



UNIVERSIDAD DE JAÉN
Centro de Estudios de Postgrado

Master's Dissertation/
Trabajo Fin de Máster

WOMEN'S TRANSLATION AND RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY: MARY TUDOR'S ENGLISH RENDERING OF ERASMUS' PARAPHRASES OF ST JOHN'S GOSPEL.

Student: Fuentes Martínez, Isabel María

Tutor: Dr. Eugenio Manuel Olivares Merino
Dpt.: English Philology

July, 2020

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT AND KEYWORDS/ RESUMEN Y PALABRAS CLAVE.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Justification and relevance	4
1.2 Objectives	5
1.3 Structure	5
2. BACKGROUND	7
2.1 Political and Religious Context: The Edwardian Reformation.....	7
2.2 Interpreting Erasmus	10
2.3 Literary Context: Translation and Female Translators	12
3. ERASMUS’S <i>PARAPHRASES UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT</i> AND ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION	19
3.1 The Original Text: Erasmus’s <i>Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum</i>	19
3.2 Nicholas Udall’s edition and his ‘Preface’ to ‘John’s Gospel’ in the <i>Paraphrases upon the New Testament</i>	21
3.3 Mary Tudor’s Translation of ‘John’s Gospel’	24
4. CONCLUSION	28
5. REFERENCES	30
APPENDIX 1: ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM’S BIOGRAPHY	33
APPENDIX 2: MARY TUDOR’S BIOGRAPHY	35
APPENDIX 3: KATHERINE PARR’S BIOGRAPHY	37

ABSTRACT AND KEYWORDS/ RESUMEN Y PALABRAS CLAVE

The aim of this Master Dissertation (MD) is to present an introductory approach to the translation of Erasmus's (1466-1536) *Paraphrases* which was created under the patronage of Catherine Parr (1512-1548). More specifically, the main focus is the paraphrase of St John's Gospel which was translated by Mary Tudor (1516-1558).

In the Early Modern period, translation was considered an intellectual activity more fitting for women than composing. The reason for this was that translation was regarded as rendering the original author's content and consequently, the translator should be faithful to the original text and did not allow creativity from the part of the translator – especially religious texts –. Therefore, educated women –as translation evaded the question of female's authorship– would make their literary paths through translation. In Catherine Parr's and Mary Tudor's case, both of them had shown their translation's skills before translating Erasmus's *Paraphrases*: Parr had translated Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471) *De Imitatione Christi* (c.1418 – 1427) –which was included in her publication of *Prayers and Meditations* (1545)– and John Fisher's (1469-1535) *Psalmes or Prayers Taken Out of Holye Scripture* (1569) and Mary Tudor, on her part, had translated Thomas Aquinas's (1225-1274) prayer “Concede mihi”.

Catherine Parr, the last wife of Henry VIII, planned to translate Erasmus's *Paraphrases of the New Testament* and she started to arrange it in 1545. She asked her stepdaughter Mary Tudor to translate the part of John's Gospel and she accepted the task. The translation was published in 1548, that is to say, in the middle of the Edwardian religious Reformation. This change in the Church was established by Archbishop Thomas Crammer during the reign of Edward VI to establish Protestantism as the official religion in England and this translation, *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* was established as mandatory in every church of England during this period. Therefore, the link between the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* and English Protestantism is clear; however, the reasons that prompted Mary Tudor –a staunch Catholic and the Queen that would restore this religion in England– to participate in a translation project so tightly connected with Protestantism, is still unclear.

Keywords: Women's Renaissance translations, Catherine Parr, Mary Tudor, Erasmus's *Paraphrases*, Edwardian Reformation.

El objetivo de este Trabajo de Fin de Máster (TFM) es ofrecer una introducción de la traducción de las *Paráfrasis del Nuevo Testamento* de Erasmo (1466-1536) que fue creada bajo el mecenazgo de Catalina Parr (1512-1548). Especialmente, se centra en la paráfrasis del Testamento de San Juan que fue traducida por María Tudor (1516-1558).

A principios de la Edad Moderna, la tarea de traducción era considerada como una actividad intelectual más apropiada para las mujeres que componer sus propios textos. La razón era que la traducción se consideraba la reescritura en otra lengua del texto compuesto por un autor previo y por ello la traducción debía ser fiel al texto original y por lo tanto no permitía al traductor ser creativo – especialmente en el caso de los textos religiosos –. Por ello, las mujeres que había recibido una educación –debido a que la traducción evitaba el problema de la autoría de mujeres– podían recurrir a ella como herramienta para adentrarse en el campo literario. En el caso de Catalina Parr y de María Tudor, ambas habían mostrado ya sus habilidades para la traducción antes de la publicación de *Las Paráfrasis* de Erasmo: Parr tradujo *De Imitatione Christi* (c.1418-1427) de Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471) –que fue incluida en su obra *Prayers and Meditations* (1545)– y los *Psalmes or Prayers Taken Out of Holye Scripture* (1569) de John Fisher (1469-1535). Por su parte, María Tudor había traducido la oración de Tomás de Aquinas (1225-1274) “Concede mihi”.

Catalina Parr, la última esposa de Enrique VIII, planeó la traducción de *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* y empezó a organizarla en 1545. Una de las personas a las que le preguntó traducir parte de este trabajo fue a su hijastra María Tudor, quien aceptó. La traducción se publicó en 1548, es decir, en plena Reforma Eduardina. Esta Reforma fue llevada a cabo por el Arzobispo Tomás Crammer durante el reinado de Eduardo VI con el propósito de establecer el protestantismo como la religión oficial de Inglaterra. Esta traducción, *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*, fue considerada como obligatoria en todas las iglesias de Inglaterra en este periodo. Por ello, la conexión entre *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* y el protestantismo inglés es clara. Sin embargo, las razones que llevaron a María Tudor –que era una católica acérrima y la Reina que restauró esta religión en Inglaterra– a participar en esta traducción tan fuertemente ligada al protestantismo, no son tan claras.

Palabras clave: Traducciones renacentistas hechas por mujeres, Catalina Parr, María Tudor, *Las Paráfrasis* de Erasmo, Reforma Eduardina.

1. INTRODUCTION

The main topic of this Master Dissertation is an approach to the translation into English of Erasmus's¹ *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* (1548) arranged by Katherine Parr.² More specifically, to the part that Mary Tudor³ translated which was the paraphrase of John's Gospel. In this introductory section we find the justification for choosing this topic, the objectives of the dissertation, and its structure.

1.1 Justification and relevance

The choice of this topic and the focus on Mary Tudor's translation is justified for several reasons. First of all, Mary Tudor's participation in the production of Erasmus's *Paraphrases* is a natural development from my BA dissertation about the Princess's education during her childhood and early youth. This education was guided by Juan Luis Vives's⁴ treatises *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523) and *De institutione foeminae Christianae* (1524) which remarked the importance of learning languages and translation in a Humanist education system. Indubitably, it was this education what allowed Mary Tudor to translate Erasmus's paraphrase of John's Gospel.

Secondly, this translation offers us the opportunity of exploring women's translator role in the Early Modern Period.⁵ Indeed, women used translation in order to be able to participate in the literary production and, in an indirect manner, engage in political and religious matters without being judged by society. Moreover, we will see that, even if many translations composed by women were published anonymously, there were other that were printed under their names.

Finally, and this reason connects with the political and religious engagement mentioned, it is interesting to analyse the relationship between project of translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases* and Mary Tudor's participation. On the one hand, the translation of this work by Erasmus became associated with the Edwardian Reformation, as it is described in the political

¹ For Erasmus of Rotterdam, see Appendix 1

² For Katherine Parr, see Appendix 3

³ For Mary Tudor, see Appendix 2

⁴ Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540) was a Spanish Humanist born in Valencia. He studied in the University of Paris where he became an acquaintance of Humanism by the influence of Guillaume Budé and Nicolas Bérault. In 1517, he became tutor of Guillaume de Croy, Archbishop of Toledo while living in Louvain at the court of Charles V. After the death of Croy, he decided to go back to Spain but he stayed instead in England until 1528, where he met Thomas More. After having to leave England due to the King's Matter, he lived in Breda where he tutored Mencía de Mendoza until his death in 1540. For more information about Vives's life, see Gómez-Horigüela Amillo, A. 2014. 'La vida *sine querella* de Juan Luis Vives'. *eHumanista* 26, 345-356; and González González, E. 2008. 'Juan Luis Vives. Works and Days'. In Fantazzi, C. (Ed.), *A Companion to Juan Luis Vives*. (pp.15-64). Brill.

⁵ Early Modern Period is historical period normally considered from the end of the fifteenth century, comprising the Tudor (1485-1603) and the Stuart (1603-1714) monarchies in England.

and religious context, which was the implantation of Protestantism in England. On the other hand, Mary Tudor is historically known for being the Queen that during her reign restored Catholicism in England. Therefore, the link between these two facts is a question that can be strange for the reader. However, this topic has not been widely studied by researches and, consequently, it is a niche to fill in literary investigation.

1.2 Objectives

After justifying the choice of the topic, I focus now on the aims I tend to fulfil in this MD. The main aim of this essay is to provide an approach to the English translation of *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* by Erasmus, with an especial focus on the translation of the paraphrase of John's Gospel by Mary Tudor. Hence, this general purpose encompasses a series of sub-objectives:

- To contextualize the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* within the political and religious situation of the Edwardian Reformation.
- To approach the importance of translation and the role of women translators in the Early Modern Period in connection with Mary Tudor's translation of the paraphrase of John's Gospel.
- To comprehend why Mary Tudor, a staunch Catholic, agreed to participate in the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases*.
- To analyse the manner Mary Tudor and Francis Mallet⁶ translated the paraphrase on John's Gospel.

1.3 Structure

The objectives that have just being explained above influences the structure of the dissertation. Consequently, the MD is divided into different parts. First of all, the introduction part has already offered to the reader the justification of the choice of the topic, the objectives that the MD aims to achieve, and the structure of the MD.

The second section, called "Background", offers the context of the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*. This section is also divided into several parts. The first one is about the political and religious context. In this, the Edwardian Reformation is explained and also its relationship with the literary work that is discussed in this dissertation. After that,

⁶ Francis Mallet (?-1570) studied at the university of Cambridge and he was the chaplain of many influent authorities in England like Cranmer, Cromwell, and Mary Tudor. During his time as Mary's chaplain, he was imprisoned in the Tower in 1551 for saying Mass without Mary being at the household (which was the requisite Edward VI made for respecting his sister desire). However, he was released eventually. He was also Dean of Lincoln from 1554 until his death in 1570, having conformed to Elizabeth I's changes in the Church.

there is a section in which the focus is set in the figure of Erasmus, how his works were interpreted by Early Modern readers and how in many cases there were ambiguous and even contradictory interpretations of his religious ideas. Finally, there is a section about the literary context. It is about the consideration of translation in the Early Modern Period and the role of women within that literary field.

The third section, “The English Translation of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*” is about the translation itself. However, this section starts with a description of the original work, called *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum*, written in Latin. After that, there is an explanation of Nicholas Udall⁷ “Preface” to the translation of John’s Gospel paraphrases, the part that Mary Tudor translated. Finally, in the section dedicated to Mary Tudor translation, explaining the reasons why she accepted the task and also how the translation was made.

Finally, in the conclusion, the main points of the dissertation are recapped, and if the objectives of the MD were achieved. Moreover, there is also an exposition of the limitations of the MD and possible new lines of research.

⁷ Nicholas Udall (1505-1556) was a dramatist and scholar, who studied at Corpus Christi College (Oxford). It was there where he became a follower of Lutheranism. In 1534, he was appointed as headmaster of Eton College until 1540/1. During the reign of Edward VI, Udall enjoyed of the favour of the king and he was an important scholar who contributed to Edwardian Reformation with his works. Nevertheless, during Mary I’s reign, he was not affected by the turn into Catholicism. Furthermore, he was appointed as a schoolmaster in Gardiner’s household and he wrote plays for the Queen’s court. Moreover, Udall was the headmaster in Westminster school from 1554 until 1556.

2. BACKGROUND

In this section three topics are analysed. Firstly, the political and religious context in which the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases* was created is explained. After the Edwardian Reformation, the issue that is explained is the interpretation of Erasmus's religious ideas by the intellectuals of the period. Finally, the last section is about the literary context where the attention is directed towards translation in the Early Modern Period and especially on women translators.

2.1 Political and Religious Context: The Edwardian Reformation.

First of all, in order to contextualize the translation that is introduced in this dissertation, it is important to see how the political and religious situation was and how it related with translation, especially with the translation of the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*.

The sixteenth century in England was a period of political and religious changes and instability (Meister & Stump, 2010, p. 371). This period was known as the Anglican Reformation,⁸ covering King Edward VI⁹'s reign and five years in Queen Elizabeth's reign, after the Catholic period of Queen Mary I (Solt, 1990, p.44). In the beginning, the Anglican Church, under the reign of Henry VIII¹⁰, was mainly a Catholic institution just independent from the Roman Church. In this situation, Henry VIII named Thomas Crammer¹¹, a Protestant

⁸ Anglican Church: The beginning of the Anglican Church is related to the so-called King's matter. In 1527, Henry VIII wanted to annul his marriage with Catherine of Aragon –on the basis that the marriage was incestuous as Catherine had previously married Henry VIII's brother Arthur–. However, Pope Clement VII, influenced by Charles V, did not concede the annulment. As a result, Henry VIII declared the English Church's independence from the Holy See.

⁹ Edward VI of England (1537-1553) was the son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, his third wife. After Henry VIII death, the king's will established him as his successor and he was crowned. Although, his reign was exercised by a regency council as he did not reach maturity. This period was marked especially by the Edwardian Reformation, which aimed to convert England into a Protestant country as it was Edward VI's religion. In 1553, Edward was hopeless ill and he decided to appoint as his successor his cousin Jane Grey, married to Lord Dudley (son of Duke of Northumberland), trying to avoid the succession of his sister Mary Tudor. For more information about Edward VI's life and his reign, see Skidmore, C. 2007. *Edward VI*. St. Martin's Press; and Jordan, W. 1968. *Edward VI: the young King*. London: Allen & Unwin.

¹⁰ Henry VIII of England (1491-1547) was the second son of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York. After his brother Arthur's death, he was named Prince of Wales in 1503. He became king in 1509 and married Arthur's widow, Catherine of Aragon. His reign was marked by the foundation of the Anglican Church which separated the English Church from the Roman Church. Therefore, he declared himself Supreme Head of the Church in 1534. Furthermore, he is also known by his numerous marriages, having six wives. From these matrimonies, only three children survived: Mary I (from his marriage with Catherine of Aragon), Elizabeth I (with Anne Boleyn) and Edward VI (with Jane Seymour). For more information about Henry VIII, see Ives, E. 2007. *Henry VIII*. Oxford University Press.

¹¹ Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556) was the archbishop of Canterbury. He studied in Cambridge. During the process of annulation of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon's matrimony, Cranmer supported the king by writing a treatise which allowed him to gain the favour of Henry VIII. In 1533 he became Archbishop of Canterbury and was a key figure in the separation of the English Church from the Roman Church. However, during the reign of Edward VI, Cranmer was allowed to make more radical changes into the Church making it Protestant. When Mary I became Queen, he was imprisoned and executed by heresy.

theologian from Cambridge University, as Archbishop of Canterbury, the main position in the English Church. From this office, Crammer tried to change the new Anglican Church into a Protestant one, as far as Henry VIII allowed it. It was after the King's death and at start of Edward VI's reign when the Archbishop had more freedom to fully convert the Anglican Church into Protestantism, what we call the Edwardian Reformation (Meister & Stump, 2010, p. 371).

It is important to emphasise that, in the Early Modern Period, religion and State –or politics– more often than not did their best to remain supportive of each other and in good terms. In the case of the Edwardian Parliament –led by John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland–, it was characterised by the innovation, while the Henrician one had been conservative. About this, the main difference was that, while the change of religion in the Henrician reign was a decision of the State mainly, in the case of the Edwardian Reformation the willingness of establishing Protestantism was originated in the Church, as it is seen in more detail below (Solt, 1990, p.57). As a matter of fact, this strong connection between the State and the religion is observed in the fact that the reign of Edward VI, who was educated by Protestant tutors (Solt, 1990, p.44) was identified by this willingness of reformation. Consequently, even if his father was the one that created an English religion independent from the Holy See, it was with Edward VI when it reached its more complex, challenging nature, giving power and authority to the royal figure (Alford, 2002, p.100). Moreover, preachers and writers of this period depicted the King as “the godly son of a godly father, personally and valiantly moving to a natural second stage of the Reformation begun by Henry VII” (Alford, 2002, p.100), a role that Edward VI accepted, seeing himself as “the principal agent in the rescue of his realm from the corruption of Roman Catholicism” (Alford, 2002, p.100).

The changes to Protestantism were made through a commission that sought to unify the rites of the Church and with the issuing of royal injunctions through the Parliament that, at first, were quite similar to the Henrician ones (Bay, 2007, p.98). These injunctions were mainly related to the written works that were mandatory in every English Church: an English Bible, an English translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases*, the *Litany* of 1544¹², the *Primer* of 1545, and the *Book of Homilies* of 1547¹³, all supported by Crammer (Solt, 1990, p. 46). This process ended with

¹² *Litany* of 1544, also known as *Exhortation and Litany*, is the earliest officially authorized service in English. In general, a litany is a prayer of penitential character to ask for intercession, commonly addressed to saints. On the contrary, this *Litany* weakened the presence of saints and it was similar in style to a homily.

¹³ *Book of Homilies* of 1547, also known as the *First Book of Homilies*, is a collection of twelve sermons mainly written by Cranmer. The sermons focus on God and the Justification by Faith, which is one of the main characteristics of Lutheranism.

the Act of Uniformity in March 1549 that “required all members of the Church to use a new worship manual: the Book of Common Prayer” composed by Crammer himself (Meister & Stump, 2010, pp. 371-372). The *Book of Common Prayer* regulated the services of the Protestant Church: the morning and evening offices, the administrations of the sacraments... However, the first edition of the *Prayer Book* was considered as not enough Protestant by some of the English theologians. So, for its second edition, in 1552, Crammer adopted ideas from the German and Swiss Reformed theologians (Meister and Stump, 2010, pp.371-372). Apart from these royal injunctions, the Edwardian Act of Repeal was also passed, replacing Henry VIII’s Acts of Treason (1534). The difference was that, while the Edwardian Act of Repeal also considered as high treason to write, print or commit any overt act against the Supreme Head, words, speeches and sermons against the same were only considered as such if those acts were committed thrice (Solt, 1990, p.47).

The translation of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* was published in England in 1548. It was promoted by Katherine Parr, the widow of Henry VIII. In 1545, Katherine started the preparations for the translation, inviting some well-educated scholars to translate the different parts; she also asked her own stepdaughter to translate the paraphrases upon John’s Gospel (Goodrich, 2014, p. 75). Indeed, Mary’s participation in the translation was considered by Katherine of great importance as she even wanted the Princess’s name to appear in the manuscript – for Katherine thought that it would give authority to the text and show to the English people that Mary supported the Edwardian Reformation (Goodrich, 2014, p. 76).

As I have already mentioned, Edward VI ordered all churches to have at everyone’s disposal the translation of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases*. Moreover, even Elizabeth I¹⁴ reissued Edward VI’s injunctions and again Erasmus’s *Paraphrases* were compulsory to be held in the churches of England (Goodrich, 2014, pp. 67-68). In this way, the *Paraphrases*, which was aimed to support the Bible-reading by helping with its interpretation, became a way of influencing the reluctant people to accept the Protestant reformation (Goodrich, 2014, p. 76). The reason for this was that they were texts that were used by the Catholic faith that were adapted to the Protestant faith, therefore, giving some continuity to the previous religion to the new one. Moreover, the

¹⁴Elizabeth I of England (1533-1603) was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. She was considered as illegitimate after the death of her mother, but in Henry VIII’s will she was introduced within the succession line after Mary. During her sister’s reign she was imprisoned at the Tower because of the fear that Protestant supporters would claim her as Queen. After Mary I’s death, Elizabeth accessed to the throne in 1558 at the age of 25. The Queen restored Protestantism. Her reign was regarded as the Golden Age of England. Elizabeth I kept herself unmarried, being consequently the last Tudor monarch. For more information about Elizabeth I, see Collinson, P. 2007. *Elizabeth I*. Oxford University Press.

fact that the translation was commanded by Katherine Parr –Henry VIII’s last wife– and that the Paraphrase upon -Saint John’s Gospel was translated by Mary Tudor helped to show the royal family’s support for the Edwardian Reformation (Goodrich, 2014, p. 76).

Summarily, the Early Modern Period was a convulsive stage in terms of political and religious changes –as the official religion of England was altered on different occasions–. In the Edwardian Reformation, the production of texts was of vital importance for gaining support to Protestantism and some previous authors and texts needed to be reinterpreted in order to be adapted to the new circumstances. Such this is the case of Erasmus’s texts.

2.2 Interpreting Erasmus

With regards to the religious context, it is important to examine how Erasmus was interpreted in the Early Modern Period. In general terms, Erasmus is an example of how in the Early Modern Period, the author had little control over how his ideas were understood by the readers (Enenkel, 2013, p.1). These readers were becoming in this period “more and more heterogeneous, diverse, fragmented and changeable” which was the consequence of the emergence of new lay intellectuals (Enenkel, 2013, p.14).

Concerning Erasmus’s religious image, he has a “twofold legacy as an instigator of religious reform and a champion of Roman Catholicism” (Goodrich, 2014, p. 78) and even others connected him with “backward and counterproductive indecisiveness in religious matters” (Enenkel, 2013, p.2). In spite of this double reputation, it was difficult that any Protestant, Catholic or even humanist was completely in agreement with all Erasmus’s beliefs (Doods, 2009, p. 8; Dodds, 2013, p.105). As a matter of fact, Erasmus’s theology had detractors on both sides. For Protestants, and especially for Martin Luther¹⁵, Erasmus was “popish guide”, but it is telling that Thomas Cranmer and Nicholas Udall decided to “overlook Erasmus’ Catholicism in their determination to bring the scriptures to the English people” (Doods, 2009, p. 10). At the same time, on the Catholic side, his works were included by Pope Paul IV¹⁶ in the *Index librorum prohibitorum* in 1559 – but they were published in England – (Doods, 2009, pp. 9, 12). What is more, during Mary’s reign, even if the *Paraphrases* could be found in churches,

¹⁵ Martin Luther (1483-1546) was a German Augustine priest. He studied in the University of Erfurt theology and philosophy. He entered in the Augustinian order. In 1512, he became Doctor of Theology and in 1512 he entered into the senate of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Wittenberg. He is most well-known by the composition of his *Ninety-five Theses* (1517) which was the origin of the Protestant Reformation.

¹⁶ Pope Paul IV (1476-1559) was the Pope from 1555 until 1559. In religious matters, he was an orthodox and authoritarian and he required that all the Roman Catholic rulers to consider Protestants ones as heretics. Moreover, he supported the Inquisition.

Stephen Gardiner,¹⁷ the Queen's Lord Chancellor, thought that Erasmus was one of the promoters of the Reformation and he accused him of heretical teaching – even if some of those ideas were actually not in the original text but additions by editors – (Doods, 2009, p. 11). Nevertheless, other English Catholic leaders decided to ignore Erasmus's ideas that could be interpreted as reformatory and to highlight his more Catholic thoughts. This strategy was followed because in England, Erasmus was read widely and so admired by people that he was prevented to be censored by the authorities. One of the strategies adopted by these Catholic leaders was to accentuate the relationship existing between Erasmus and Thomas More.¹⁸ In point of fact, the figure of Thomas More was considered as a Catholic martyr and he “stood for everything that was good in English Catholicism”, being impossible to condemn Erasmus while praising More (Doods, 2009, p.12). Indeed, the addition of introductions in religious works – especially those which were not Protestant in nature – was common. As a matter of fact, introductions were used mainly to influence the reader towards a Protestant interpretation of the text (Doods, 2009, p. 16). This was easy to achieve because Early Modern readers thought to have the right to interpret the texts as they found more convenient (Enenkel, 2013, p.15). In this case, Erasmus's works were not otherwise treated: scholars chose from his works what supported their ideas giving them the authoritative weight of Erasmus's name (Enenkel, 2013, p.17). In the case of the Edwardian Reformation, “Erasmus was claimed for the English reformed church” especially through the translation of the *Paraphrases* (Craig, 2002, p.335). Even more, Edward Stillingfleet¹⁹ would declare in the seventeenth century that the ‘father’ of the English Protestant Church was Erasmus (Dodds, 2013, p.116). One of these scholars who made good use of Erasmus was Nicholas Udall, the editor of the translation of the *Paraphrases*; I will return to this in section 3.2.

¹⁷ Stephen Gardiner (1483?-1555) was the bishop of Winchester. He studied at Cambridge and he became the private secretary of Cardinal Wolsey. In the King's Matter he was sent as a diplomat to France and to Rome to seek for support. Per contra, Gardiner was against the Protestant reform of Edward VI and, hence, he was imprisoned in the Tower of London. When Mary I became Queen, Gardiner was liberated from the Tower, restored as bishop, and named Lord Chancellor. In this position, he was in charge of the negotiation of the matrimony between Mary I and Phillip II, favouring the English interests.

¹⁸ Thomas More (1478-1535) was an English humanist, statesman, lawyer, social philosopher, and author. He started his studies at Oxford, but he left to start legal training in one of the Inns of Chancery. More became a student in one of the Inns of Court and he was called to the Bar. More's political career started when in 1504, he was elected as Member of the Parliament and he gained more and more political influence until he was named Lord Chancellor in 1529. However, More resigned in 1532, as consequence of the creation of the Anglican Church. Furthermore, he was charged of high treason because he refused to sign the Oath of Succession (1534) and the Oath of Supremacy. Finally, he was executed in 1535.

¹⁹ Edward Stillingfleet (1635-1699) was a British theologian and scholar. He studied in Cambridge and he became the vicar of Sutton in 1657 and Bishop of Worcester in 1689. He defended the Anglican orthodoxy during the Restoration period and he wrote treatises like *The Irenicum* (1659), *A Discourse Concerning the Idolatry Practised in the Church of Rome* (1671) or *he Unreasonableness of Separation* (1680).

Udall was not the only one in trying to assimilate Erasmus into Protestant theology; Thomas Key, the translator of the *Paraphrases of Mark's Gospel*, tried the same. In this case, he underlined that the reading of the Bible and the obedience to the king were the key points for Christianity (Doods, 2009, p.22). Nevertheless, the introduction demonstrates how difficult it was for English Protestants to make Erasmus' thought fit into the Protestant one, as they were inconsistent in the inclusion of this humanist's theology (Doods, 2009, p. 4).

In this way, the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* was composed of different layers of voices that contributed to the general ambiguity of the work. First, we find the original paraphrases written by Erasmus – thus translated –. Then, Erasmus's own prefaces where he illustrates his own theology. Finally, surrounding the previous layer, there were the English editors and translators, which gave their personal thought to the work. Inside this amalgam of voices and ideas, we find another equally ambiguous view: Mary Tudor's. For the creation of these different layers of voices, the role of translation was essential at the time because it was a powerful political and cultural tool, as it is described in the next section.

2.3 Literary Context: Translation and Female Translators

After discussing the political and religious scenario that promoted of the translation of the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*, the focus is now turned into the literary context by describing the situation of translation in the Early Modern Period and especially women's renderings, as the focus of this MD is Mary Tudor's one.

The first important point is to reflect on the Renaissance's attitude towards upon the activity of translation. Some scholars have considered that women were allowed to translate because it was an activity with little prestige. They considered than translations were defective (Goodrich, 2014, p.5) and that it did not count as a creative activity as the words were not the women's words but another person's (Demers, 2005, p.64). Nevertheless, the importance of translation in the Early Modern period is now a confirmed fact and translation has been rescued from its alleged secondary role as it was "relegated in Anglo-Saxon literary cultures (Belle, 2012, p.5). Translation was the foundation of the grammar school system in the Early Modern Period as its primary practice was the double translation –the text was translated from Latin into English and from English into Latin– (Clarke, 2009, p.171). Moreover, it allowed translators to manipulate Classical texts if they thought they were unfit for a contemporary readership – due to moral content mainly – (Goodrich, 2014, p.15). On the other hand, as Demers writes, "by using 'language more fully alive than it had ever been' and by ensuring that 'their translations were originals,' early modern translators have been credited with making 'the modern English

character” (2005, p.65), meaning that translators helped to develop the language. The last evidence of translation’s importance in the Early Modern period is the fact that, in the mid-sixteenth century, anyone from the educated classes could find a person who could translate a text from Latin into English. Furthermore, as the sixteenth century went on, more and more translated copies of foreign works could be found easily (Stevenson, 2006, p.128) and most of the popular works in this period were translations or works derived from translations (Clarke, 2009, p.168).

Because all these reasons, as Micheline White argues, “translators of both sexes saw themselves as powerful cultural agents engaged in the difficult and invaluable task of importing foreign works or making domestic Latin works available to English readers” (1999, p.376-377). From the late 1990s, this role as cultural agents has caught the interest of translation theorists, and so context and motivation of the translator have become a major point (Goodrich, 2014, p.9) as translation is inevitably affected by its cultural moment (Demers, 2005, p.64). In point of fact, translation raised in this period the question of the “dispersal of textual authority” because the translations were used to express “highly coded political or ideological” ideas but being shielded from the authorities behind the original author’s words (Clarke, 2009, p.169). Hence, two elements are prominent when analysing a translation: the functional habitus and the practical habitus – often interrelated and dependant on their socio-cultural moment – (Goodrich, 2014, p.10).

The functional habitus –why a translation was produced– was determined by the financial, theological and political situation. In the case of England –as it has been exposed in the section 2.1.–, the political situation influenced some printers, publishers and translators to collaborate with the government’s religious policies. On the contrary, other translators produced works that were opposed to the official religion as they searched the support of other dissidents. These translators worked outside the country or published through clandestine presses as the government tried to avoid the distribution of opposing works (Goodrich, 2014, pp. 12-14). Regarding the practical habitus, the translator of religious texts works between the two opposite sides: faithfulness and freedom, depending on how the author’s religious ideas are similar to those of the translator (Goodrich, 2014, p. 14). In the case of English Protestants translating Catholic texts (those Christian texts previous to Protestantism that were considered by default Catholic), they acted as censors and they removed or changed some of the contents in those texts to adapt it to the Protestant beliefs (Goodrich, 2014, pp. 20-21). On the contrary case,

Catholics translating Protestant texts, we do not have information as they were not required to be translated.

Before proceeding to the role of women translators, it would be interesting to consider how their education is related to translation. In the case of the upper-class English families, translation was also important for women's education within the household (Clarke, 2009, p.172) as it was considered to be a virtuous occupation that kept "the impressionable mind from straying beyond prescribed limits" (Clarke, 2009, p.173). About this matter, three Humanists supported the education of women: Erasmus, Thomas More and Juan Luis Vives. First of all, it must be said that Erasmus was not especially attracted to the idea of women being educated. However, the Dutch humanist reconsidered this idea when he met Thomas More's daughters, who enjoyed a meticulous education which not all girls – even if they were from the aristocracy – experienced in England.²⁰ Erasmus was especially surprised by Margaret More²¹ (Hickman, 2016, p.49) and she is thought to be the inspiration of one of his *Colloquies*, 'The Abbot and the Learned Lady', as the lady is called Magdalia (Hickman, 2016, p.60). Related with the education of Thomas More's daughters –and by extension what Thomas More thought about educating women–, 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) –which illustrates the importance of the father figure in women's education (Clarke, 2009, p.174)–. 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). Finally, Juan Luis Vives was also another defender of women's education as it is exemplified in his implication in Mary Tudor's education. The Spanish scholar composed for the princess three treatises with the aim of helping her through her education: *De institutione foeminae Christianae* (1524), *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523) and *Satellitium* (1524) (Watson, 1912,

²⁰ For more information about the general status of female education in England see also Eales, J. (2013). "To booke and pen: Women, education and literacy in Tudor and Stuart England". *The Historian*, 119. Autumn 2013.

²¹ Margaret More Roper (1505-1544) was the elder daughter of Sir Thomas More and Jane Colt. She was married with William Roper. Margaret 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.

p.13; 151)²². Nevertheless, Vives was not only in favour of the education of the princess but of upper-class women as it is illustrated by the fact that *De institutione foeminae Christianae* 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 et al., 1950, p.57) as long as they knew the language. In addition, this text was even translated to several languages during the 16th century such as 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. Moreover, Vives was even the tutor of a noblewoman, Mencía de Mendoza²³²⁴.

Proceeding to the role of women translators, it must be emphasised that there was a change in scholars' opinion. Before the 1990s, it was believed that women had a passive role as translator. However, during the 1990s, critics' views started to change. Some of them claimed that translation was an essential element in building the female authorial practice (Belle, 2012, p.5; Demers, 2005, p.64) and that those female translators should be recognized as literary and political agents, as much as male ones. Indeed, translation was a safe way for women to engage in politics because of the “decentring of authorial responsibility” (Clarke, 2009, p.169). Furthermore, it was also a prudent manner for women to take an authorial role as they also rewrote and modified the source texts, as their male counterparts (Goodrich, 2014, pp. 7-9).

In relation to the female translator's functional and practical habitus, it is more or less the same as men's. Still, there is one important difference: women's translations were intended to be more private and domestic works, on the ground that they had to show that they possessed the female virtues: chastity, silence, and obedience. For this reason, the public circulation of women's translation could be seen as “trespassing the masculine learning sphere of learning” (Goodrich, 2014, pp. 21-22). And yet, not all women's translations were only domestic as many were distributed in public and many women translators were “known, acknowledged, and lauded” (Clarke, 2009, p.169). Therefore, concerning translation's functional habitus, both men

²² For more information about the treatises *De institutione foeminae Christianae* (1524) and *De ratione studii puerilis* (1523) in relation with Mary Tudor's education, see: Fuentes Martínez, I. (2019). *The Education of a Princess: The Humanist side of Mary Tudor*. Trabajo Fin de Grado de Estudios Ingleses, Universidad de Jaén, España.

²³ Mencía de Mendoza (1508-1554) was the daughter of Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar y Mendoza and María de Fonseca y Toledo. She married Henry III of Nassau-Breda in 1524 and after his death to Ferdinand, Duke of Calabria in 1541. She lived in the Netherlands and she was a patron of culture and she was interested in education –appointing Vives as her tutor– especially women's.

²⁴ For more information about Erasmus's, More's and Vives's views on women education, see: Cousins, A.2004. “Humanism, Female Education, and Myth: Erasmus, Vives, and More's *To Candidus*”. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 65(2), pp.213-230.

and women used translations to please “potential or actual patrons” (Goodrich, 2014, p. 22) which demonstrated that women were also “aware of the cultural and political uses of translation” (Goodrich, 2014, p. 23). As a matter of fact, these women’s translations were enriched by the household discussions which provided informal networks in which theological issues were treated, especially in families where a given political or religious position was defended (Clarke, 2009, p.174).

As regards to the practical habitus, female translators preferred to create a faithful translation rather than a free one because it was expected from them to not use translations to fulfil their own ideological purposes (Clarke, 2009, p.171). Women usually rendered a submissive position towards the author of the source text, by means of conventional disclaimers (Clarke, 2009, p.174) and even in some cases, the woman’s identity was left unknown for the majority of the readership (Goodrich, 2014, p. 24).

In spite of the general private and domestic nature of these translations, we must point that, in many cases, the source texts those women translated were key texts in European culture, which in some cases were of religious controversy –either Catholic or Protestant– (Clarke, 2009, p.175). These texts were high literary genres. This fact proved the remarkable level of education of the women that translated them – who were mainly from the social elite – (Belle, 2012, p. 12). These translations were composed by royal and not royal members. In this manner, they showed their mastering on Classical languages such as Latin and Greek (Demers, 2005, p. 78).

Regarding female translators that were part of the royal family, the first we have to mention is Lady Margaret Beaufort²⁵. She is known to be one of the main figures on the support of education in the Early Modern Period. Additionally, the Countess of Richmond translated Thomas à Kempis’s²⁶ devotional manual *De Imitatione Christi* (ca. 1441) from French to English, which was published under her name (Demers, 2005, p. 66).²⁷ Following the example

²⁵ Lady Margaret Beaufort (1441/3-1509), Countess of Richmond and Derby was the mother of King Henry VII by her second marriage to Edmund Tudor. She was a crucial figure in the War of Roses, helping her 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. It is important her implication on the education that is seen for example in the refound of Christ’s College in the University of Cambridge in 1505. Moreover, she established the Lady Margaret’s Professorship of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge.

²⁶ Thomas à Kempis (c.1380-1471) was a German-Dutch monk of the Modern Devotion and a writer. He entered in a monastery called Mount St. Agnes where he devoted himself to copy manuscripts and to compose his own. He was ordained a priest in 1413 and sub-prior in 1429. He wrote several sermons like *Prayers and Meditations on the Life of Christ* and his most important work *The Imitation of Christ* (1441); though his authorship is disputed.

²⁷ For more information about the literary participation of Lady Margaret Beaufort, and also to know about some similarities she shared with Margaret Roper see Olivares, E. 2001. ‘Lady Margaret Beaufort and Margaret More Roper: Similarities and Differences’. “*So long lives this, and this gives life to thee*”

of their grand-grandmother, Mary and Elizabeth Tudor also publicly published some religious texts, as their status as princesses allowed it. In the case of Mary, – apart from her participation in the English translation of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases* – she translated, at the age of 12, Thomas Aquinas’s²⁸ prayer “Concede mihi” from Latin into English.²⁹ On the other hand, Elizabeth Tudor, also at the age of 12, presented a translation of Marguerite de Navarre’s³⁰ *Le Mirroir de l’âme pécheresse*, titled *The Glass of the Sinful Soul* (Demers, 2005, p. 73). She also translated many texts throughout her life like Euripides’s³¹ tragedies, Isocrates³²’s orations, a dialogue of Xenophon,³³ and other many texts at the end of her life (Demers, 2005, p. 74).

Outside the royal family, we find the translations of Margaret Roper and Mary Roper Basset Clark.³⁴ Margaret Roper was the first non-royal Early Modern translator (Demers, 2005, p. 66). Her translation, *A devout treatise upon the Pater Noster* (1524) from Erasmus’s *Precatio Dominica* (1523) was published anonymously, to protect her from any possible criticism (Goodrich, 2010, p. 314). Margaret Roper’s daughter, Mary Roper Basset, was also a translator and her major work was the translation of Eusebius’s³⁵ *Ecclesiastical History* from its original Greek into English.³⁶ Contrasting with other female translators, Basset expressed in a more forward manner her own voice, by composing a preface and using the marginalia of her

²⁸ Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was an Italian Dominican friar, philosopher, priest and Doctor of the Church. His most important works are *Disputed Questions on Truth* (1256-1259), *The Summan contra Gentiles* (1259-1265) and the *Summa Theologica* (1265-1274).

²⁹ For more information about Mary Tudor’s translation of Thomas de Aquinas’s “Concede mihi” prayer, see: Goodrich, J. 2011. “Mary Tudor, Lord Morley, and St. Thomas Aquinas: The Politics of Pious Translation at the Henrician Court.” *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews*. 24 (1-2) (pp.11-20).

³⁰ Marguerite de Navarre (1527-1549) was the eldest child of Louise of Savoy and Charles, Count of Angoulême. She was the princess of France by her marriage to Charles IV of Alençon who died in 1525. After that, she became Queen of Navarre through her marriage to Henry II of Navarre. She was also the sister of Francis I of France to whom she freed from Charles V’s power by using her diplomatic knowledge. She was an important figure for the French Renaissance and she wrote many poems like *Miroir de l’âme pécheresse*, plays and a collection of short stories called the *Heptameron*.

³¹ Euripides (c.480 – c.406 BC) was a tragedy playwright from Greece. He is believed to write around 90 plays from which only 18-19 survive. Some of his most known tragedies are *Medea*, *Hecuba*, *Electra*, *The Trojan Women* or *Orestes*. He also wrote romantic drama like *Helen* or satyr play *Cyclops*.

³² Isocrates (436-338 BC) was one of the most important rhetoricians in Classical Greece. One of his most important speeches is the *Panegyricus* which is about the literacy in Sparta. Isocrates also founded the first school of rhetoric in Athens around 392-390 BC.

³³ Xenophon (c.431-354 BC) was an Ancient Greek historian, philosopher and soldier. He was disciple of Socrates and he is known by his historical records of the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC) in the work called *Hellenica*. He also wrote some Socratic dialogues which are included in works like *Apology*, *Memorabilia*, *Symposium* and *Oeconomicus*.

³⁴ Mary Roper Basset Clark (c.1523-1572) was the daughter of William and Margaret Roper. Like her mother, she was also a talented translator as she rendered Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History* and Sir Thomas More’s *De tristitia Christi* into English which are characterised by their strong opinions in religion –as she was Catholic– and politics.

³⁵ Eusebius of Caesarea (AD 260/265-339/340) was a historian of Christianity, exegete, and Christian polemicist. He was the bishop of Caesaria Maritima. He wrote several works like *Demonstrations of the Gospel*, *Preparations for the Gospel* and *On Discrepancies between the Gospel* and his well-known *Ecclesiastical History*.

³⁶ For more information about Mary Roper Clark Basset translation, see Olivares Merino, E. 2017. “Some Notes about Mary Roper Clar(c)ke Bassett and her Translation of Eusebius.” *Moreana*. 46(2-3). pp. 146-180.

manuscript (Goodrich, 2010, p. 314). Despite this presence of Basset's own voice, she also tries to fit in the humble tradition of the previous women translators by downplaying her work as a private manuscript in order to persuade her readership that she was "not trying to show off in an inappropriate, unfeminine fashion" (Stevenson, 2006, p. 131).

In brief, translation provides a great amount of evidence that demonstrates women's participation in the cultural sphere in the Renaissance period, not only in a literary level but also in the discussion of public issues (Clarke, 2009, p.177).

3. ERASMUS'S PARAPHRASES UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION

In this section, Mary Tudor's part in the English translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*: John's Gospel and the letter to Ferdinand of Austria that Erasmus used as the preface for this paraphrase is analysed. Although, before describing this translation, it is important to describe the original work written by Erasmus as it will give us some idea about the structure the text and also about the intention Erasmus had when writing it. Moreover, it is also important to comment on Nicholas Udall's preface because, as it has been already stated when discussing the interpretation of Erasmus in the Early Modern Period, prefaces were used to favour a Protestant the reader into a Protestant reading of the work. After this, the focus is directed to Mary Tudor's participation in the translation, explaining the reasons that could have motivate her to engage with this translation linked with the Edwardian Reformation, and how she did it. Finally, regarding the issue of which edition was used for the translation, before 1548, there were only the first editions from 1522 to 1525 and the compilation included in Erasmus's *Omnia Opera* (1540); hence, any of the two versions could be used; although it seems more probable that they used the first editions.

3.1 The Original Text: Erasmus's *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum*.

Erasmus wrote the *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum* (PNT) from 1517 to 1524 writing the paraphrases of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles³⁷ from 1522 to 1524³⁸ (Pabel and Vessey, 2002, p.?). While the *Paraphrases on the New Testament* are sometimes not analysed when writing about Erasmus, at their time of composition they were quite popular, and as consequence several editions were published and they were translated in several languages (Bloemendal, 2016, p.108). Also, Erasmus considered them as important and he said about writing the *Paraphrases* "Here I am in my own field." (Doods, 2009, p.5). Erasmus started to write his *Paraphrases* in a context where he was facing several critical positions and detraction due to the ambiguity of his religious ideas –as it has been already argued in the section

³⁷ Erasmus, D. 1522. *Paraphrasis in Evangelium Matthaei, per D.Erasmum Rot. Nunc primu nata edita*. Basileae: Ioan Froben.

Erasmus, D. 1523. *In evangelium Lucae paraphrasis Erasmi Roterodami nunc primum & nota & aedita*. Basileae: Ioan Froben.

Erasmus, D. 1524. *D. Erasmi Roterodami Paraphrasis in Evangelium secundum Ioannem, ad Illustrissimum principem Ferdinandum, per autorem recognita*. Basileae: Ioan Froben.

Erasmus, D. 1524. *In Evangelium Marci Paraphrasis, per D. Erasmum Roterodamum nunc recens & nata & formulis excusa*. Basileae: Ioan Froben.

Erasmus, D. 1525. *In acta apostolorum paraphrasis*. Petreius.

³⁸ From 1517 to 1521, Erasmus wrote the Paraphrases of the Epistles.

about interpreting Erasmus– (Vessey, 2002b, p.43) and; likewise, the *PNT* was the target of praise and critics equally (Froude, 1894, p.192).

It was written in Latin and it was composed by the paraphrases of the four gospels and several pieces of marginalia. Each of the Paraphrases was preceded by a letter addressed to one of the most important rulers of Europe at the time. In this way, Saint Matthew’s Gospel’s Paraphrase was preceded by a letter to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V³⁹, Saint Mark’s by a letter to Francis I⁴⁰, King of France, Saint Luke’s by the one addressed to Henry VIII, King of England and finally John’s Gospel was preceded by a letter to the Archduke of Austria, Ferdinand⁴¹, Charles V’s brother. Apart from these letters, there is one to the “pious lectori”, to Cardinal Mathäus Schiner⁴² –who were the one that suggested Erasmus to write the paraphrasis of Matthew’s Gospel and also motivated Erasmus’s continuation with the other Gospels (Rabil, 1979, p.143)–, (Erasmus, 1522), and one to the Pope Clement (Erasmus, 1525).

In this way, Erasmus was the first author to create a “full and expanded” paraphrases of the New Testament (Doods, 2009, p. 5). He intended to make “the Word of God effective” and to move people to follow the example of Christ’s life as a way to salvation (Vessey, 2002a, p.3). Moreover, Erasmus thought that Christ’s life was best known from the Gospels and the letter of Paul, that is why he chose the New Testament (Bloemendal, 2016, p.106). These *Paraphrases* were composed because, even if Erasmus has already published a revision of the New Testament in Greek⁴³ and Latin with notes, he considered those previous texts –even if clear in their meaning– were not sufficient to inspire that feeling of imitating Christ’s life in the readers (Vessey, 2002b, p.48). Moreover, it has been argued, he was little concerned with the doctrine

³⁹ Charles I of Spain and V of Germany (1500-1558) was the son of Phillip I of Castilla and Joanna I of Castilla. He was the Holy Roman Emperor and the King of Spain. He was the first of the so called major Habsburgs and he was the first one considered to rule “the empire on which the sun never sets”.

⁴⁰ Francis I of France (1497-1547) was the King of France from 1515 to 1547 due to his marriage with Claude, daughter of Louis XII and to the Salic Law that prevented women to have access to the throne. He was the precursor of the French Renaissance as he supported many Italian artists, including Leonardo Da Vinci. During his reign, he would maintain a constant state of dispute with Charles V.

⁴¹ Ferdinand I of Austria (1503-1564) was the son of Philip I and Joanna I of Castile and brother of Charles V. He acted as the representation of his brother in Austria. After Charles V’s abdication, Ferdinand became the Holy Roman Emperor (1556-1564) separating in a definitive manner the Spanish crown and the Holy Roman Empire.

⁴² Cardinal Matthäus Schiner (c.1465-1522) was the bishop of Sinon, then Cardinal and diplomat. Schiner was also a military commander in several battle in northern Italy, fighting against the French army. Due to his hatred feeling towards the French, Schiner supported the election of Charles I of Spain as Emperor. He was called to Rome by Pope Adrian VI where he died of plague.

⁴³ Erasmus, D. 1516. *Novum instrumentum omne ab Erasmo Roterdamo recognitum et emendatum*. Basiliae: Ioannes Frobenius.

For more information about Erasmus’s New Testament in Greek, see Hamilton, A. 2004. “Humanists and the Bible” (pp.100-117). In: Kraye, J.2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. [Online]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Date accessed: 12th April 2020]. Retrieved from: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2137999456?accountid=14555>

of the Church. (Doods, 2009, p. 6). For this reason, his target readership was mainly “a broad Latinate readership [...] that did not have the theological background of trained clergy” although it also helped “less well-educated clergy” (Doods, 2009, p. 6). Nevertheless, for this purpose, instead of choosing a pulpit as the clergy did at the time, Erasmus decided to preach the New Testament by using the printing press as a consequence of the “highly evolved and rapidly developing textual and typographic culture” (Vessey, 2002a, p.3).

The *Paraphrases* were a detailed commentary that made the New Testament accessible to these readers (Doods, 2009, p. 6). Despite this, the *Paraphrases* is by no means an easy narrative, as it combined translation, commentary and fiction (Doods, 2009, p.6). Indeed, Erasmus firmly believed that the Bible itself was purposely unclear and that some of its doctrines and mysteries were not intended to be understood (Doods, 2009, p.34). As a matter of fact, this complexity caused some shock in the early readership, as it illustrated that Erasmus’s concept of paraphrase was not the same the tradition considered because in the literary tradition the objective of paraphrases were to simplify a given text in order to it being easier to understand (Vessey, 2002a, p.9).

Therefore, the main aim of the *Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum* was to approach the Bible to the lay readers—even if as it has been just said the *Paraphrasis* are considered difficult to understand—and to give Christians the ultimate model a virtuous life, Christ’s. As a matter of fact, Erasmus’s intentions do not seem to go as far as being focused on Church doctrine, even less on being supportive of Protestant faith—as his preface to the Pope seems to demonstrate—. In point of fact, he even requests the kings he addresses his prefaces to not interfere with the matters of the faith and the Church. Thus, it is difficult to believe that Erasmus would agree with the Edwardian Reformation because it meant the interference of the State in religious matters. Nonetheless, as already seen and will again below, thanks to the process of translation and edition, the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* seemed to support this intervention.

3.2 Nicholas Udall’s edition and his ‘Preface’ to ‘John’s Gospel’ in the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*.

As I have pointed out previously, the English *Paraphrases* were planned by Katherine Parr and they were published in 1548, including, of course, Mary Tudor’s translation. All the translations of the *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* were introduced by a preface written by Nicholas Udall, except his own translation, that was preceded by Thomas Key’s preface.

The high level of implication of Udall with *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrases of Erasmus upon the New Testament* is widely known as, in 1543, he became its editor and chief

translator (Edgerton, 1966, p.51). However, in his dedication to the *Paraphrase on Acts*, Udall admits that as editor he only “placed the texte, and divided the paraphrase” as any further act of revision would have been a “cryme of great arrogancie and presumption [...] to entremedle” (Pollnitz, 2011)⁴⁴. In addition, he also translated Luke’s Gospel (Edgerton, 1966, p.79) and apparently also Matthew’s Gospel and the Acts (Edgerton, 1966, p.51). At the same time, other scholars think that it was Katherine Parr who translated Matthew’s Gospel –however, considering Parr’s insistence on Mary’s about recognising her participation, other critics think that it seems unlikely that Parr herself did not publicly acknowledge her translation– (Norton, 2010, p.128). As a matter of fact, his participation in the *Paraphrases* was in itself the cause of his popularity in Tudor’s era (Edgerton, 1966, p.109), more even than the fact of writing *Ralph Roister Doister*⁴⁵, which is considered the first comedy publicly performed in 1552 (Carter and McRae, 1996, p.39). Furthermore, the importance of Udall’s participation in the *Paraphrases* is due to the fact that, as commented in the section of interpreting Erasmus, this scholar was the one who shaped the framework of the translation in such a way that it could be interpreted as a Protestant work in support of the Edwardian Reformation. Udall used the prefaces and edited the text to ‘Protestantize’ Erasmus. Regarding the editing, the letter to Pope Clement VII⁴⁶ was eliminated from the English translation alongside with some fragments that were modified to erase those sections that could be considered as problematic, like the praise of Saint Thomas Becket⁴⁷, as a model of standing against the monarchy when needed (Doods, 2009, p. 30; Craig, 2002, p.321). Furthermore, Udall also extended Erasmus’s margin notes with the addition of new ones, for example in Mark 10, when Erasmus says “after that Christ hath one forsaken the worlde, he cannot be shewed nor pointed with fingers”, Udall adds: “Howe do the Papists then se him in the Sacrament?” (Craig, 2002, p.321). In relation to the aforementioned letters that functioned as prefaces for the different paraphrases, most of them –as shown below– were

⁴⁴ Text located in website, with no numbered pages.

⁴⁵ *Ralph Roister Doister* (1567) is a 16th century play written by Nicolas Udall. It is believed to be written in 1552. The play is a comedy about a rich widow Christian Custance who is wooed by Ralph Roister Doister even if she is betrothed to Gawyn Goodluck.

⁴⁶ Pope Clement VII (1478-1534), born as Giulio di Guliano 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. Clement VII is also well-known for approving Copernicus’s heliocentric theory and also for issuing laws that protected the Jews from the Inquisition.

⁴⁷ Saint Thomas Becket (1119-1170) was the Lord Chancellor of Henry II from 1155 until his election as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162. Becket’s resign created a antagonism between the King and himself which was more accentuated after the Constitutions of Clarendon in which Henry II sought less clerical independence and less control from Rome. Becket did not accept these Constitutions and he had to flee to the Low Countries in disguise. At the end, Becket was allowed to come back to England but he was murdered in Canterbury’s Cathedral by four of the King’s knights.

addressed to monarchs. For this reason, Udall stated that Erasmus supported the monarchy's control over the Church (Doods, 2009, p.29). Nonetheless, what Erasmus defended in his letters was not this absolute power. On the contrary, Erasmus asked the monarch to support a reformation of the Church under the Holy See and advised that the clergy should not implicate in political matters or the monarchy in religious matters (Doods, 2009, pp.31-32). Udall tried, in essence, to present Erasmus as the creator of "prepapal Catholic Christianity" (Doods, 2009, p.19). In addition, Udall, in his own Preface, called "to the good christian reader", warned people to against challenging Erasmus's theology as in his opinion it was mainly Protestant – even when Catholics in the Continent also respected it– (Craig, 2002, p.319). Finally, Udall wrote that the Reformation was not a new idea since Erasmus was already an antipapal reformer (Doods, 2009, pp. 19-22).

In the case of the Preface to the paraphrase of John's Gospel, Udall uses this piece of paratext to praise first women's learning by citing the examples of well-educated women from Antiquity (Erasmus, 1548, fol.Ir). Afterwards he praises the work of female translators in England with an emphasis on their virtue⁴⁸. Then, he praises the works of Katherine and Mary, who in his opinion put their efforts to the service of the country⁴⁹. These works, in this context, clearly reflect that Udall is referring to the service of supporting the Edwardian Reformation.

Especially in the case of Mary, Udall tries to connect both her roles as Henry's daughter and as Edward's sister with her wish to serve the country⁵⁰ and by extension to the Reformation (Goodrich, 2014, p. 81). While in the case of Katherine this was truly the case, for Mary it was a misleading assumption (Goodrich, 2014, p. 69), as the letter of Katherine Parr shows that it was Mary's private favour to her (Goodrich, 2014, p. 82). In addition, as I am about to show, several other reasons justify Mary Tudor's participation in a production that seemed to be quite

⁴⁸ But nowe in this gracious and blissefull time of knowledge [...] what a noumbre is there of noble weomen [...] yea and howe many in the years of tender virginitie, nor one ly asweli sene as familiarlye traded in the Latine and Greke tongues, as in their owne mother language: but also bothe in all kyndes of prophane literature [...] and in the holy scriptures and Theologie so ripe, that they are able aptely, cunningly, and with muche grace eythrt to endicte or translate into the vulgare tounge for the publike instruccio and edifying of the unlearned multitude. (Erasmus, 1548, fol.ir)

⁴⁹ Howe happie art thou, o England, for whose behoufe and edifying in Christe, Quenes and Princesses spare not ne cease with all earnest endeavour and sedulitee to spende their tyme, their wittes, their substaunce, and also their bodyes? (Erasmus, 1548, fol.ii)

⁵⁰ Ladye Maries Grace, daughter of the late moste puissaunte and moste victorious kyng Henry the eyght [...] and moste beloved systur to the king our soveralgue lord that now is [...] For what could be more manifeste argumente of myndyng the publike benefite of her country, what could bee more evident profe of her will and desire to dooe good to her fathers moste dere beloved subiectes (Erasmus, 1548, fol.ii)

removed from her religious ideas. What is more, the princess even managed to assimilated the translation to her own religious beliefs.

3.3 Mary Tudor's Translation of 'John's Gospel'

Focusing now on the part that Mary Tudor translated for the English translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament*, the first question that might strike readers and scholars is how she agreed to participate in a composition that was tightly linked with Protestantism. As it was mentioned, Nicholas Udall tried in the preface to this translation to turn Mary Tudor into a supporter of her brother's Reformation to the public eye. However, knowing that Mary Tudor would be the Queen who restored, even if briefly, Catholicism in England, it is difficult for the modern reader to believe that she supported Protestantism.

Firstly, it is interesting for some scholars that the translation was not completed by Mary, as it was finished by Parr's chaplain, Francis Mallet, due to an illness of Mary (Doods, 2009, p. 11). Whereas many scholars believe that the ailment was real – as Mary Tudor suffered many periods of ill health during her life –, some others seem to believe that she pretended to be ill. This would have free her from finishing the task and to detach herself from the religious implications of the work – and it would not be the only time as she pretended to be ill when Edward VI invited her to celebrate Christmas together in 1549 (Whitelock, 2009, pp. 149-150) –. However, after being asked by Parr to publish the translation under her name, she agreed (Goodrich, 2014, pp. 82-83). Katherine Parr's interest in having Mary Tudor's name in the publication was to acknowledge her “many labors for the highest good of the commonwealth” (Goodrich, 2014, p.77), that means, that Parr's intention was the same as Udall's: to present an unified royal support to the Edwardian Reformation, including Mary. By accepting the translation being published under her name, even if she did not fully engage with the text, a middle ground was allowed.

One of the reasons for this could be that the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases* would allow the English people to approach the Bible (Goodrich, 2014, p. 75), an enterprise that both Catherine of Aragon⁵¹ and her daughter approved (Loades, 1989, pp. 118-119). Moreover, other reason would be that Mary Tudor viewed Erasmus more in accordance with the more Catholic religious reputation he had during Henry VIII's reign than with the reputation Udall wanted to

⁵¹ 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 married 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 their marriage, provoking a schism with the Church of Rome. After the annulment, she lived at Kimbolton Castle and died on 7th January 1536.

highlight. In point of fact, Juan Luis Vives, whom we can consider as a Catholic religious humanist, recommended the young princess to read the Dutch's works, including the *Paraphrases*, as being useful for her education (Vives, 1523, p. 35). Moreover, Erasmus himself wrote *Christiani Matrimonii Institutio*⁵² (1526) , by Catherine of Aragon's request (Hickman, 2016, p.60). As a matter of fact, the humanist was fascinated with Catherine of Aragon's intelligence and erudition calling her "*egregie docta* (eminently learned)" (Hickman, 2016, p.40; Watson, 1912, pp.9-10). In the same way, Erasmus considered that Mary would equal her mother and grandmother Isabella of Castille –quite known throughout Europe by her deeds as regnant queen– in intelligence and also learn from them the "art of queenship" (Schutte, 2016, p.40). In this way, Mary's education and Christian humanistic thought were influenced by Erasmus's and Vives's ideas (Edwards, 2011, p.231) and probably this childhood closeness to the author could convince her to translate one of his works.

Nevertheless, the last and probably the most important reason was Mary Tudor's friendship with Katherine Parr (Whitelock, 2009, pp. 114-115). Additionally, by 1545, the project of the translation was already prepared, meaning that originally, the *Paraphrases* were a Henrician (rather than Edwardian) project, as far as her father's religious ideas were more in consonance with those of Mary (Pollintz, 2011, p.?). Mary Tudor and Parr's relationship is even previous to the latter's matrimony with Henry VII, as Parr had served Mary Tudor in her household. Both women shared their interest in culture and religion and it is even said that Mary's princessly education was a promoter of Katherine Parr's works (Edwards, 2011, p.63). Per contra, there are some critics that state that Parr and Mary shared the same education and they were 'schoolmates' –which is not proven– (Norton, 2010, p.14). Certainly, some letters seem to validate that Parr's education as a child was not conscientious and that she was not taught Latin nor "fine handwriting" (Norton, 2010, p.15). Therefore, it was in Henry VIII's humanistic court where Parr started to be more interested in these matters (Edward, 2011, p.230) as her many published works such as *Prayers or Meditations*⁵³ (1545), *The Lament of the Sinner*⁵⁴ (1547) or her role as the patron of the *Paraphrases* (1548) prove (Hoffman, 1959, p.354, 357, 358). Moreover, Parr seemed to consider Mary as an academic mentor which is one of the reasons why she asked the Princess to translate the *Paraphrases* on John's Gospel (Edward,

⁵² *Christiani Matrimonii Institutio* (1526) was a treatise written by Erasmus dedicated to Catherine of Aragon about the institution of matrimony.

⁵³ *Prayers or Meditations* (1545) was a book in English based in Thomas à Kempis's *The Imitation of Christ* written by Katherine Parr. It was the first book in England to be published under the name of a woman.

⁵⁴ *The Lament of the Sinner* (1547) was a three-part sequence of reflections written by Katherine Parr. It was considered the first conversion narrative and the main topics are confession and repentance. It was published after Henry VIII's death.

2011, p.230). Despite their friendship and the fact that Mary Tudor accepted Parr's proposition, the Princess seemed "less enthusiastic" about the translation than Parr. Mary Tudor did not participate in later literary projects by Parr (Norton, 2010, p.128). In addition, the fact that Mallet ended the translation due to Mary's health issues –which, as said above, some critics regard as Mary's way of detaching from the project– was a "personal blow" for Parr (Norton, 2010, p.128). Notwithstanding, Parr and Mary Tudor remained close friends (Norton, 2010, p.128) –at least until Parr's marriage with Thomas Seymour soon after Henry VIII's death (Norton, 2010, p.182)–. Furthermore, Mary had in her library as a Queen several books of Katherine Parr, and she continued to support the publications of Catholic Humanism (Edward, 2011, p.230).

For these reasons, Mary Tudor agreed to translate the paraphrasis on John's Gospel. The translators –it is better to speak in plural as it is unknown which parts are Mary's and which Mallet's (Goodrich, 2014, p. 83) – kept themselves quite loyal to the original text in general but there are some points in which they used some techniques that reflected their own thoughts (Goodrich, 2014, p. 83). Due to words' restrictions, this dissertation does not discuss the linguistic matters of the translation in depth. However, some techniques are worth mentioning. One of these moments is when Erasmus praises briefly Ferdinand's brother Charles V as "optimus" (Erasmus, 1524a, p.4) (best) and "studium" (zeal) (Erasmus, 1524a, p.5). In the translation, "optimus" is rendered as "most vertuous" (Erasmus, 1548, p. III) and "studium" as "affection and zeale" (Erasmus, 1548, p. IIII). In this way, the translators not only highlighted Charles's piety and devotion for the Roman Catholic religion as this also seems to hint at Mary Tudor's affection for her cousin the Emperor, her principal defender after Mary's mother's marriage annulment (Goodrich, 2014, p. 83).

Concerning the religious content, Mary and Mallet interpreted the original text in a more Catholic way than what the reader might expect from Udall's preface.. They, taking advantage of the ambiguity of Erasmus's religious ideas –as seen in "Interpreting Erasmus" section–, chose to stress the Roman Catholic views by slightly altering some terms (Goodrich, 2014, p. 84). One of the elements that Mary and Mallet put into relevance is the figure of Virgin Mary by translating the fragment in which Erasmus wrote that Christ was born "ex homine" (Erasmus, 1524a, p.4) as "of virgin Marie" (Erasmus, 1548, fol. X) (Goodrich, 2014, p. 84), which expressed two ideas. On the one hand, it specified that Christ was born from a woman – meaning that was ambiguous in the Latin text– and also that Mary remained as virgin after Christ's birth –which was not believed by Protestants–. Another biblical figure who was

strengthened was St. Peter, alluding to his role as the first pope of the Catholic church. Whilst in Erasmus's translation there was no such explicit implication of this, in the English translation it could be read: "If thou wilt succede me [added in the translation] as my vicar [instead of "vices" (Erasmus, 1524a, p. 170) being translated as 'place']" (Erasmus, 1548, fol. CVIIIr) (Goodrich, 2014, p. 85). The purpose of this emphasis on Peter as Christ's vicar on earth is clearly a contradiction to the principle of the Anglican Church that condemned "the pope's usurped authority" (Goodrich, 2014, p. 84). Finally, the other element in which the translators echo their beliefs was in the rite of the Mass. Both of them, Mary Tudor and Francis Mallet, were defenders of the Mass and they continued to celebrate it in Mary's household, even when Edward VI forbade it (Loades, 1989, pp. 144-145). Consequently, they present the description of the Eucharist in the following terms:

after that laste and misticall supper was prepared, in the whiche the holy memoriall of his body and bloude beeing geven, he leafte unto us by way of coveaunte a continuall remembraunce of himselfe (Erasmus, 1548, fol. LXXXVII)

At huius societatis uobis mysticum symbolum relicturus sum carnem mea & sanguinem meum, quod ne ipsum quidem sumpsisse profuerit, nisi secundum spiritum sumpseritis. (Erasmus, 1524a, p.76)

In the translation then, "symbolo" is translated in English as "memoriall" and also the translators added the "he leafte unto us" meaning that Christ commanded the Apostoles to do the same ritual He did. That is to say, Mary and Mallet considered the Eucharist as a re-enactment of Christ's sacrifice (Goodrich, 2014, p. 87)⁵⁵. By virtue of this Catholic view on religion, it is not surprising that Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* were kept in the churches of England during the Catholic period of Mary I's reign –positioned between the Protestant periods of Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns–

Briefly, what it is found in the rendering of the paraphrases of John's Gospel by Mary is that, while Parr and Udall tried to cast a feeling of support to Protestantism and the Edwardian Reformation in Mary Tudor's cooperation, the princess opted to offer a more Catholic translation and she directed her work towards a more Roman Catholic doctrine that could be recognized by an "alert reader" (Goodrich, 2014, p.87).

⁵⁵ For Erasmus' views on the Eucharist, see: John B. Payne, *Erasmus: his Theology of the Sacraments*. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1970.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the English translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* was a central text in the Early Modern Period from its publication during Edward VI's reign to Elizabeth I's.

Considering the objectives that were established in the Introduction, the following outcomes can be stated. First, in relation to the connection of the translation with its contextual moment within the Edwardian Reformation, the English *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* was an essential tool of the political and religious authorities for the conversion of the country from the more Catholic-oriented Church Henry VIII's founded –which only differed from Roman Catholicism in its obedience to the Holy See– to proper Protestantism. For this purpose, the Edwardian political and religious authorities, next to scholars, leveraged the already existing ambiguous interpretation of Erasmus's religious ideas, offering a Protestant approach to the Dutch Humanist. In the case of Erasmus's *Paraphrases*, Nicholas Udall was the main responsible for influencing the readers of the translation towards a Protestant interpretation by means of his prefaces.

In relation to the importance of translation in the Early Modern Period, we have observed that it was not considered as a second-rate literary activity. On the contrary, it was fundamental first in the Humanist's education system because it helped to teach languages. Moreover, it was an ideological tool employed to agree or disagree with the official political and/or religious statement in the country. Regarding women's role as translators, we have seen that, in relation to the ideological use, there were not many differences with male translators. However, the difference was that, in theory, women's translations were considered to be directed to a more private and domestic sphere. Despite this manner of thought, there were women from the royal family and outside it that managed to publish their works either claiming their authorship or not –and even in this last case, they were known by the readership as the authors–.

Considering the ideological use of literary translation –and the royal family presence in this field– which connects directly with the third sub-objective of this dissertation: to comprehend why Mary Tudor agreed to participate in the translation. As it has been explained, the English translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* was one of the main texts in the Edwardian Reformation and, consequently, in principle, this fact is conflicted with the historical perception of Mary Tudor as the defender of the Catholic faith in England. All the same, there are some reasons why the Princess could have agreed to translate this work without opposing her religious ideas. First, Mary Tudor, like her mother, Catherine of Aragon, were supporters

of the reading of the Bible. Therefore, Mary Tudor would think that the access to an English edition of Erasmus's *Paraphrases* could help the English people to achieve this end. In addition, the opinion that Mary would have of Erasmus's ideas were probably not the same as Udall had but the more Catholic interpretation –influenced by Vives's treatises for her education–. Finally, the last reason is that the request came from Katherine Parr, a beloved friend, so the translation can be considered as a personal favour to her. Of course, the fact that she did not finish the translation could be, and it is indeed for some critics, related to this clash of religious ideas.

Finally, the last objective was to analyse how Mary and Mallet translated Erasmus's paraphrase on John's Gospel. Actually, they, like Udall, leveraged from the ambiguity of the interpretation of Erasmus's works to favour a more Catholic view closer to the Roman Church. This Catholicism is indirectly observed in some points like the extended praise to Charles V – the Roman Catholic champion at the time in Europe–, the defence of the Virgin Mary's purity even after Christ's conception. Moreover, the clearest points that were contrary to the Edwardian Reformation was the underlining of St Peter as the first pope –which was contrary the Protestant denial of the Pope's authority– and the certainty that the Mass was the actual re-enactment of Christ's sacrifice at the cross, which necessarily took for granted his real presence in the sacrament.. In brief, their participation in the translation was not an indication of their support to the Edwardian Reformation but a vindication to their Catholic's ideas.

Lastly, about the limitations of the MD, it must be said that, due to extensions requirements, this was only an approach to the translation of Erasmus's work and especially to Mary Tudor's translation of the paraphrase of John's Gospel. Accordingly, I have not discussed here all the subversive religious implications behind the translation of Erasmus text in Protestant England, precisely by two Catholics. This requires a detailed knowledge of all the points of divergence between the two creeds and it would go beyond the limits of this work. Nevertheless, this detailed analysis of Mary Tudor's and Mallet's text can be an interesting future study by comparing it with the original text written by Erasmus.

5. REFERENCES

- ALFORD, S. 2002. *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ARNOLD, M. 1993. *Queen Consorts of England: the power behind the throne*. New York: Fact on File.
- BAY, G. 2007. "Chapter 6: English Protestantism to Present Day." In: McGrath, A.E. and Darren, M.C. (eds). *The Blackwell Companion to Protestantism*. pp. 96-108. John Wiley & Sons.
- BELLE, M. 2012. "Locating Early Modern Women's Translation: Critical and Historiographical Issues". *Renaissance and Reformation*, **35** (4) pp. 5-23. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- BLOEMENDAL, J. 2016. "Erasmus' *Paraphrases on the New Testament*". *Erasmus Studies*, **36** pp.105-122. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- CARTER, R. AND MCRAE, J. 1996. *The Penguin Guide to Literature in English Britain and Ireland*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- CLARKE, D. 2009. "Translation". In: Knoppers, L.(ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*. pp. 167-180. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CRAIG, J. 2002. "Forming a Protestant Consciousness? Erasmus' Paraphrases in English Parishes, 1547-1666". In: Pabel, H. and Vessey, M. (eds). *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus Paraphrases on the New Testament*. pp. 313-360. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- CROMPTON, S. 2005. *Desiderius Erasmus*. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers.
- DEMERS, P. 2005. *Women's Writing in English: Early Modern England*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- DOODS, G. 2009. *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy Change in Early Modern England*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- DODDS, G. 2013. "'Betwixt Heaven and Hell': Religious Toleration and the Reception of Erasmus in Restoration England." In: Enenkel, K. (ed). *The Reception of Erasmus in the Early Modern Period: Reception of Erasmus in the Early Modern Period*. pp.103-127. Brill.
- EDGERTON, W. 1966. *Nicholas Udall*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- EDWARDS, J. 2011. *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen*. Yale University Press.
- ENENKEL, K. 2013. "Introduction – Mainfold Reader Responses: The Reception of Erasmus in Early Modern Europe. In: Enenkel, K. (ed.) *The Reception of Erasmus in the Early Modern Period: Reception of Erasmus in the Early Modern Period*. pp. 1-21. Brill.
- ERASMUS, D. 1522. *Paraphrasis in Evangelium Matthaei, per D.Erasmum Rot. Nunc primum nata edita*. Basileae: Ioan Froben.

- ERASMUS, D. 1524a. *D. Erasmi Roterodami Paraphrasis in Evangelium secundum Ioannem, ad Illustrissimum principem Ferdinandum, per autorem recognita*. Basileae: Ioan Froben.
- ERASMUS, D. 1548. *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testamente*. Udall, N. (ed). London: Edwarde Whitchurche.
- FROUDE, J. 1894. *Life and Letters of Erasmus*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- GOODRICH, J. 2010. "The Dedicatory Preface to Mary Roper Clarke Basset's Translation to Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History." *English Literary Renaissance*, **40** (3) pp.301-328.
- GOODRICH, J. 2014. *Faithful Translators: Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England. Rethinking the Early Modern*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- HICKMAN, L. 2016. *Katherine of Aragon: A "Pioneer of Women's Education"? Humanism and Women's Education in Early Sixteenth Century England*. Thesis of Master of Arts in History, Massey University, Manawatu, New Zealand.
- HOFFMAN, C. 1959. "Catherine as a Woman of Letters". *Huntington Library Quarterly*. **23** (1). pp.349-367.
- JEBB, R. 1897. *Erasmus*. Cambridge University Press.
- LOADES, D. 1989. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Basil Blackwell.
- LOADES, D. 2009. *The Tudor Queens of England*. New York: MJF Books.
- MCCUTCHEON, E. 1987. "Margaret More Roper: the learned woman in Tudor England". In: Wilson, K. (ed.) *Women Writers of the Renaissance and the Reformation*. pp.449-480. Athenas and London: The University of Georgia Press.
- MEISTER, C., AND STUMP, J. 2010. *Christian Thought: A Historical Introduction*. Routledge.
- MORE, T. 1518?. *More's Letters to His Children's Tutor, William Gunnell*. [Online]. [Date accessed: 9th April 2020] Retrieved from: <https://www.thomasmorestudies.org/docs/More%20to%20Will%20Gonell.pdf>
- NORTON, E. 2010. *Catherine Parr*. Stroud: Amberley Publications.
- POLLNITZ, A. 2011. "Religion and Translation at the Court of Henry VIII: Princess Mary, Katherine Parr and the Paraphrases of Erasmus" (pp.?). In: Doran, S. and Freeman, T. (eds.). *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- RABIL, A. 1979. "Erasmus' Paraphrase of the Gospel of John". *Church History*. **48** (2) pp.142-155.
- REES, F. 2006. *Desiderius Erasmus*. Compass Point Books.
- SCHUTTE, V. 2016. "Chapter 3: Under the Influence: The Impact of Queenly Book Dedications on Princess Mary". In: Duncan, S. and Schutte, V. (eds). *The Birth of a*

- Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I.* pp.31-47. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- SOLT, L. 1990. *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509 - 1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- STEVENSON, J. 2006. "Women Translators from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century." In Weissbort, D. (ed.) *Translation - Theory and Practice*. pp. 128-143. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VESSEY, M. 2002a. "Introduction". In: Pabel, H. and Vessey, M. (eds.) *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus Paraphrases on the New Testament*. pp.3-25 Toronto: University of Toronto.
- VESSEY, M. 2002b. "The Tongue and the Book: Erasmus' Paraphrases and the Arts of Scripture" (pp.29-). In: Pabel, H. and Vessey, M. (eds.) *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus Paraphrases on the New Testament*. pp.29-58. University of Toronto.
- VIVES, J. 1537. *De ratione studii puerilis*. Basileae.
- WATSON, F. Ed. 1912. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. London: Edward Arnold.
- WATSON, F., PERMENTIER M. & PEYNAUD, M. 1950. *Vives*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Lectura.
- WHITE, M. 1999. "Renaissance Englishwomen and Religious Translations: The Case of Anne Lock's *Of the Markes of the Children of God*". *English Literary Renaissance*. **29** (3) pp.375-400.
- WHITELOCK, A. 2009. *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen*. Random House.

APPENDIX 1: ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM'S BIOGRAPHY⁵⁶

Desiderius Erasmus was born in Rotterdam on the 28th of October ca. 1469. His parents were Robert Gerhard, a Catholic priest, and Margareta Boeckel, who were not married. The family of Gerhard wanted to prevent the matrimony and they were successful; however, two sons (Pieter and Erasmus) were born of this union. After the births, Gerhard flew to Rome and Pieter and Erasmus lived with their mother. The humanist started to attend a school at Gouda when he was 4 years old. When Erasmus was 10 years old, he and his brother went to the School of St Lebuin in Deventer, an important centre of learning in Europe. In 1483, Margareta died due to the Black Death and both brothers went to live with their father who died the following year. At the age of 13, Erasmus and Pieter were under the care of one of their teachers, Peter Winkel, who sent them to a monastic seminary at the Brethren at Bois-le-Duc (Netherlands). Even if Erasmus did not enjoy monastic life, this offered him the opportunity of having access for the first time to Classic authors. Three years later, he was sent to the Monastery of Steyn in the Netherlands.

In 1493, he was able to quit monastic life as he was invited by Henry de Bergis, Bishop of Cambrai, to live with him and to work as his secretary, a work that pleased Erasmus. Nevertheless, before leaving the monastery, Erasmus had been ordered priest, even if he did not have the intention to practise as one. Two years later, in the fall of 1495, he entered the University of Paris. He was first lodged in the Montaigu College –which was the college for the ‘poor’ students– but his fragile health was compromised, and he became ill due to the poor conditions. After a year of recovery with the Bishop of Cambrai, he returned to Paris, this time residing in a one-room lodging which he paid by taking in private pupils. By that time, Erasmus had already a reputation as a known scholar and Latinist. He wrote two books: *Antibarbari* and *De conscribendis epistolis*. When he ended his studies in 1496, he worked as a teacher.

This situation lasted until 1499, when one of his pupils, Lord Mountjoy, invited him to go to England. In this country, Erasmus met several important humanists of the time, like William Grocyn, William Latimer, Thomas Linacre, John Colet and Thomas More. However, in 1500, the Dutch scholar returned to Paris where he dedicated himself to the study of Greek and published *Adages* (1500), his first collection of proverbial sayings from the Classics –which would influence later writers like Miguel de Cervantes and William Shakespeare–. He also wrote in 1503 *Enchiridion Militis Christianis* translated as the Handbook of a Christian Soldier. He decided to go again to England in 1505. The following year, he fulfilled his wish of travelling

⁵⁶ For the composition of this biography I have used Jebb (1897), Crompton (2005) and Rees (2006).

to Italy where he stayed until 1509. During this period, he obtained a degree of Doctor in Theology in the University of Turin, visited Rome and the Papal Palace where he met Cardinal Giovanni de Medici –the future Pope Leo X– and Cardinal Grimani. In 1509, he returned to England and he stayed in Thomas More’s house. There he composed one of his most well-known works *The Praise of Folly*, a satire about several topics. Erasmus also stayed at the University of Cambridge by the invitation of John Fisher and he taught Greek and Theology. In 1512, he completed his collation of the *New Testament* written in Greek, which was published in 1516 in Basle.

In 1514, Erasmus left England for the last time. He went to Basle (Switzerland) and he moved to Freiburg in 1529. Finally, he returned to Basle where he died on 12th July 1536 when he was about 67 years old. This last period of his life is marked by an intense literary production. He wrote several letters to his acquaintances and he also composed *Praeparatio ad mortem* (1534) which was a short pamphlet about his reflections upon his spiritual beliefs. Regarding Erasmus’s intellectual activities, there are two essential elements. On the one hand, Erasmus was quite engaged with the revival of learning. For this reason, he took the most profitable Classic authors –in the literary and moral sense– and aimed to make them widely known with an educative purpose. Due to this, he wrote school-books like the *Colloquia familiaria* (1518), the fore-mentioned *Adages*, and editions of classical authors. On the other hand, his other concern was the reformation of the Catholic Church. Erasmus, as a Christian Humanist, supported the Catholic Church but, at the same time, he wanted it to solve its problems and purify itself. He thought as his duty to promote the knowledge of the Bible and, consequently, he composed many Biblical texts like the Greek and Latin edition of the *New Testament*, the *Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum*, and some editions of Jerome’s works. About the matter of Protestant Reformation, Erasmus hoped it had been solved pacifically and he even tried to help to that end. However, he was in the middle of the conflict between Martin Luther and the Catholic Church, as he supported the Catholic faith but agreed with some of Luther’s propositions. In the end, he wrote against Luther in his treatise *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio* (1524). In conclusion, he was disappointed by Reformation and in 1521, he declared that his era was the worst since the beginning of Christianity.

APPENDIX 2: MARY TUDOR'S BIOGRAPHY⁵⁷

Mary Tudor was born on 18th February 1516 in Greenwich, London. While it was good news after Catherine of Aragon's miscarriages, she was a girl and she did not guarantee the stability of the throne. In any case, Henry VIII was hopeful that there would be more births. Still, the King's wish did not become true and Mary was considered the heir of the throne of England. For this reason, the princess's hand was the decisive piece of either an alliance with France, with the Empire, or even a way of achieving the peace with Scotland. In 1525, Mary was sent to the marches of Wales, the territory of the Principality of Wales. Nevertheless, she was called back to the Home Counties in 1528. In 1533, Henry would separate the Church of England from Rome, and Thomas Cranmer –recently appointed Archbishop of Canterbury– proclaimed him Supreme Head of the New Ecclesia Anglicana. With this new power, he could annul his marriage and officially marry Anne Boleyn.

In 1534, even if Pope Clement VII had declared that the matrimony of Henry and Catherine was 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 –Henry VII's and Anne's daughter– (Whitelock, 2009, p.79). After the passing of the Act, Catherine and Mary were informed and required to take an oath, but neither of them did. After the former's death (7th January 1536), Anne Boleyn was again pregnant, but she suffered a miscarriage of a boy. The king started to put his attention on Jane Seymour 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 19th May 1536. Henry and Jane Seymour were married (30th May 1536). As her life was in danger again, on 22nd June, Mary accepted the Act of Succession and her father as the Supreme Head.

From that moment until Henry VIII's death, Mary will be in the King's grace and will live in peace. 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 28th January 1547, Henry VIII died and in his will, the position of Mary as the heir of Edward (should he not have heirs of 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 be in tension again. Her brother Edward was proclaimed as King (Edward VI) on 31st January. The

⁵⁷ For the composition of this biography I have used Loades (1989) and Whitelock (2009).

young king had been educated in the Protestant faith. Hence, in 1549 the Act of Uniformity established this religion as the official one of England while forbidding the previous Catholic rites. However, Mary did not renounce to her Catholic faith. The circumstances rose to such a degree that the Imperial ambassador at the time, Van der Delft, feared for Mary's life and even planned for the princess's escape. However, in the last moment, Mary decided to remain. Shortly after, in 1552, Edward felt ill. He arranged his heir to be his cousin Lady Jane Grey, and her future descendancy. Edward VI died on 6th July 1553. While in London Jane was crowned, Mary proclaimed herself Queen. The conflict was avoided because Queen Jane's Privy Council deposed her and supported Mary's claim to the throne. On 1st October she was officially crowned in Westminster Abbey, being the first Queen regnant of England.

Two issues will mark her five years of reign. The first matter was the restoration of the Catholic religion in England. At the beginning of her rule, Mary restored the rites although, she was still the Supreme Head of the Church and she did not force the Papacy's authority on England. The major complainer of this situation was Cardinal Reginald Pole. Anyhow, Pole's wishes were finally met and on 30th November 1554, the Parliament's members restored Papal authority. Furthermore, this came along with the restoration of heresy laws against Protestants. The other issue was her marriage with Philip II of Spain, the son of Charles V, even if there was a general rejection in the Parliament. The English were afraid that Philip would actually rule England, so they established some conditions to prevent that. After the adversities, Philip and Mary got married on 25th July 1554 at Winchester. From their union, Mary suffered two false pregnancies due to her concern about giving an heir in order to avoid the succession of her sister Elizabeth.

In addition, the last year of her rule marked by bad harvests and epidemics. In this context, on 23rd April 1557 an English Protestant exiled attacked England with the help of a French ship. Thus, England declared war on France, which was already in conflict with Spain. However, the French troops occupied Calais, the last English territory in the continent, a blow to England's morale. Mary fell ill with influenza from which 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.

APPENDIX 3: KATHERINE PARR'S BIOGRAPHY⁵⁸

Katherine Parr was born in 1512 –the exact date is unknown– to Sir Thomas and Maud Parr, quite probably in Blackfriars. The Parrs were a prominent family in England and they were tightly linked to the Crown since King Edward IV. Katherine's father was part of the royal court and he was dubbed as a Knight of the Bath. Moreover, Maud Parr was one of the ladies of Catherine of Aragon and one of the few women with a permanent room at the court, while Katherine's sister Anne was the lady-in-waiting of several of Henry VIII's wives, including Katherine herself. Sir Thomas Parr died of the plague in November 1517 and Maud Parr did not marry again. It was Maud who tutelage her daughters, giving them sufficient instruction to provide them with advantageous matrimonies. However, even if Katherine's education was above the standard, it did not reach its peak until she lived in court. In 1528, being 16 years old, Katherine married Sir Edward Burroughs, who was older than her and died the following year. Then, Maud Parr arranged in 1533 her daughter's matrimony with John Neville, Lord Latimer, who died also in March of 1542. After these two childless and loveless matrimonies, Katherine Parr fell in love with Thomas Seymour and she hoped that she could marry him after a sensible mourning time for her last husband.

By the 16th February 1543, Katherine Parr entered in Princess Mary's household drawing the attention of Henry VIII. In this situation, even if she still loved Thomas Seymour, Henry VIII and Katherine Parr were married the 12th July 1543 and the latter was proclaimed Queen that same day. Indeed, Katherine had the opportunity to exercise her power as regent Queen when Henry VIII went to war in France in 1544. Nevertheless, in her time as Queen, she had also some difficulties, mainly related to religious issues. Parr's faith is a controversial issue as some scholars believe that she was an evangelical, meaning that she was somehow reformist but quite close to Catholic thought. On the contrary, other scholars consider she was Protestant. Be as it may, she was concerned on religious matters and the reformation of the Church. This can be seen in her compositions *Prayers or Meditations* (1545) and *The Lamentation of the Sinner* (154–) and also in the fact she was the patron of the translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* (1548). As a matter of fact, these religious ideas provoked the enmity of the more Catholic part of the court –including Stephen Gardiner and Henry Wriothesley–. In 1546, This section tried to convince the King to arrest her after several of her ladies were accused of being Protestant –which at Henry VIII's time, was considered heresy–. Despite this, Katherine was able to convince Henry VIII that she was not a heretic and she avoided being

⁵⁸ For the composition of this biography I have used Norton (2010), Loades (2009) and Arnold (1993)

arrested. As to Parr's relationship with her stepchildren, it was in general good as she was a friend of Mary Tudor. Moreover, she could even appoint Elizabeth's and Edward's tutors, all Protestants.

When Henry VIII died in 1547, Katherine finally married Thomas Seymour in May of that same year in secret, with the posterior disapproval of Mary Tudor and Edward VI. From that matrimony, quite unexpectedly, Katherine became pregnant for the first time. However, their happiness did not last long. Soon after their union, Seymour started to show his favour to Elizabeth, who lived in the Seymours' household and even they developed a close intimacy that caused Katherine sending her stepdaughter away from her household when she discovered it. In the end, Katherine Parr did not survive to the birth of her child and both Parr and the baby died on 7th September 1548.