’s Palace at the age of forty-two.

---

⁴⁵ The Wyatt’s Rebellion or Revolt (1554) was an uprising caused mainly by the displeasure of the English people by Mary and Philip union. It was led by Sir Thomas Wyatt, Sir James Croft, Sir Peter Carew and Henry Grey. The plot failed and the participants, except Courtenay who was exiled, were executed.

⁴⁶ Saint-Quentin is a French commune situated in the Aisne department in Hauts-de-France.
3.3. Juan Luis Vives’s Biography.

For the composition of this biography, I have mainly relied on the works of González González (2008) and Gómez-Hortigüela Amillo (2014).

Juan Luis Vives was born in Valencia in March 1492 and he was the elder son of a middle bourgeoisie family of ‘Judeo-conversos’. His parents were Luis Vives Valeriola, who was a merchant, and Blanquina March Almenara. Both of them were descendants of a large lineage of merchants, bankers and tax collectors, which were typical trades for the ‘Judeo-converso’ community in Spain. In his early years, Vives must have attended primary school in Valencia and it could probably mean the first encounter with the educative system. At the time, education was not humanistic but still heavily influenced by scholastic philosophy.

In 1509, with only sixteen or seventeen years, Vives left Valencia to go to study his degree of Arts at the University of Paris. However, from his time in Paris, his studies at the University are not as important as the fact that Paris was the place he first encountered Humanism. This contact was indeed out of the University, considering, as Vives complained, it was heavily influenced by scholasticism. For the Valencian humanist, the University’s lecturers used complex speeches that helped to cover an empty knowledge. Vives also lamented that University education was not practical for life. These are probably the reason why Vives felt attracted to humanist ideas that were outside the classrooms, because, as it has been mentioned above, Humanism was more focused on pragmatic knowledge. Around 1512, Vives met and established friendly relationships with the most important French humanists of the period: Guillaume Budé⁴⁷ and Nicolas Bérault⁴⁸. Until 1514, Vives lived between Paris and the Low Countries; as to his academic formation, he extended his learning to the Classical world.

In 1514, Vives left permanently Paris and went to live to the Low Countries where he started to be recognised by his work. Also in that year, he published his first writings composed during his stay in Paris, prefatory letters (Poeticon astronomicon and De modo et ordine docendi et discendi) and oractical pieces, that came out with the title of Opuscula duo. At the end of 1514, Vives moved from Bruges to Louvain where he was under the sponsorship of several noblemen and gave private lessons. One of his patrons was George Halewijn, Lord of Comines, who in 1515 would become chamberlain at the court of Princes Charles, the future

---

⁴⁷ Guillaume Budé (1467-1540) was one of the most prominent French humanists. He studied Classical Studies, especially he learnt Greek and Law. He was the secretary of Louis XII and he also was really close with Francis I, going with him to many travels. His most important works are Commentaria linguae Graecae and De philologia.

⁴⁸ Nicolas Bérault (1473-1550) was a French humanist, philology and educationalist.
Emperor. Halewijn could have easily been the link that allowed Vives to come into contact with the court of Charles. By 1516, he was already a resident at it. His presence at the court allowed that, at the end of that year, Vives could meet Erasmus of Rotterdam, who caused great influence in the Spanish humanist and with whom he would share many ideas like pacifism, spirituality, and anti-dogmatism. In 1517, Guillaume de Croy, Lord of Chièvres\(^{49}\) chose Vives as his nephew’s tutor, also called Guillaume de Croÿ\(^{50}\). From 1518 to 1521, Vives experienced a period of plenty of liveliness. Between 1518 and 1519 he published a collection called *Pompeius fugiens* that included his philosophical text *In pseudodialecticos*. This marked his complete disengagement from scholasticism and positioned him within the humanistic movement. In 1520, he was offered to prepare the annotations of a new edition of St. Augustine’s *De civitate Dei* by Erasmus. It was also in 1520 that the court of Charles V came back to the Low Countries and, during a visit of Henry VIII, Vives was able to meet Sir Thomas More. It was the starting point of a friendship that would last until the death of Thomas More in 1535\(^{51}\). Another event that highlights the importance of Vives is that when Erasmus rejected the offer of Prince Ferdinand\(^{52}\) to be his tutor, the name of the Valencian humanist was suggested for the office. Nonetheless, Vives also rejected the position because he was already committed to Guillaume de Croÿ.

The death of the Archbishop of Toledo caused by a hunting accident in 1521 marked the beginning of the most complicated but more literary productive years in the life of Juan Luis Vives. At the death of his protector, Vives decided, in 1523, to go back to Spain. However, he had to pass through England because Spain and France were war, and he decided to stay in England where he was given an office for teaching Latin and Greek at the Corpus Christi College at the University of Oxford. It was not the first contact of Vives with England. Before

\(^{49}\) Guillaume de Croÿ, Lord of Chièvres (1458-1521) was the chief tutor of Charles V when the latter was only Archduke. During his live, he will serve Charles V and he would be recompensed with many titles and positions of power like Chief of the Spanish treasury. He supported Charles I of Spain in his campaign to the Emperor Crown and in his persecution against Martin Luther. His death in 1521 is recorded as poisoning caused by the Protestant followers.

\(^{50}\) Guillaume de Croÿ (1497-1521) was the nephew of Lord Chièvres. His uncle convinced Charles I of Spain to make him Archbishop of Toledo (1517-1521). His appointment of this position was one of the many causes of the Revolt of Comuneros (1520-1521).


\(^{52}\) Ferdinand I (1503-1564) was the son of Philip I of Castile and Joanna I of Castile and brother of Charles V. During his brother reign, he will be his representative in the Habsburgs’s lands in Austria, where he was sent to avoid him to become a symbol of the revolt against Charles V in Spain. At the death of his brother, Ferdinand became the Holy Roman Emperor, separating the Spanish crown, which was for Philip II, from the Holy Roman Empire.
that, in 1521, Catherine of Aragon was granting him with a pension; Vives had dedicated his edition of *De civitate Dei* of St. Augustine to Henry VIII in 1522. In addition, in 1523, he presented to the Queen the requested manuscript of *De institutione feminae Christianae* and published *De ratione studii puerilis*, containing two letters about education, the first one dedicated to Mary Tudor’s education. In 1524, during a short return to Bruges, he married Margarita Valdaura. Until 1528 he lived between Bruges and England and in 1526 he published *De Subventione Pauperum*, a treatise on the eradication of poverty through education. Moreover, his presence in the court provided him with the opportunity of meeting many of the most important English humanists: Fisher, Linacre, Mountjoy, and further reinforcing his friendship with More, who he visited frequently at his home. At the time of the “King’s Matter”, the situation of Vives in England was delicate as he was even placed by house confinement by the order of Cardinal Wolsey because the Valencian asked the Imperial Ambassador to inform the Pope about the queen’s matter (Noreña, 1976, p.86). Furthermore, he was one of the ‘lawyers’ of Queen Catherine next to two Flemish advocates. After Catherine’s trial, Vives left England to never return (Noreña, 1976, p.87).

From his departure from England in 1528 to his death, Juan Luis Vives would dedicate himself to his studies about education. He wrote his most outstanding works, which were mainly social, educational and religious. From 1538 to 1539, he lived in Breda and he was the tutor of his fellow countrywoman Mencía de Mendoza, the daughter of Marquis of Zenete and wife of Count Nassau. In 1540, shortly after writing *De veritate fidei christianae*, which would be published as a posthumous work in 1543, Juan Luis Vives died in Bruges being forty-eight years old due to a severe attack of gout.

---

53 Margarita Valdaura (1505-1552) was the daughter of Bernardo Valdaura, a Valencian converse merchant who moved to Bruges. Juan Luis Vives passed his first years in Bruges living with the Valdaura family who were related with the mother of Vives. In those years, Vives was the tutor of Margarita and years later he married her in 1524. Margarita had an important role in the last years of Vives, as she helped him by copying the works Vives dictated her when he was not able to do it by himself due to his gout.

54 John Fisher (1469-1535) was an English Catholic Bishop, theologian, academic and Chancellor of Cambridge University. He was executed, like Sir Thomas More, the 22nd June 1535 because he refused to take the Oath of Succession of 1534.

55 Thomas Linacre (1460-1524) was an English humanist, scholar and physician. He was the mentor of several important figures like Erasmus or Prince Arthur.

56 William Blount, Baron Mountjoy (1478-1534), was an English courtier, humanistic scholar and patron of learning. He was the chamberlain of Catherine of Aragon.

57 Mencía de Mendoza (1508-1554) was an important figure of the Renaissance and the support of women education in the Netherlands.

58 Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar y Mendoza (1466-1523) was a Spanish nobleman. He was the first Conde del Cid and the first Marquis of Cenete.

59 Count Henry III Nassau-Dillenburg-Dietz (1483-1538) was the Upper Chamberlain of Charles V after the death of Lord of Chièvres and an important military commander being Captain General.
4. Mary Tudor’s Education.

In this section, I will comment on the two works Juan Luis Vives wrote related to the education of Princess Mary Tudor: the book *De institutione fœminæ Chistianæ* (1524) and the letter to Queen Catherine published in *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523); this is a more detailed plan of study for Mary and was published with another letter containing a plan of study for Lord Montjoy. However, I will mainly focus on the first one, due to its length and variety of topics. On the other hand, *De ratione studii puerilis* will be mentioned as complementary information, as it only offers a deeper view on some topics that are already exposed in the first work.

For the approach to *De institutione fœminæ Chistianæ*, first I will focus on the “Preface” written by Vives. This “Preface” will help us to introduce the work since he wrote about his motivation for writing it, the target reader, the main objective of the book, and also about its division. Then, I will comment on the main precepts, divided by topics that the humanist offered for the education of an unmarried woman and I will compare it with Mary’s real situation.

4.1. Prefaces.

As I already have commented above, Queen Catherine of Aragon requested from Vives a work that could help on the education of her daughter Mary Tudor. So, in 1522, the Spanish scholar started to write *De institutione fœminæ Chistianæ* (Hickman, 2016, p.44). However, in his ‘Preface’, Vives does not refer directly to this command, embellishing his motivation by writing: “Mouit me tum [Catherine’s] sanitas morū tuorum in sacra studia ut de Christianæ fœminæ institutione” (Vives, 1524, p.648). Thus he does not mention it was ordered by her, as he does at the beginning of his letter to the Queen in *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523): “Ivssisti, ut breuem aliquam rationē conscriberem qua in Maria filia tua instituenda præceptor cius uti posset” (Vives, 1523, p.17). He also mentions that he decided to write the former because he thought there was a lack of texts about the topic. Actually, it is not exactly a matter of lack of texts but more the treatment of the topic of those text, as they praised chastity but they did not give advice to women as how to maintain it, or to live a virtuous life:

```
Nam de re familiari Xenophon & Aristoteles, & de republica Plato præcepta quī traderēt, nōnulla dixerunt, quae ad mulieris officium pertinerēt Tertillianus, Cyprianus, Hieronymus, Ambrosius, Augustinus, Fulgentius, de uirginibus ac uiduis sic disseruere ut aliquod uite genus suadeant, potius quam forrnēt. Toti sunt in castitatis laudādis, magnificō vero opera
```

---

60 “Moved by the holiness of your life and your ardent zeal for sacred studies, I have endeavoured to write something for your majesty on the education of a Christian woman” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.45).
61 “You have ordered me to write a brief plan of study according to which thy daughter Mary may be educated by her tutor.” (Watson, 1912, p.137).
& illis ingenı̈s illa sanctitate digno, sed precepta formulars vite paussimas perhibureūt, satitus esserat adhortari adoptima, & manū porrigere ad altissima, q erudire inferiora.62 (Vives, 1524, p.648).

According to Vives, the main objective for women “est cure pudicitę, id circa cum ĥec exposita es abūdeilla dimitti videt instructa”63 (Vives, 1524, p.648). On the grounds of this objective, it can be asserted that the scholar’s work was in general terms quite conservative (Hickman, 2016, p.44). On the other hand, despite its traditional view, there were some progressive thoughts (Hickman, 2016, p.57) like the fact that the book is directly addressed to women, the assertion that women’s intellectual capacity can be equal to that of men, and that also men should be as virtuous as women (Fantazzi, 2008, pp.65-66).

With reference to the target reader of the work, there is a direct mention to Princess Mary by addressing to her mother: “Leget hæc monita mea Maria filia tua, & effiget ea, dum se ad domesticum exemplar componit probitatis & sapientæ tuæ. Effigent certe: & nisi humanas omnes coniecturas sola fallat, optima & sanctisima ut sit necesse est, te & Henrico octauo nata, tali & tam laudaro coniugum pari.”64 (Vives, 1524, p.650), being possibly addressed to Catherine because Mary was only seven years old at the time. Still, De institutione fœminæ Chistianæ (1524) was not exclusively composed as a moral treatise for the English Princess, but it was also intended to be applied to all upper-class women, regardless their age (Hickman, 2016, p.44; Pierret Perkins, 2007, p.15). For that reason, it was published, instead of only being given to the Princess. What is more, it was not even only for the English upper-class women, since it was written in Latin, the lingua franca of the period. Thus, all European women could read it (Watson, Permentier & Peynaud, 1950, p.57) as long as they knew the language. In addition, it was even translated to several languages during the 16th century like to Spanish, French, German, Italian and English (Watson et al., 1950, p.60) so it was available even for women that did not know how to read Latin.

62 “Moreover, when Xenophon and Aristotle transmitted rules for the management of domestic affairs, and Plato for the state, they made some observations pertaining to the duty of the woman. Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Fulgentius discussed the status of virgins and widows in such a way that they advocate a way of life rather than give instruction about it. They spend all their time singing the praises of chastity, a commendable undertaking in itself and one worthy of those mind and of the sanctity of virtue, but they gave very few precepts or rules of life, thinking it preferable to exhort their readers to the best conduct and to point the way to the highest examples rather than give instruction about more lowly matters.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.46).

63 “[I]s chastity, therefore when this has been thoroughly elucidated, she may be considered to have received sufficient instruction.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.47).

64 “Your daughter Mary will read these recommendations and will reproduce them as the models herself on the example of your goodness and wisdom to be found in her own home. She will do this assuredly and, unless she alone belie all human expectations, must of necessity be virtuous and holy as the offspring of you and Henry VIII, such a noble and honoured pair.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.50).
The last point of the ‘Preface’ I would like to comment is the way Vives divided its work in three parts: “Ita orsi a prima fœmina ætatis, ipsam usque ad connubial Primo libro deducimus: hinc a coniugo ad uidgetatem, quemadmodum trasmittēdum illi cum marito tempus bene ac beate censeamus, Secundo: Postremo, uiduitas instituta est.” (Vives, 1524, p.648). Taking into account this division, – and against the author’s wish to consider the three parts as an indivisible unit: “ne qua uel uirgo solū sibi legendum primū librum putet, nupta alterum, uel uidua tertium, uni uersos singulis lengendos censeo.” (Vives, 1524, p.648) –, I will only comment on the first part for several reasons. The first reason is the limitations of the dissertation itself, owing to the fact that analysing the whole treaty would be lengthy. The second reason is because the most formative years in a person’s life are usually childhood and adolescence, periods that correspond mainly to the “Virginem” part – as More and Erasmus called the work (Pierret Perkins, 2007, p.15) –. The third reason is because of Mary Tudor’s life: as we have seen from her biography, her early years became a bit convulse after the separation of her parents, so her education presumably came second in Henry’s mind. Moreover, by the time she married, she was also the Queen that, even if she tried to be a good wife to Philip and please him, she was also committed to her country and these two facets of her life were in tension. Finally, the last part cannot be applied to her, because she died before Philip.

In short, the ‘Preface’ helps us to locate and to get an overview of Vives’s approach. It was linked to the Queen and to Mary obviously, but he wanted it to be helpful to any upper-class women. It was also conservative, so we do not expect an over-revolutionary defence of the education of women as we understood it today, because it only deals with virtue, which is a traditional belief. And yet, it is sparkled with innovative ideas for his time. That is one of the main reasons why it is relevant nowadays, as it marks a separation between medieval thought and Humanism (Watson, 1912, p.27).

After having introduced the work, I will start commenting on Vives’s precepts which are gathered by topics, in order to compare them to Mary’s life. First, I will analyse what Vives considered the virtues that a Christian woman should have, as it is the essential idea for the whole part and even the whole treaty, then what he says about the people in charge of the woman’s instruction and the relationship she should have with them. After that, I will continue

---

65 “Thus, in the first book, I begin with the first state of a woman’s life and continue up to the state of matrimony, then in the second book, I make recommendations on how time is to be passed properly and happily with one’s husband from marriage to widowhood, and, in the last book, instruction is given concerning widowhood.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.46).
66 “[T]he unmarried girl will not think that she has to read only the first book or the married woman the second or the widow the third. I think all books should be read by every class of woman” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.46).
with what she should be taught and how the girl should be educated and then I will concentrate on the activities she should learn, which are adequate for her leisure time, and on other daily matters. Finally, I will explain what the Spanish scholar said about public life, that contains going out and the relationships she would build, and also, concerning relationships, the matter of love and marriage.

4.2. The Christian Woman’s Virtues and the People in Charge of the Education.

Concerning the virtues of a Christian woman, Vives wrote “Pudicitiae comites indiuiduae sunt, pudor & sobrietas [...] Nulla re insolescet [...] Cum envidia est illi crebrò pugnandum [...] At quae pudibunda est, & temperato animo, quae sobria, nunquam ira effetur, nec in maledicentiã proprum pet, nec in fœuité aliqua & inhumanitã rapietur” (1524, p.674). Of these virtues that the scholar lists, Mary Tudor was described as stubborn and proud by her father when she refused to give up on the title of Princess (Whitelock, 2009, p.56), even if she denied that it was a question of pride:

I protest before you [...] that my conscience will in no wise suffer me to take any other than myself for princess, or for the King’s daughter born in lawful matrimony [...] Nor say I this out of any ambition or proud mind, as God is my judge [...] since the pope hath not so declared it by his sentence definitive, to whose final judgement I submit myself (Whitelock, 2009, p.56).

And she also had some moments of public anger like when she was advised to marry Courtney instead of Philip, as she wished (Whitelock, 2009, p.224).

From these virtues, the one that our author recognized as the most important one was chastity or virginity, to such a degree that he devotes a whole chapter – “De virginitate” – to it. In his opinion, the only valid virginity is that of mind and body: “Virginitatē uovo, integritatē métis, que etiam in corpus dimanet: integritatē porro, ab omni corruptiōe ac cōtagio” (Vives, 1524, p.659). Actually he even considers more important the mind than the body because “[n]am corpus terrenū ac brutū, administrū est solum nostræ volūtatis: ne illud spectat Deus, aut curat, alicnissimū à se; sed mentē, naturā sibi similē & quadātenu propinquā” (Vives, 2000, p.80).

67 “The inseparable companions of chastity are a sense of propriety and modest behaviour [...] She will not grow proud of anything [...] She must frequently do battle with envy [...] A woman who is chaste and moderate and sober-minded will never be carried away by anger or give vent to abusiveness or be swept away by violence and inhumanity.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.118)
68 “I define virginity as integrity of the mind, which extends also to the body, an integrity free of all corruption and contamination” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.80).
69 “For the terrestrial and brute body is only the servant of the will, and God does not look to it or have any care for it, a thing totally foreign to him, but attends only to the mind, of a nature similar to his own and to some extent close to it.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.80).
In consequence, Vives emphasises the importance of a pure mind – “Per integritatē mētis: uide ut maiore sollicitudine ad custodiā huius excubes, corporis”\textsuperscript{70} (Vives, 1524, p.660) – because it is easier to corrupt: “Illue ergo admouenda sunt ualidiora presidia, quo maius periculū incumbit. mens est diligēter muniēda, ne in uirgineo fit corpore uiolata”\textsuperscript{71} (Vives, 1524, p.660). In addition, he also justifies his insistence on women being chaste, owing to the fact that, in contrast with men, no other virtue is demanded of them: “At in muliere nemo uel eloquētiā recquirit, uel ingenium, uel prudentiā, uel artes uiē, uel administrationē repub. uel iustitiā, uel benignitatē. Nemo denicb quicq uā alud præter pudicinā: quæ sola si desideretur, perinde est acsiuio desint omnia”\textsuperscript{72} (Vives, 1524, p.662). Concerning this matter, the only historical source we have is a letter that Catherine of Aragon sent to her daughter when she was moved to Elizabeth’s household and she could not see her. In that letter, Catherine asked Mary to “keep your heart with a chaste mind, and your body from all ill and wanton company, [not] thinking or desiring any husband for Christ’s passion” (Whitelock, 2009, p.58). As Mary Tudor had in her mother her role model, we can assume that she kept herself chaste until her wedding with Philip II of Spain.

On the grounds that I have already mentioned the figure of the mother, I will now focus on the people that would be in charge of watching over the young woman: the mother, the father and any other woman. Regarding the parents, the Valencian scholar tells the young woman “patrē rerū omniū post Deū charissimos habebit”\textsuperscript{73} (Vives, 1524, p.672). About the other woman, she is mentioned in case that the mother is absent for some reason, and during the infancy, she is the figure of the nurse and when the girl grows up she is a woman of trust.

In relation to the mother, Vives recommends that the instruction of the woman “initia quoq a lacte ipso, quod velim fierisi possit, maternū esse, [...] sic mutual erit inter matrem & filiā charitas maior.”\textsuperscript{74} (Vives, 1524, p.650). Also it would avoid that “[q]uum nihil de matris

\textsuperscript{70} “To preserve integrity of the body, much care must be expended, but for the other much more is needed, or to put it more correctly, total vigilance [...] Control your thoughts and hold them in your power” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.82).
\textsuperscript{71} “The strongest defenses should be moved up where the danger is greatest. The mind must be particularly fortified, lest it be defiled in a virgin body, so that all treasures and beauty of integrity will endure there, firm and unassailable” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.81).
\textsuperscript{72} “In a woman, no one requires eloquence or talent or wisdom or professional skills or administration of the republic or justice or generosity; no one asks anything of her but chastity. If that one thing is missing, it is as if all were lacking to a man” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.85).
\textsuperscript{73} “[W]ill hold her mother and father in deep affection above all else after God himself” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.113).
\textsuperscript{74} “[B]eginning with her nurturing at the breast, which, if possible, should be with her mother’s milk [...] In that way, the mutual love between mother and daughter will become greater” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.53).
nomine a matre ipsa in aliam descidetur, nam & nutrices mater appellari sunt solitae”75 (Vives, 1524, p.650); However, for achieving this, it is important than the mother takes care of her as “[v]eritus mater filiā existmat suam ć non sollum utero gestuit & pepeit, sed etiam infantulum sempter in vulnis baulautui cui mamma prebuilt quā de sanguine suo aluit cuius somnos sinisuo fuit primos arrisus except blanda, & osculate est prima balbutiē conatis fari audiiit lacta & ad pectus infantem pressit, optima precās”76 (Vives, 1524, p.650). In the case of Mary, as we have seen in her biography, the relationship with her mother was quite affectionate like the one Vives describes, as Mary had her mother in great esteem.

However, in royal families, that the Queen took such complete care of the children was not common. So, here we find the figure of the nurse. In this case, Catherine in person chose carefully the members of the royal nursery that was formed by “a lady mistress, Lady Margaret Bryan [...], a wet nurse, Katherine Pole [...], three ‘rockers’ [...] and a laundress” (Whitelock, 2009, p.29) 77. Moreover, the exclusivity of the title ‘mother’ was not taken to consideration, as Mary would refer to her future governess, Margaret Pole78, the Countess of Salisbury – who replaced Margaret Bryan – as her second mother (Whitelock, 2009, p.33). Hence, Vives’s suggestions on how to choose a nurse were followed. He also wrote that the nurse should have a perfect morality: “[P]rimā videbit & quae rudis discet, hec perita & callida tētabit essigere [...]

Even if there is not much information of the character of the people Catherine chose to the royal nursery, it is easy to assume that if she considered them suitable for the responsibility and they were also noble-born, they would be fitting in Vives’s definition. Moreover, he asked

75 “[T]he name of mother will not be shared with another, for it is the custom to call wet nurses mother also.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.53).
76 “A mother thinks the daughter to be more truly her own when she has not only borne her in her womb and given birth to her but carried her own blood, cradled her in her arms as she slept, listened lovingly to her first joyous laughter and kissed her, heard with joy her first stammerings and helped her in her attempt to speak, and pressed her to her bosom, praying for every blessing from heaven” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.53).
77 Margaret Bryan (c.1468-c.1551/52) was the governess of Princess Mary Tudor, Princess Elizabeth, Henry FitzRoy and Prince Edward and previous to this she was the lady-in-waiting of Catherine of Aragon.
Katherine Pole (1522-1576) was the daughter of Henry Pole, first Baron Montague and she married with Francis Hastings, second Earl of Huntingdon. She was also the granddaughter of Lady Margaret Pole.
78 Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury (1473-1541) was the niece of the kings Edward IV and Richard III making her one of the few survivors of the Plantagenet royal house. She was one of the ladies-in-waiting of Catherine of Aragon and later she was appointed as the governess of Mary Tudor in 1520. After the schism with the Roman Church, Margaret Pole was arrested and executed in 1541 because of her support to Catholicism.
79 But since we do not wish the young girl to be as learned as she is chaste and virtuous, care must be taken on the part of the parents that she not to be defiled by anything immoral or dishonourable, and that nothing of that nature be acquired through the bodily senses or through her early upbringing. The first person she will hear and the first person she will see is the nurse, and what she will learn as an immature child she will try to reproduce when she is more practiced and experienced. [...] one should not hire a nurse who is given to drink or is of loose morals or talkative.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.54).
the nurse not to have a defective speech – “Quintilianus satis habuit dicere, videndū ne sit vicious sermo nutricibus, propetera qui in infant insedit sermonis modus, difficile elueretur”\(^{80}\) (Vives, 1524, p.650) – because it would cause the child to learn the language in a bad manner. About this, as being of noble families, we can assume that the royal nurses’ speech was sufficiently correct.

Furthermore, even when the girl grows up, either the mother or this figure of a woman of trust should be a constant companion. For the woman of trust, she should be

pudicitiae custos: quippe nulla est pestis maior, ne pernicosior, quam quae alitur domi.

[...] Quapropter prouidendū est, ne matrona, cui puella creditor, uiros habebat, aut filios, aut fratres procaciores ac lasciuos, uel quib. ipsa obsistere not audeat, nec cōmissam rem forriter propugnare. Sit nō casta modo, sed quae se etiā uultu & grauitate, tum prudēctiæ, tum morū, tum orationis, ucerabilē & suspiciendā reddat [...] ipsa in custodia stationis suæ nullū uereatur, ut sola præsentia sua, tuta omnia circū pudicitā prēstet\(^{81}\) (Vives, 1524, p.671).

In Mary Tudor’s situation, she was eventually separated from her mother: first when she was sent to the Marches in 1525 (Loades, 1989, p.39) and in a permanent way in May 1530, when Mary was sent to Richmond, and Queen Catherine to the More in Hertfordshire (Whitelock, 2009, p.46). In the place of her mother, Mary Tudor had this figure of respectable woman that Vives prescribes in her governess, Margaret Pole, at least until 1533, when her household was dissolved and she was sent to Elizabeth’s (Whitelock, 2009, p.55); There the main authority figure was Lady Anne Shelton\(^{82}\) and after her, Mary did not have more governesses.

While the bond shared by Mary and Catherine was affectionate and strong, her relationship with his father was rather changeable. After the separation of her parents, their communication was tense as Mary did neither approve nor accept the breaking of the English Church from the Pope and the situation would remain as such until Mary acceded to her father’s wishes. After that, Henry “showed her ‘such love and affection, and such promises for the future

\(^{80}\) “Quintilian put it well when he said, ‘One must see to it that the speech of nurses is not defective, because the manner of speech that is instilled in the child is difficult to eliminate” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.54).

\(^{81}\) “[A] guardian of her chastity, since there is no greater or more pernicious plague than that which is nurtured at home. [...] the matron to whom the girl is confided does not have men, children, or brothers in her house who are inclined to licentiousness or unruliness, or persons to whom she does not dare to offer resistance for the protection of the charges committed to her. She should not only be chaste but should earn respect and admiration through her facial expression and the austerity of her wisdom, moral, and conversation. [...] She should fear no one in the fulfilling of her duties of guardian, and her presence alone should ensure that chastity be safeguarded.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.111).

Anne Shelton (1475-1556) was the elder sister of Thomas Boleyn, the father of Queen Anne Boleyn. She was married to Sir John Shelton, who was the comptroller to the household of Mary and Princess Elizabeth.
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that no father could have never behaved better towards his daughter” (Whitelock, 2009, p.91). From that moment on, even if not affective, their relationship will be cordial enough, as she was restored in the succession and she was given properties by her father’s testament. Although the father and daughter’s relationship was not as close as the Spanish scholar recommended it should be, what was in the middle of Henry VIII and Mary was God, whom Vives considered before the parents, and in the same way for Mary as “she would obey her father in all things ‘next to God’” (Loades, 1989, p.100).

4.3. Education, Leisure Time and Personal Care.

Having considered who should supervise the education of the Christian woman, I now direct the attention to how to provide her with proper education. In the first place, when the girl is young, it is important to consider the behaviour. Vives is persistent in not allowing any missbehaviour:

> Uideāt parētes ne factu aliquod eius indecēs uel risu, uel bis, uel gestu approbēt, aut quod turpiissimē, osculis & coplexu excipiāt, id sepe conabit puella reddere, quod gratissimū parētibus putabit, oia sint in primis annis casta et pura, fältē morū grā, q ex illa infiantili consuetudine, prima, uelut deliniamenta ducū83 (Vives, 1524, p.651).

And in other to avoid this, it would be better not to teach about the notion of evil at this age:

> In illa ætate quae nondū bonū ac malū dajudicat, ne docenda quidē sunt mala. Pestilēs opinio eorū qui filios suos volūt & bonū & malū nō ignorare, ita demū(aiūt) melius uirtutē presecuturos, & fugituros uicia, quanto certius & utulius est, mala nō modo nō facere, sed nescire quidē, quanto etiā ho fœlicitus84 (Vives, 1524, p.651).

About this, we can guess that, as Henry VIII indicated the Countess of Salisbury that, when educating Mary, she had to teach her to “serve God, from whom all grace and goodness proceedeth” (Loades, 1989, p.42), neither of Mary’s parents would be interested in Mary learning about bad behaviour or actions.

The next step and the first one to begin with academic learning is to teach the girl how to read and the initial question is when she should start to read. The Spanish scholar says that:

83*Parents should be careful not to give approval to any unseemly actions of her either by laughing or by word or gesture, or worst of all, welcome it with kisses and embraces. The girl will often try to repeat what she thinks gives particular pleasure to her parents. In the early years, let everything be chaste and pure for the sake of morals, which from childhood habits take on their first features, so to speak. (Fantazzi, 2000, p.56).

84*“At that age which cannot yet distinguish between good and evil, she should not even learn about evil things, [...] Pernicious is the view of those who wish their children not to be ignorant of both good and evil. In that way, they say, in the end they will between pursue virtue and flee vice. How much more proper and useful is it not only not to do evil but not even to know it!” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.55).
Tempus nullū diffinio, ali eĩn anno septimo exordiendū putauerūt [...] ali quarto’ue [...].
Ego uerò totam hac dere deliberationē ad parentū prudentiā reicio, qui ex qualitate & habitu infantis cōsiliū sument: mode ne officiat indulgentia85 (Vives, 1524, pp.651-652).

But he also recommends that parents should not be indulgent because “[m]ultū officit filis parent indulgēu, quę effrenē illis in mille uitia licentiā offert, at adeō ingerita sed fœminæ in primis. Hæc eĩn magna ex parte solo cohibetur metu.”86 (Vives, 1524, p.652). In this aspect, the King and the Queen were not indulgent with Mary Tudor as she was able to read and write English and Latin at the age of nine, she knew some French and understood Spanish (Loades, 1989, p.32).

The learning of languages is the main topic in De ratione studii puerilis (1523), especially Latin: the way of teaching proper pronunciation, the different parts of speech (nouns, verbs, verbal nouns...), the Syntax, how to learn vocabulary, how to write and even how to speak it. In this part, the way in which Mary Tudor learned Latin was following Thomas Linacre’s87 course book Rudimenta Grammatices (1525), that was written in English and that explained Latin grammar in an easy way (Hickman, 2016, p.68). Actually, another work by Linacre is mentioned – next to Erasmus’s Colloquies and Melanchthon’s Constitutione – in the letter: the Compendium grammaticae (Vives, 1523, p.28). Consequently, he probably thought that the book by Linacre fitted the needs of the Princess. However, even if Linacre’s coursebook was followed, Mary’s tutor was Richard Fetherstone88 (Loades, 1989, p.41; Whitelock, 2009, p.29). Additionally, contrary to the real way Mary was taught Latin, the Spanish scholar advised that the princess should learn “cum discipulis [...] quas habeat tres aut quatuor nam solā institui non conducit: sed nec plurimæ sint, & eæ puellæ, at; etiam selectissimæ, liberaliter & sanctissime educatæ: à quibus nihil audire possit, aut discere, quod mores corrumpat, quorū prima semper

85“I do not prescribe any definite time. Some thought that this should begin at the age of seven [...] Other preferred the fourth or fifth year of age [...] I leave all this deliberation to the discretion of the parents, who will be guided by the character and qualities of the child so long as they do not spoil them through indulgence.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.58).
86 “The indulgence of parents is very harmful to children, since it offers them free access to a thousand vices and even thrusts in their face. But this is especially harmful for the girl, for she is held back to a great degree solely by fear.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.58).
87 Thomas Linacre (c.1460-1524) was an English humanist scholar and a physician. He was the first Englishman to study Greek and he was a mentor to many important people of the period: Erasmus, Sir Thomas More, Prince Arthur, Queen Mary I, John Colet, William Grocyn and William Lilye among others.
88 Richard Fetherstone (? – 1540) was an English Catholic priest. In 1534, he was imprisoned for not taking the Oath of Supremacy until his execution in 1540.
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debet esse cura”⁸⁹ (Vives, 1523, p.33). Apart from how to teach Latin, Vives also gives recommendations to improve Mary’s memory and how she should take annotations.

The lessons of the Princess were, at least at the beginning, a constant worry for her parents, as their letters prove. When Mary departed to Wales, the King gave detailed instructions, stating that she should to be taught to “serve God” and that she should keep her musical language’s learning (Whitelock, 2009, p.30). In a similar way, Queen Catherine also wrote to her daughter asking her to be attentive to her lessons (Loades, 1989, p.42). Hence, Henry VIII and Queen Catherine were considered a good model of parenthood for the time, as they gave Mary an enlightened education (Loades, 1989, p.35). Their efforts also were successful as, at the age of twelve, the Princess had enough knowledge of Latin that she could translate a prayer of St Thomas Aquinas from Latin into English (Whitelock, 2009, p.24), and she also was talented for music as she played the lute, the harpsichord and the virginals (Loades, 1989, p.43).

For Vives, one of the main aims of education was to keep the mind occupied in the young woman’s leisure time, by doing different activities. Vives writes that “[s]unt enim nostril animi as aliquid agendū nati, & apposite ita opera pascentur, roborātur, gaudēt: ocio ue rò dissoluuntur, inertia decidūt, nec omnino possunt nihil agree: ut as libidinē & flagitia & his grauior etiā facinora prolabātur necesse sit, quum melius aliquid deest quo occupentur”⁹⁰ (Vives, 1524, p.664). When the girl is young, her leisure time will be spent playing. Concerning this, Vives says that: “lususoeōs sint cū paribus puellis, præsente aut matre, aut nutrice aut grauioris ætatis, pha ðæminæ, ālusus illos & animi oblectamenta tēperet, at ad hostate virtutē dirigar, oïs masculus sexus absit nec assuescat cū viris delectari.”⁹¹ (Vives, 1524, p.651)

Furthermore, he also writes about the toys she should have and how to use them:

[S]ed iam tum ceu per lusus meditet, quæ postea, pfutura sunt. Castis fabellis, ducat:
tollani pupeæ, imago quædæ idolatriæ, et quæ cōptus ac ornatus cupiditatē docēt, augent. Magis
phærim feruta illa, quis simulachra totius domestic supellectilis in stanno aut plūbo sunt expressa

⁸⁹ “Of fellow-pupils let her have three or four; for it is not good to be taught alone. But do not let them be many, and let the few be most carefully chosen, and most piously and liberally educated, from whom she will not hear or learn anything which would be injure her morals; for conduct (mores) ought to be the first care.” (Watson, 1912, p.145).

⁹⁰ “Our minds were born and destined to perform some activity, and they thrive, grow strong, and derive enjoyment in work, whereas they are weakened by idleness, lapse into inertia, and are incapable of doing anything. Consequently, they are bound to lapse into lust and shameful conduct and worse crimes than these since they have nothing better to occupy themselves.” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp.91-92).

⁹¹ “All her playtime must be spent with girls of her own age in presence of her mother or nurse or a good woman of mature years, who will regulate those pastimes and the pleasures of the mind and direct them to goodness and virtue. Any male should be excluded, and the girl should not be accustomed to find pleasure in the company of men.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.55).
As a matter of fact, little is known about Princess Mary’s playtime but according to Loades, the more probable outcome is that Mary did not enjoy the company of girls of her age (1989, p.46) and consequently, it is less feasible the option that she played with boys. Regarding her toys, nothing is known but we can imagine that, in consideration of her status, she got the popular toys of the time and that she probably would then had dolls.

As the girl grows up, our author also suggests other activities like reading or sewing and he is opposed to games of cards and dice, meaning, gambling (Vives, 1524, p.664). For Vives, sewing is an activity that is fitting for every woman, regardless of her social status as it is “utilissimas rei familiari & cōseruatrices frugalitatis, cuius cōuenitin primis studiolas esse fēminas.” (1524, p.652). On this, Loades notes that the Princess “enjoyed sewing” and that “she probably learned [to sew] at an early age” (1898, p.34). In fact, it was actually common among princesses, as in the case of Isabella I of Castile and her daughters, to learn how to spin, sew and do needlepoint. Also related to household duties, Vives considered that another task that was adequate for women was cooking:

Discet ad hæc culinariā, nō illā popinariā fordidā immodicorū ciborū,[... ] sed sobriā, mundā, temperate, frugalē, qua parentib, & fratribus cibos paret virgo, marito uero & liberis nupta sic enim & ab ilis, & ab his nō exigūa initura gratiā, si non omnia in samulas reicerit, sed ipsa sui manib curait, & cōcinnarit [...] Spectar id quo ad frugalitē & mundicias nam presente domina, aut filia familias omnia siunt lautius, nitudus, adde etiam accuratius, minore sumpto (1524, p.655).

However, learning how to cook was not frequent amid the royalty and, consequently, Mary did not learn, as she herself declared: “[M]y father and mother never brought me [up] with baking and brewing” (Whitelock, 2009, p.168).

---

92 "[I]n the form of play, let her exercise herself in the things that will be of benefit to her later. Let her be edified by chaste tale, and take dolls away from her, which are a kind of imagine of idolatry and teach girls the desire for adornments and finery. I would be more in favour of those toys made of tin or lead that represent household objects, [...] This is a pleasant pastime for the child, and in the meantime she learns the names and uses of various things without even being aware of it”. (Fantazzi, 2000, pp.56-57).

93 “[T]wo arts passed on to posterity and contributing to frugality, which should be the matter of prime concern for women.” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp.58).

94 “[S]he will learn the art of cooking, not the vulgar kind associated with the low-class eating-houses that serve up immoderate amounts of food to great numbers [...] but a sensible, refined, temperate, and frugal art with which, as unmarried maiden, she prepares food for her parents and brothers, and as a married woman for her husband. She will win no small favor with the one and the other if she does not leave everything to the servants but attends to things and set the house in order with their own hands. [...] This contributes also to frugality and elegance, for when the mistress of the house or her daughter are present, everything is done with more taste and refinement, not to say with more care and less expense” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp. 61-62).
Whereas the suggestion that the young woman should be busy with household works is not quite innovative, the recommendation of spending her time reading is new. Nevertheless, according to Vives, not every book is suitable. The Valencian scholar lists in the first place those books which he would not allow reading (mainly the vernacular books about war and love): “Inualuit cōsuetueto quauis gentilitia peior, ut uulgares libri [...]nullam habeant aliam quam de bellis aut amoribus materiā”\(^95\) (Vives, 1524, p.657). This is such a serious concern, that Vives goes as far as naming works and authors:


In opposition, he approves reading religious and moral texts, and he also offers examples:


This list of advisable readings is broadened in *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523). On the one hand, he continues with his preference for moral works and he recommends works on Latin aphorisms like *Distichs* of Cato, Publius Syrus’s *Mimi*, Seven Wise Men’s *Sentences*... (Vives, 1523, p.30). On the other hand, he includes, as the letter is directed to the only heir of England, more political works like *Institutiones Principis*, *Enchiridion*, and *Paraphrases* (all of them by

\(^{95}\) “A custom has grown up, worse than any pagan usage, that books in the vernacular [...] treat no subjects but love and war” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.73).

\(^{96}\) “They should also concern themselves with pernicious books like those popular in Spain: Amadís, Esplandián, Florisando, Tirant, Tristín, book filled with endless absurdities [...] Celestina, the brothel-keeper, begetter of wickedness, the Prision of Love. In France, there are Lancelot du Lac, Paris and Vienna, Pontibus and Sidonia, Pierre of Provence, Maguelone and Melusine, the heartless mistress. Here in Flandes, there are Floris and Blancheleur, Leonella and Canamoro, Turias and Floret, and Pyramus and Thisbe. There are some translated from Latin into the vernacular languages Poggio’s unfacetious Facetiae, Euryalus and Lucretian and the Decameron of Boccaccio. All these books were written by idle, unoccupied, ignorant men, the slaves of vice and filth” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp.74-75).

\(^{97}\) “As for books should be read [...] the Gospels of the Lord, the Acts of the Apostoles and the Epistles, the historical and moral books of the Old Testament, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Hilary, Gregory, Boethius, Fulgentius, Tertullian, Plato, Cicero, Seneca and other such authors [...] There need not be any lack of poets if a woman takes delight in the rhythm of poetry. She may read Prudentius, Arator, Prosper, Juvenecus and Paulinus.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.78).
Erasmus) and *Utopia* by Thomas More (Vives, 1523, p.35). In addition, Vives is also interested in Mary knowing about History with the works of Justinus, Florus and Valerius Maximus (1523, p.35).

In this case, we do not know if Mary Tudor would have read and liked any of the vernacular books Vives forbade, as there is no information. Per contra, we know that both Catherine and Mary approved the reading of the Bible (Loades, 1989, pp.118-119). Also, we know with certainty that Mary Tudor possessed *De Vita Christi* and the letters to Paula and Eustochium written by St Jerome, as they were given to her by Catherine of Aragon (Whitelock, 2009, p.59). Those books would have been totally approved by Vives.

Another activity about which Vives comments on is praying. He explains for whom the young woman should pray: “Orabit primum pro se, ut augeatur pietate, proposito sanctæ pudicitiae, & reliquis uirtutibus: tum pro parentibus, hinc pro fratib. sororib. cōsanguineis, & cæteris pro quib. deum precari eam cōueniet” 98(Vives, 1524, p.673). Furthermore, it was important that she understood understand what she is saying, “uel loquetur lingua, quā norit”99 (Vives, 1524, p.673) or “uel quae Latine dicet, habeat prius ab aliquot declarata”100 (Vives, 1524, p.673) because she should pray feeling it and “in mente & cogitatione, cum a rebistis uilib. ad coelestia diuina animū ergit.”101 (Vives, 1524, p.673). Even if we cannot know how Mary prayed or what she asked for, we can know that she understood what she prayed as she knew Latin.

In other respects, Vives’s work also involves other everyday matters connected to personal care: food, sleep, hygiene and physical appearance. Regarding the diet, the humanist follows Galen’s102 theory which declared that young people are innately warm so they have to eat cold food and drinks (Vives, 1524, p.662). About this cold food, Vives says that “[v]ictus sit facilis, ac parabilis, nec efficacia calidus”103 (1524, p.662) and that it is beneficial to do fasts in the unmarried stage that “refrenēt, & cōprimat, restinguat iuuētutis incendia nā haec demū

---

98 “She will pray first for herself that she may grow in piety, in her commitment to holy chastity, and in the other virtues. Next she will pray for her parents, brothers, sisters, relatives, and other for whom it is fitting that she pray to God.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.115).
99 “[W]hether she prays in a language she knows” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.115)
100 “[O]r, if in Latin, that someone will tell her beforehand what it means” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.115)
101 “[I]n the mind and in contemplation, when she raises the soul from vile earthly concerns to the heavenly and divine.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.115).
102 Aelius Galenus, (129 – c.200/216) was a Greek physician, surgeon and philosopher in the Roman Empire. His works are considered the most important medical documents of the Antiquity and it has influenced Occidental modern sciences: anatomy, pathology, neurology... and also philosophy and logic. He was the most prolific author of his time as it is though he has wrote 600 treatises.
103 “Let her nourishment be light, plain, and not highly seasoned.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.87).
sunt uera & sancta ieiunia”\textsuperscript{104} (Vives, 1524, p.662). On the prohibition of hot food, Vives put special emphasis on meat and leguminous vegetable which are also heavy to digest (1524, p.662). Likewise, on drinks, the scholar recommends “liquida & pura aqua”\textsuperscript{105} (1524, p.662), but if it damages the woman’s stomach, she is allowed to drink “paulū ceruisie̜, aut uini, quantū sat erit ad conco quēdum cibū, nō ad corpus inflāmandū”\textsuperscript{106} (Vives, 1524, p.662).

About Mary Tudor’s meals, during her stay at the Marches, Henry VIII demanded her diet “to be pure, well-prepared, dressed and served” (Whitelock, 2009, p.30). It was also set up in extreme detail; for instance, she could order “anything up to thirty-five dishes in the two courses of her dinner” (Loades, 1989, p.44); there, we could imagine, not probably be as light and plain as Vives would have liked. Additionally, due to Mary’s health problems\textsuperscript{107}, she required some special meals with more meat (Loades, 1989, p.80).

On sleep, our author mentions first the bed: “Lectus erit nō perinde delicatus, ac mundus: ut placide quiescat, nō molliter”\textsuperscript{108} (Vives, 1524, p.663) and then he refers to the necessary number of sleep hours (without giving any specific number): “Somnus sit in uirgine nō longus: nec minor tamē, quam pro ualeinudine cui nos ita prospticimus ut melius ualeant, quē hane nostra frugalitate sequuntur, quam quà delicias: quibus deditas marcescere uident, ac pallere.”\textsuperscript{109} (Vives, 1524, p.664). Regarding Mary’s sleep, we can only know that her father commanded her servants on the March that her bed should be “pure, sweet, clean and wholesome” (Whitelock, 2009, p.30).

Relative to the issue of hygiene and physical appearance, Vives should have considered it quite important as he wrote about it in a whole chapter. The Spanish scholar commanded cleanliness but not to be excessively flamboyant in the use of perfumes:

\begin{quote}
Ut non probat animus recte at ad humanitatem institutus immun
diciem aut fœtorem, moderatos odores no recit, quibus spiritus uel reficiuntur defatigati, uel excitantur languentes, uel etiam curantur affecti [...] Sic odores istos tam immodicos improbat, fomenta istius corporis,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{104} “[C]heck and control it and extinguish the fires of youth. These are true and holy fasts.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.87).

\textsuperscript{105} “[L]impid and clear water” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.87)

\textsuperscript{106} “[L]ittle beer or wine [...] , enough for digestion, but not to inflame the body.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.87).

\textsuperscript{107} During her life, Mary Tudor had health problems mainly related with uterus problems.

\textsuperscript{108} “[A] young woman’s bed will be clean rather than luxurious so that she may sleep peacefully, not sensually” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.90)

\textsuperscript{109} “The sleep of a virgin should not be long, but no less than what is good for her health, to safeguard which we are of the opinion that young girls are healthier if they follow the austerity we recommend rather than sensual delight, which is manifested in its devotees by weakness and pallor.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.91).
On clothes, Vives upholds the use of modest tissues: “Non uestietur serico, at laneo: nó bysino, at line uulgari: nō splendebit uestis, at nec fordebit: nō erit admirationi, sed nec fastidio”\(^{111}\) (1524, p.670). Of course, he does not approve the use of men’s clothes, as it would be unnatural: “Illud uero ne admonēdum quidearbitror, foeminae uirili cultu & uestitu utendū no esse aliqui euidentissim fore signū & audaciā uirilem, et notabilem impudentiā inesse muliebri pectori. Conferuatur enim distintione illa ucititus pudor, parēs & nutritious pudicitie.”\(^{112}\) (Vives, 1524, p.671). This same modesty is extended to the use of complements like jewels:

> Mundus muliebris nominates earū ornatus, quo mundicies significatur, nō artificiū, uel opulentia. Auri, uel argentii, aut margaritarū, gemmarum ue, nō uideo rei tam sumptuose ad quid ualeat usus: nisi quorundā lapillorū uires magis æstimētur, quam ostentatio, sicut coralli, uel smargdi si modo tantille rei uires illas natura indidit, quas perhibēt.\(^{113}\) (Vives, 1524, p.670).

About the use of cosmetics, Vives is against it: “In quo equidē audire peruelim, quid spected uirgo, quū ceussa & purpurisso se illinit. Si sic placer sibi, demens est. [...] Si uiris, scelsta”\(^{114}\) (p.665).\(^{115}\)

This pressure in maintaining the aspect of women in a modest and humble way is defended by two arguments. The first one, according to Vives, is that the reason of wearing adornment is only grounded by the desire of “tunc dire, tuc ostentare sese, & uersari com uiris

---

\(^{110}\) “An upright and cultivated mind does not approve of uncleanness and stench and does not reject mild perfumes, by which tired spirits are revived or roused from their languor or even cured of their ailments [...]. In like manner it condemns excessive odors, fomentation of this body of ours, which the more it is indulged, the more it rebels insolently against the mind, claims tyranny over the whole man, and drags everything down to the basest desires, the seat of self-indulgence.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.100).

\(^{111}\) “She will not dress in silk but in wool, not in lace but in ordinary linen, her dress will not be resplendent, neither will it be squalid. She will not be an object of admiration, nor one of repugnance” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.107).

\(^{112}\) “I do not think I need to advise a woman against putting on men’s clothing and attire. To do so would be a clear sign of a masculine audacity and astonishing impudence in a woman’s heart. In the distinction of dress, modesty is preserved, which is the parent and guardian of chastity” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.109).

\(^{113}\) “Female cosmetics are named after the word for cleanliness, not artifice or opulence of gold, silver, pearls, or precious stones. I do not see the use of this sumptuousness unless it be said that some of these stones are valued more for their power then for mere display, like corals and emeralds, if nature really did give these tiny minerals the powers they are said to possess” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.107).

\(^{114}\) “In this regard I should like to know for what reason a young woman smears herself with white lead and purple pigment. If it is to please herself, she is mad. [...] If it is to please men, she is stupid” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.94).

\(^{115}\) As a curious note, Shakespeare will be also against the idea of the use of cosmetics. This is shown in his play *Hamlet* as Hamlet tells Ophelia “God hath give you one face and you make yourselves another” (p.283 in The Arden Shakespeare edition, 1982). Moreover Sonnet 127 can be interpreted as a defence of the natural beauty, even if not canonical, against the artificial one.
gestiunt”\(^{116}\) (1524, p.668), what he names as: “naufragiū pudicitiae”\(^{117}\) (1524, p.668).

Furthermore, it is not only a danger for the women but for others; in the same way they are guilty for causing the perdition of others: “[S]uspire adolescentū post te trahas, cōcupiscendi libidoīnē nutrias, peccadi fomenta succēdas, ut si ipsa nō pereas, alios tamē perdas, & uelut gladiū te & uenenū uidentib. praeaeas: excusari nō potes, qualisisi mente casta, & pudica.”\(^{118}\) (Vives, 1524, p.669).

In a sense, we might say that Mary Tudor did not dress in a modest and humble way, as she liked “fine clothes and jewelry” (Whitelock, 2009, p.24; Loades, 1989, p.119) and it is recorded in the historical resources that she dressed in a rich way in the reunions that were organized in the court (Whitelock, 2009, pp.14, 35, 115.). Obviously, we need to take into account that she was a princess and future Queen of England.

### 4.4. Social Life: Social Gatherings and Love.

As we see, ornamentation is fairly linked to social life. Vives’s approach to the topic is that “[v]irgini rarus debet esse egressus in publicū, quum nec negoci sit ei quicquā foris, & periculū preciosissimae rei pudicitæ”\(^{119}\) (1524, p.671) and in some way, Mary adhered to this as she did not get out of the court because even the official events were hold in the royal household. Moreover, for much time she was under house arrest in Elizabeth’s household, which forbade her even to walk in the gardens (Whitelock, 2009, p.56). In spite of his resistance to a young woman going out, Vives gives some advice on how her behaviour should be if she is obliged to be in public. He asserts that “[p]rius tamen quam pedē iauna efferat non secus quam pugnatura paret animum”\(^{120}\) (Vives, 1524, p.677). After that, he repeats some of the ideas that he has previously mentioned: she must avoid by all means provoking other to sin (Vives, 1524, p.678); and she has to be accompanied by the mother or any other woman (Vives, 1524, p.678). Although it is recorded and obviously it would be inevitable that Mary went to banquets

---

\(^{116}\) “[T]hey are impatient to issue forth in public, put themselves on display, and converse with men.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.668).

\(^{117}\) “[S]hipwreck of chastity” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.103).

\(^{118}\) “[T]o attract attention and draw the glances of young men and have them sighing after you, encourage lustful desires, kindle the fire of sin, so that if you yourself do not perish you cause the perdition to others, and lend yourself as a sword and poison to those who see you, you cannot be excused from blame as if you were chaste and modest in mind” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.105).

\(^{119}\) “An unmarried young woman should rarely appear in public, since she has no business there and her most precious possession, chastity, is placed in jeopardy” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.110).

\(^{120}\) “But before she steps over the threshold, let her prepare her mind as if she were entering a combat” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.126).
and dances at the court, we have no records about how she behaved, except for the fine and luxurious clothes she wore, as it has been already mentioned when dealing with the ornaments.

A common activity in those social gatherings was dancing, which Vives considers as sinful (1524, p.683). He is utterly against a young woman dancing. Indeed, he writes that, if she is obliged to dance, she must “uideantur retineri uultu & gestu toto illa aspernantes, tan non probent.”121 (Vives, 1524, p.683). In like manner, he was also against the new practice of young people disguising themselves and going to parties as he considered that:

Sed sub larua eiusmodi multa delitescunt flagitia. Primū curiositas immodica mulierū, que seire quid ubi agatur, uehementer auent: qui conuiuentur, quo ordine, quomodo ornate, quàm splendido apparatu unde nascitur inuidētia, loquacitas, detraction, infamatio. […] Tum habēne laxūtur impudentiae muliebri quàm aliquo probo profesisci & salt atē erubescent coginta, nō ueretur id facere laruta eo nullus est illic respectus ætatis, dignitatis, fortunae, exositionis”122 (Vives, 1524, p.684)

Due to her love for music, Mary Tudor is often mentioned as dancing many times at the court, mainly to impress visitors (Loades, 1989, p.27; Whitelock, 2009, pp.24, 35). She enjoyed going to dances so much, that her brother Edward asked her stepmother, Catherine Parr, to “beseech [Mary] to attend no longer to foreign dances and merriments which do not become a most Christian princess.” (Loades, 1989, p.119; Whitelock, 2009, p.116).

Social life allows having relationships with other people. On this, Vives makes a division between women and men. As for the former, Vives claims that they must be also examples of Christian virtue:

Placeat ei comes nō compta, neque sormosa at lasciuia, quae liquid gurture carmen dulce moduletur: sed grauis, pallens, sordida, subtristis’ […] Nihil tibi sit omnino rei cum puelliis, quae spectari quae amari gaudent: quae fornisum illū, aut diuitē, aut elegantē, aut nobile gloriātur se habere amatorē, & ab eo scriptas literulas circumferūt, interim suis æqualib. ostentant, aut facta narrāt, aut dicta reserūt, hæc egit, hæc dixit, sic me aggressus, sic me laudauit123 (1524, p.672).

121 “[C]onduct themselves in such a way as to give the impression that they do not wish to be there, their facial expression and attitude indicate their aversion and disapproval.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.141)
122 “[U]nder that mask many shameful things are concealed. The first of them is the uncontrolled curiosity of women, who are dying to know what is happening everywhere: who is out banqueting, at whose invitation, how they are dressed, with what splendid apparel. From this arise envy, talkativeness, detraction, and defamation. […] Then female shamelessness is given free rein. A woman who would be ashamed to go out and dance if she were known is not afraid to do so if she is masked, and consequently there is no respect for age, social status, fortune, or reputation in those circumstances” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.142).
123 “She should have a companion who is not elegantly adorned or beautiful and frivolous, who can modulate sweet songs in a clear voice, but one who is grave, pale, shabbily dressed, and somewhat melancholy.’ […] Have nothing at all to do with girls who enjoy being looked and being loved, who boast that they have a handsome or rich or elegant or noble lover and carry around with them letters written by him. From time to time they show them to
This recommendation is extended to the servants, who should not be confidents of secrets: “Hieronymus præcipit: ‘Nolo de ancillulis suis aliquam plus diligat, cuius crebrò auribus insusurret: quicquid uni loquetur, hoc omnies sciant.’”\(^{124}\) (Vives, 1524, p.672).

As I had already mentioned, there were no other children next to her when growing up (Loades, 1989, p.46). In addition, the only friend we know she had was her father’s last wife, Catherine Parr (Whitelock, 2009, pp.114-115). Taking this relationship into account, we can apply what Vives said about which activities women should do when accompanied:

\[
\text{Oblectabit se igitur uirgo mea cum delectis uirginibus sui similibus interim lusibus honestis ac liberalibus: alias sanctis lectionibus aut cōfabilationibus, quas lectio suggeret. nihil de saltationibus aut conuiuio, aut uoluptatibus referat, ne sociæ falsa delectationis specie cōmouēāri. nemo intererit uir. Tum à focis relicta sola in cubiculo suo, nō prorsus nihil agēt. nam ociosam esse, periculosum est, præsērtim solam}^{125}\ (Vives, 1524, p.672).
\]

On this matter, the friendship between Catherine Parr and Mary Tudor was what it would be accepted by the Valencian scholar, as they studied together and even they made a translation of \textit{Erasmus’s Paraphrases on the Four Gospels}, even if Mary could not complete it due to an illness (Whitelock, 2009, p.115).

On the other hand, when in the presence of men, the Valencian scholar commends the woman to

\[
\text{totū corpus comuestiendū ornanā erit modestia, quae nō ex ostentation nascatur, sed ex miti & uere Christiano pectore [...] Oculos cōtinear de missos nec atollat nisi rārō & modice & uerrecūdi, neminē intēte ac incōniuēter aspiciat [...] Si uris feorisū sedeāt, & in puellas spectēt, acinter se colloquant: ne credit uirgo se spectari, de se illos loq.}^{126}\ (Vives, 1524, p.678).
\]

\(^{124}\) “Jerome has this to say: ‘I do not wish a woman to love one servant more than another and continually whisper secrets into her ear. Whatever she says to one must be known to all.’” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.112).

\(^{125}\) “The young woman, therefore, will amuse herself in the company of young women of her own age, sometimes in respectable and ladylike entertainments, sometimes in pious readings or conversations suggested by the reading. She should not recount stories about dancing and banquets and entertainment, lest her companions be stirred up by the false appearance of pleasure. No man should be present. Then, when she is alone in her bedroom after her companions have left, she must not remain without doing anything for it is dangerous to be idle, especially when alone.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.112).

\(^{126}\) “[H]er whole body should exhibit great modesty of attire and adornment, born not of the ostentation but of true Christian gentleness and humility of spirit. [...] She will keep her eyes cast down, and will raise them but rarely and with modesty and decorum. She will not stare at anyone intently or in an unbecoming manner. [...] If the men are seated apart and look at the young women and talk among themselves, she should not think that she is being looked at or that they are talking about her” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp.128-129).
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Furthermore, the writer recommends that “[p]uella & uirū on loco aliquot solo diutine cōfabulari, ne si fint quidē fratres, sinendū est.”\(^{127}\) (Vives, 1524, p.680) and, what is more, Vives even instructs on how to act if one of those men tries to court the young woman: “Illud ne admonenda quidem est, ne iuueni ridenti arrideat [...]. Ne sinat se uellicari, uel luscious tagi [...]. Nihil uiro det, nihil uiro accipiati”\(^{128}\) (Vives, 1524, p.679). On the interactions of Mary with men, we know anything.

It is now fitting to explain how Viv\es deals with the topics of love and marriage. Firstly, Vives urges the woman to “[e]rgo primis quibu occasionib. fortitier obsistendū”\(^{129}\) (1524, p.685); mainly because “Fallet te amator, uel quia solitus fallere, uel quia hoc est præmium obscnceni amoris, uel quia id seadet uoluptatis satietas.”\(^{130}\) (1524, p.686). Thus, we infer, about love (1524, p.687). In an ultimate sense, for the Valencian scholar the only acceptable forms of love to think were the following ones: “Habes primū quē ames, patrem Deū, sposu habes matrem eius, & sororem tuā, diuam Virginē habes tui simile, Dei ecclesiā habes tot uirgines sanctissimas, [...]Habes parētes, qui te genuerunt [...]Habes animū tuum [...] Hi demū sunt ueri ac recti amores”\(^{131}\) (Vives, 1524, p.688).

Concerning love in Mary’s life, we know that she loved deeply her mother (Whitelock, 2009, pp.56-57), we can also suppose that she loved her father, even if they had a complicated relationship from the separation of the parents onwards (Loades, 1989, p.90). In relation to other people in her life, she had quite a strong attachment to her cousin Charles V, whom she considered “a father” (Whitelock, 2009, p.196). However, regarding romantic love, Mary herself said that “she had never felt that which was called love” (Loades, 1989, p.202). And yet, when she was showed a painting of her future husband, Philip II she declared that she was “half in love” (Loades, 1989, p.203).

This is exactly the topic on which Juan Luis Vives ends the first part of his book ‘De quarendo sponso’. The first and most important consideration for Vives is that it should be done

---

\(^{127}\) “It is not to be permitted that a young woman and a man should converse alone anywhere for any length of time, not even if they are brother and sister” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.131).

\(^{128}\) “I need not even admonish the young woman not to return the smile of a young man [...] She must not allow herself to be pinched or touched in a lewd manner. [...] She should not give anything to a man or receive anything from him” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp. 129-130).

\(^{129}\) “[A] strong resistance must be made to the first stirrings [of love]” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.147).

\(^{130}\) “Your lover will deceive, either because he is used to deceiving or because this is the reward of an illicit love or because saciety of pleasure will persuade him to do so” (Fantazzi, 2000, pp.148-149).

\(^{131}\) “You have, first of all, one whom you can love: God the Father, and your spouse, Christ. You have his mother and your sister, the Blessed Virgin. You have one like yourself, the church of God. You have so many holy virgins [...] You have your parents, who gave birth to you [...] You have your own soul to love, [...] These are, in the end, true and right loves.” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.153).
with care as, in the Catholic faith, matrimony cannot be undone (1524, p.689). Also, it is a matter of the parents (Vives, 1524, p.689) and not of the young woman, as “puellam ne significatione quidem præbere uolūtatis cōiugi, & amare iuuenē, ut nubat”\(^\text{132}\) (Vives, 1524, p.696). Considering Mary’s status as a Princess, from a very young age, her parents prepared several marriages through the years as it was a way of sealing alliances with other countries: the dauphin François (Loades, 1989, p.16; Whitelock, 2009, p.14), Charles V (Loades, 1989, p.20; Whitelock, 2009, p.18). Following her parents’ separation and her acceptant of her father’s role as Supreme Head of the Church of England, Mary was considered again in a marriable position in Europe. Then, she was again proposed to marry the Duke of Orleans, Dom Luis of Portugal or James V of Scotland (Whitelock, 2009, p.99). Those proposals would be alternating until her father’s death and her coronation as Queen. Even as Queen, her matrimony was a matter beyond her own control, since it fell mainly on her Privy Council. While this one offered her to marry Courtenay, an English nobleman, (Whitelock, 2009, p.218), she followed the recommendation of her cousin Charles V and married his son Philip. In spite of her life being marked by marriage proposals, Mary, (already as a queen) confessed to the Imperial ambassador Renard\(^\text{133}\) that “as a private individual she would have never have desired [to marry], but she preferred to end her days in chastity” (Whitelock, 2009, p.219).

In relation to the perfect candidate to be a husband, the Spanish scholar enlists some requirements to take into account. Firstly, he asks to the future husband “qui à pietate nō deterreat, nō auertat aut impediat, sed inuitet, ad hortetur, adiuuet”\(^\text{134}\) (Vives, 1524, p.690). The man should have enough patrimony to maintain a family (Vives, 1524, p.690):“q uædam fungiendæ omnino, ut flagitiosæ, uelut ea quæ rem facit pecunia foenori data: crudeles item at inhumane, quales sunt carnificum, piratum, militum mercenariorum”\(^\text{135}\) (Vives, 1524, pp.690). Husband and wife to be should, more or less, belong to the same socio-economic level (Vives, 1524, p.691). Finally, “[i]n corpore contemplamur formā, ætatem, uaeludine”\(^\text{136}\) (Vives, 1524, p.691). Beauty was not much taken into account actually, as age was more important: not understood as having the same age, but more focused on being old enough to have authority

\(^{132}\) “It will be evident that a girl must no give even a sign of her desire for marriage or that she loves a young man in order to marry him.” (Vives, 1524, p.170).

\(^{133}\) Simon Renard (1513/8-1573) was an advisor to Charles V and Phillip II. She was the ambassador of Spain in England. As ambassador, he had an enormous influence over Mary I of England, until she married Phillip II

\(^{134}\) “[W]ho will not discourage, distract, or impede her from the practice of piety, but will invite, exhort, and assist her” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.157).

\(^{135}\) “Some should be avoided altogether as dishonourable, such as that which accumulates wealth by lending out money at interest. Other are cruel and inhuman such as the occupation of executioners, pirates, and mercenary soldiers” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.158).

\(^{136}\) “In the body, we consider beauty, age, and health” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.159).
but young to have strength; so it was health. Concerning his character, only two virtues are requiered: “‘bonus & prudens’”137 (Vives, 1524, p.691). As a matter of fact, most of Mary’s suitors had these requirements: most of them were sons of Kings, except Courtenay who was a nobleman – with patrimony –; they were Catholic; of good health at the time of the engagement; and of the age that Vives considered as adequate.

137 “[G]ood and wise” (Fantazzi, 2000, p.159)
5. Conclusion
As we have seen, Juan Luis Vives wrote two treatises under the command of Queen Catherine of Aragon: *De institutione foeminae Christianae* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523). The intention of the Spanish Queen was that these would help with the education of the English princess, Mary Tudor, since she was the only heir to the throne of England, and she could be called to rule.

Considering the first of my objectives – whether the treatises were followed or not – it is a difficult question to answer. In the first place, as I have often stated in relation with some aspects of Mary Tudor’s life, many facts of its facts are unknown so we do not have facts to prove this point. Every now and then, I have only guessed from the information that the biographers offered or from that which was common among royal families at the time. With regard to the known aspects of Mary Tudor’s life, there are few counsels that we know for sure were followed – learning how to do needlepoint, learning Latin, her friendship with Catherine Parr...—. On the other hand, there were many indications in the treatises that were not followed, mainly for two reasons: either Mary Tudor’s personal circumstances, or because they were not common practices for royalty. In the case of the personal circumstances, the separation of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon provoked that Mary was sent away from her mother – a union that Vives considered of great importance —. Moreover, her alleged bastard status prevented further consideration of her as a Princess. Consequently, she was not any longer educated as one. In view of her royal status, many of the precepts could not be put into practise in the case of royalty, this is the case of the obligation attached to motherhood, learning to cook, not assisting to feasts and social gatherings, no dressing richly... All these recommendations were incompatible with royal habits. In short, not much of Vives’s works were followed, due to different reasons.

Related to Mary's royal status, the second objective was to answer if Vives’s works were written for instructing a future ruling Queen or not. In this case, the solution to the question is easier: it was not written thinking about a ruling Queen. Furthermore, it was not even written thinking exclusively about a Princess. Apart from the fact that it was published for the public – as I have already mentioned when discussing the prefaces of both treatises —, the inclusion of pieces of advice which are unfitting for the royalty – but could be fitting for other social classes — proves that it was thought for women in general. About not being aimed to the instruction of a future ruling Queen, it is evident from the fact that both works are more moral and religious in their nature than political – the only ‘political’ information are some books recommended in
De ratione studii puerilis (1524) –. Even when translating, Vives recommended moral and religious topics instead of political, historical or legal ones; These would have been more fitting for a future Queen.

Despite the fact that Vives’s treatises were not completely observed and the fact that they were not intended for a future Queen, Mary Tudor did not fall short in her academic education, as she was quite competent in languages and gifted for playing music. As a matter of fact, her partial translation of Erasmus’s Paraphrases of the Four Gospels with Catherine Parr is one of the fruits of her academic instruction. In the future, further investigation about this translation will contribute to the dissemination of the humanistic side of the so-called “Bloody Mary”.
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