

## Mary I, Mary of Guise and the Strong Hand of the Scots: Marian Policy in Ulster and Anglo-Scottish Diplomacy, 1553–1558

*Jonathan Woods*

After her triumphal entry into London as queen regnant in July 1553, Mary I received a letter from her cousin, the Queen of Scots, then residing in France. The Scottish sovereign expressed her desire: “qu’il sera si dieu plaist perpetuelle memoire de deux Roynes auoir esté...en ceste Isle la’ioinctes d’inuiolee amitie (that, if God pleases, there will be a perpetual memory of two Queens in this Isle...having been joined in everlasting friendship).”<sup>1</sup> Despite these sentiments, Anglo-Scottish amity in the 1550s was precarious. In 1555, the north of Ireland was the epicenter of conflict. Increasing migration of Scots from the Western Isles and the expansion of military networks from Scotland into Ireland pitted personal allegiances against political identity, threatening the supremacy claimed by Mary I in Ulster. In February of 1555/6, the Tudor administration complained that Scots “with force and strong hand” were murdering and pillaging to the ruin of the queen’s “loving subjects.”<sup>2</sup> This chapter explores the development of and context surrounding anti-Scottish language in the letters of Mary I and her Irish governors.

---

J. Woods (✉)  
Fordham University, New York, USA

Scholarly interpretations of Mary I as a strong and effective monarch have grown more common since the 1980s. David Loades, Anna Whitelock, and others have devoted much work to contesting the perception that the mid-Tudor period in general, and Mary I's reign in particular, was a time of crisis and instability.<sup>3</sup> More recently, Jennifer Loach, Judith Richards, and Eamon Duffy have argued that the Marian regime, including its religious policy, was founded on widespread consensus.<sup>4</sup> Much interest in Mary I, England's first sovereign queen, centers on the extent to which she exercised real power. The particular challenge Mary faced was justifying her rule in a society that took for granted that a woman, while the spiritual equal of any man, had a duty to submit to her husband.<sup>5</sup> Mary's marriage to Philip Hapsburg, future king of Spain and son of the Holy Roman Emperor, further occasioned fears that England was to become constitutionally subordinate to Spain through the conjugal relationship. Thus, the question of Mary's authority is closely related to that of the emergence of ethnocentric national identity in England. Recent scholars have argued that, contrary to the crown's push to create a monolithic polity, early modern Britain was a multicultural society.<sup>6</sup> In Ireland, particularly in Ulster, there is little doubt that diversity was a fact of life. The kingdom was shared by Old English, Gaelic Irish, and Scottish populations, well before the New English began to settle in large numbers. Revisions of the mid-Tudor period in Ireland have focused on the debate over the origins of Elizabeth's Irish policy, which sought pacification through military force. Steven Ellis and Ciaran Brady characterized it as the natural consequence of Ireland's status as a kingdom, which necessitated that the Tudors create a monopoly over secular power, while Brendan Bradshaw argued that increased violence stemmed from a deliberate rejection of Mary's liberal reform by the administration of Thomas Radcliffe, baron Fitzwalter and earl of Sussex (from February 1596/7), and lord deputy from 1556 (for ease, called Sussex in this chapter).<sup>7</sup> More recently, attention has centered on the perspective of the Gaelic world, with a number of scholars adopting a Borderlands paradigm to understand why Irish lords vacillated between support for and resistance to the Tudor regime in the sixteenth century.<sup>8</sup> In what follows, this essay considers three phases of Marian policy toward the Scots in Ulster, integration, diplomacy, and expulsion. It argues that though her methodology changed, Mary I's goals in Ireland remained consistent throughout her reign. Politically, she meant to establish a monopoly on secular power and Mary's toleration of the Scots had always been conditional to their obedience. Thus, Sussex's campaign to expel the Ulster Scots did not represent a watershed change in Tudor policy in Ireland, but was the consequence of Mary's claim of full sovereignty.

## THE FAMILIES OF ULSTER AND EARLY MARIAN POLICY TOWARD THE SCOTS IN ULSTER

Mary's goals for Ireland were similar to those for England. Most important was the restoration of the Mass and other sacraments. Secondly, she looked to employ uniform justice and thus "reduce the people to obedience and civile ordre" and bring them to "good civilitie."<sup>9</sup> Mary's sovereignty over Ireland was articulated in terms similar to the kingship established by her father, albeit she did not claim supremacy over the Church, and restored the pope's authority. Nonetheless, all inhabitants were to be incorporated into the Tudor polity by their loyalty to the queen. Civility was defined by obedience to Mary's rule of law. Though she claimed sovereignty, the queen did not yet wield effective power throughout Ireland. In 1553, there was a garrison of three hundred horsemen and two hundred footmen in Ireland, which was hardly enough to establish obedience through force. Furthermore, Mary's reappointment of the moderate Anthony St Leger as lord deputy that year indicated that she meant to continue the process of incorporation through conciliation and consent begun by the practice of surrender and re-grant.<sup>10</sup> The implementation of this policy required the cooperation of the Gaelic nobility.

The entangled fortunes of four families: the O'Donnells of Tyrconnel, the O'Neills of Tyrone, the MacDonalds of Dunyvaig and the Glens, and the Campbells of Argyll dominated the history of Ulster in the mid-sixteenth century. These families occupied lands that straddled the constitutional divide between Scotland and Ireland but which shared a common language, customs, and sense of identity.<sup>11</sup> The O'Donnells and O'Neills were native Irish, but the presence of the Scottish clan Donald in the north of Ireland had its roots in the exchange of military personnel among the Scots and Irish. Scottish migration to Ulster began in earnest in the late fourteenth century when Eoin Mór MacDonald, brother of the lord of the Isles, wed Margaret Brisset of Antrim.<sup>12</sup> The dissolution of the lordship of the Isles in 1493 and the rise of the Campbells of Argyll as the dominant family in the west of Scotland drastically altered the fortunes of the MacDonalds, allowing for the rise of a subordinate branch of the family and shifting their center of gravity toward Ireland.<sup>13</sup> In 1532, Alexander MacDonald of Dunyvaig and the Glens, in the service of the Scottish crown, invaded Ulster with seven thousand men. MacDonald joined his cousins in Antrim, absorbed the rest of the Brisset's land, and began to advance

on the O'Neills of Clandeboyne and the MacQuillans of the Route. Both families were septs, or dependent kindreds, of the O'Neills of Tyrone, and MacDonald expansion was a threat to O'Neill power in Ulster. By the mid-Tudor period, the O'Donnells, benefiting from three generations of strong lords, had also wrested supremacy in Ulster away from the O'Neills in northern Connacht.

The intricacy of "clan" politics was only exacerbated in the sixteenth century by the recurrence of civil war within the O'Donnell and O'Neill lordships.<sup>14</sup> Manus O'Donnell, for instance, challenged the authority of his father after successfully defending the family's territory against the O'Neills in 1510–1511. In 1547, Manus' son, Calvagh, first defied him, seeking to become lord of Tyrconnell. The rebellion went on intermittently until 1555, when it succeeded thanks to the assistance of the fourth earl of Argyll, Archibald Campbell.<sup>15</sup> Internecine conflict broke out among the O'Neills when the lord of the kindred and first earl of Tyrone, Conn O'Neill, was imprisoned by James Croft, lord deputy, in 1552. Though Croft sought to supplant Conn with his eldest son, Matthew, Baron of Dungannon, Shane O'Neill was able to exploit the chaos and establish military dominance over his brother. While Tudor intervention certainly played a role in internal clan wars, some have argued that the transition from a conciliar lordship, based on legal legitimacy, to coercive lordship, based on the right of conquest, was, in part, begun by the MacDonalds. Gallowglass, men of war often descended of Scottish settlers in Ireland, and seasonal kern, Scottish mercenaries from the Isles, at least increased the presence of military men in Ulster.<sup>16</sup> The MacDonald use of stone keeps to protect land acquisitions changed the landscape of Ireland, though there is disagreement over whether these fortresses were a signal of increasing violence or an indication of stability.<sup>17</sup> In any case, by the mid-sixteenth century, Irish lordship had become more militarized and perhaps more effective at controlling local populations, making it difficult for the English governors to establish Tudor sovereignty.

Recognizing the long history of the MacDonald presence in Ulster, Mary I's administration initially adopted a policy of toleration for the Scots living in Ireland, conditional to the population's submission of Tudor authority: "we will that all scottyshe men, dwelling in the North *partes* of Irland that haue long contynued & will acknowledge their duties & due obedience vnto vs & *our* successors and be sworne to contynue the same & gouerne them selves thereafter, shalbe suffred to remayne."<sup>18</sup> Thus, the queen recognized that there were entrenched, long-established

Scottish communities in Ulster whose methods of self-governance could provide stability to the territory. The English government expected the Scots in Ireland to become good subjects, defined by their professed and practiced allegiance to the Tudor monarch. They were also expected to facilitate a policy of gradual Anglicization of Gaelic law and land use by contributing to the pacification of internecine clan conflict. However, it is crucial to note that toleration was contingent on obedience to the queen. In light of the potential utility of the Scottish population, Mary also authorized the use of gallowglass, many of whom were of Scottish descent, in the Tudor army in Ireland. Such men were to serve alongside English and Irish soldiers, appointed “amonges the rest continually in our service...for increase of our strength.”<sup>19</sup> Private armies would be tolerated so long as they abandoned the practices of Irish lordship: “others that be of the Cuntrey may remayne strong of them selves, eschuyng blak rentes and Coyne and lyveries asmoche as maye be, charging vs with no more then shalbe necessary.”<sup>20</sup> Black rent and coign and livery, according to Tudor knowledge of Irish custom, were the means by which Gaelic lords extracted economic and military tribute from the family groups they governed. The abandonment of these practices would lead, presumably, to the disintegration of Gaelic lordship, which was to be replaced with Tudor vassalage and county government. Thus, Mary initially sought to use both the Scottish population and private armies to reinforce her authority.

Within 2 years, the Tudor queen’s attitude toward the Scots in Ulster had shifted. Policy in 1555 aimed at gradually eliminating the Scottish population from Ireland: “Touching the north of the Realme, The Scottes to be banished thense as the tyme and oportunitie may thereunto best shæruice and in the meane to be vsed *with* discrecion.”<sup>21</sup> The policy seemed to have taken the Dublin administration by surprise. St Leger looked to delay the expulsion of Scots by saying they could still be used to the regime’s advantage. He also had to defend his appointment of a Scottish man, Coll McOneboye, as the captain of a band of horsemen in December 1555.<sup>22</sup> Considering the deputy was authorized to utilize Scots to the advantage of Tudor aims when possible, it is likely that the objection to McOneboye arose out of his appointment as an officer. It is the first indication that Ulster Scots were deemed to be intrinsically unfit for office in the Tudor state by the Marian regime on the basis of their ethnic origin. St Leger defended his decision by downplaying the extent to which McOneboye ought to be considered Scottish: “tho he be named a Scot, yeat speketh he good englishe and was borne in Irland

and his auncestors many yeres.”<sup>23</sup> He was defined as Scottish, but this was misleading, St Leger argued, and did not adequately represent his English and Irish credentials. St Leger suggested that use of the English language and habitation in Ireland made the man fit for office; thus, he implied that a degree of assimilation to Irish society under Tudor rule was required before men of Gaelic Scottish origin should have been given positions in the government.

In spite of St Leger’s defense of McOneboye, perceptions of Scots grew more negative and more categorical in the ensuing months. In February 1555/6, Mary I cited a long list of Scottish crimes in Ulster and ordered her Ambassador in Scotland, Thomas Challoner, to demand the intervention of Mary of Guise, mother of Mary, Queen of Scots and regent of Scotland. Scots in Ulster had burned over sixty square miles of land, kidnapped Manus O’Donnell, the lord of Tyrconnell, and continued to “slaye a great nombre of...loving subiects” and commit various “spoyles, robberies and myrders...within *our* realm of Ireland.”<sup>24</sup> Mary’s frustration with the situation in Ulster occasioned a transition in policy and tone to the Scots. Initially, she was open to including them as subjects, so long as they accepted her rule obediently; however, Scottish intervention in Gaelic civil wars necessitated that the queen adopt a policy aimed at their eventual exclusion. It was a tone and attitude that would harden under Sussex, Mary’s next lord deputy. However, before embracing Sussex’s scheme for the immediate expulsion of the Scots, Mary I attempted to resolve the situation through diplomacy.

### MARY OF GUISE, THE EARL OF ARGYLL AND ANGLO-SCOTTISH DIPLOMACY

The source of Mary’s frustration was the fourth earl of Argyll’s intervention in the O’Donnell rebellion on behalf of Calvagh O’Donnell. Argyll accepted Calvagh into his protection via a bond of manrent, or oath of service, on July 13, 1555. Whereas Scottish bonds of manrent, with few exceptions, state explicitly that the Scottish crown superseded the powers of any lord, Calvagh’s oath did not recognize either Stuart or Tudor royal authority.<sup>25</sup> The bond was silent as to either Argyll’s or Calvagh’s relationships to monarchy, though it did acknowledge Calvagh as “native l[ord]” of Tyrconnell.<sup>26</sup> Argyll, as a maintainer of Calvagh, sought to assume lordship over the O’Donnells. Rather than a recognition

of the constitutional distinction between Scotland and Ireland, there was an acknowledgment of Calvagh's native lordship and Argyll's overlordship. The alliance was not only a threat to the peace of Ulster but also challenged Mary's sovereignty. Argyll's continued support was contingent on the successful suppression of Manus O'Donnell, a task for which Argyll furnished Calvagh with men and artillery.<sup>27</sup> The Tudor rebel returned to Ireland with a canon named Gunna-Cam, the crooked gun.<sup>28</sup> Argyll had also lent Highland fighters from the MacCalin kindred to Calvagh, who led them in his personal retinue.<sup>29</sup> The earl sent two more companies to assist Calvagh. One was captained by his heir, Archibald Campbell, the lord of Lorne, and the other by James McDonald of Dunyvaig and the Glens.<sup>30</sup> A letter to Calvagh O'Donnell confirmed James MacDonald's interest in the rebellion in Ulster as early as April 1555.<sup>31</sup>

Mary I instructed Thomas Challoner to remind Mary of Guise that the Stuart government was bound by the treaty of Norham to punish any of its subjects who aided rebels against Tudor authority.<sup>32</sup> Mary I said: "the rebell of the one prince should nether be receaved not any wayes ayded by the Prince or any of their subiects."<sup>33</sup> For Argyll to aid Calvagh was for the Scottish noble to ally himself not only with an enemy of the Tudor state, but also with a traitor, a circumstance that Guise, Mary I argued, was bound to rectify. To preserve amity, Mary I presumed Guise's ignorance of Argyll's intervention in the rebellion, though she demanded that Guise act quickly to reprimand Argyll: "wee have thought meete to gyve *our* sayd good sister knowledge of [Argyll and Calvagh's bond], hopynge shee will gyve order for the speedie remeadie of the matter/accordeyne to *our* expectation."<sup>34</sup> The English and Irish queen made it clear that she desired peace but could not tolerate Argyll's actions. While there is no evidence that Mary of Guise encouraged Argyll to continue his activity in Ulster, neither is there any indication that she ordered him to stop. The earl's letters to Guise from the period did, on the contrary, reveal collaboration between the regent and Argyll. In August 1554, the earl was engaged in a campaign to suppress gangs of bandits in the isles of the Western Highlands.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, despite the fact that Guise's administration said that the "nator of the pepell" and their "effectiione" (kinship ties) caused the "cowmon weill" to "perreche" through vendetta, and a parliamentary act outlawed the practice of swearing manrent in 1554, the regent made no attempts to limit or reform the practice of forming private armies.<sup>36</sup> Rather, she used personal military structures to her political advantage.

Guise exercised regal authority from 1554 onward.<sup>37</sup> As regent for an absentee monarch, she had some notable successes, particularly her negotiation of the crown matrimonial for her son-in-law, Francis Valois, who became king of Scotland with Mary Stuart after their marriage. However, she was met with opposition on more occasions than not. For instance, when she attempted to levy a “*perpetuall Tax*” in 1556, the nobility would not permit her to make an inventory of their property.<sup>38</sup> During the Anglo-French war of 1557–1558, Guise made every attempt to abide by the norms of Scottish constitutional procedure, summoning a convention of the estates in late February to authorize national mobilization. The parliament agreed to muster for defensive purposes, but refused to attack the English border.<sup>39</sup> She did command a garrison of Valois professional troops in Scotland, which numbered as high as twelve hundred between 1557 and 1559.<sup>40</sup> This force, however, was not strong enough to crush the rebellion against Guise’s authority that broke out among Protestants in the summer of 1559. In October of that year, she was deposed as regent. In the decentralized system of Scottish monarchy, Guise had to rely on the participation of her great nobles, among whom was the earl of Argyll, lieutenant of the Isles, to enforce royal authority.<sup>41</sup> Argyll, who could raise an army of five thousand men within a matter of weeks, was the most powerful of her deputies.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, Guise had alienated the only other man in the kingdom who could challenge Argyll by sheer manpower. This was the earl of Huntly, who retained the title of chancellor, even though Guise had removed the Great Seal from his possession.

Despite not having a substantial standing garrison, Guise did theoretically have her own private army. Between 1540 and 1560, Guise entered into seventeen contracts of manrent or maintenance with eighteen men.<sup>43</sup> This is a remarkably high survival rate for such bonds, suggesting that the dowager formed many more such agreements. Indeed, considering the eventual repudiation of Guise’s authority in 1559 by the lords of the congregation, it is surprising that any of her bonds survive. The men bound to Guise were all of high status and included eight nobles, nine members of the gentry, and one burgess. Eight of the bonds were made in 1548–1549, at the height of the Somerset invasions, when Guise championed and helped organize French intervention in Scotland. The dowager continued to use manrent as a means of validating her power after the Rough Wooing, the Anglo-Scottish wars of 1544–1551, ended and even once she became regent.

Guise’s status as mother of the sovereign and queen dowager undoubtedly accounts for the abnormality of a woman accepting



a large number of men into her military service. Very few women took or accepted oaths of service in the period, and those that did were accompanied by their husbands. In total, nine women besides Guise or Mary, Queen of Scots, appear in bonds of manrent sworn between 1512 and 1568.<sup>44</sup> In most respects, Guise's oaths were typical of other Scottish bonds of manrent and maintenance. For instance, William Sinclair of Roslin promised "all the days of his life to gang and ryde" in the dowager's service in 1546.<sup>45</sup> Bonds of manrent theoretically placed entire private armies at the disposal of a lord. Thus, when Robert, the lord Boyd, and his heir swore their "gude trew and thankfull *service*," they did so for themselves and for "thair kyn freinds assisteris pairttakaris and *servandis*."<sup>46</sup> Personal obligation to Guise was passed through the proxy of men like Boyd to his social dependents. In theory, the enlargement of Boyd's network of manrent was also a benefit to Guise as an overlord. Several of Guise's bondsmen swore fealty in exchange for pensions and for land. This was an abnormality as most bonds of manrent from the sixteenth century did not involve land exchange or tenure. Guise, however, seems to have used economic incentives as a way of recruiting adherents. For instance, William Sinclair of Roslin was to receive an annual pension of 300 Scottish marks by means of certain rents assigned to him.<sup>47</sup> The earl of Bothwell's pledge was also precipitated by the distribution of a pension of £1000 annually for as long as Guise or Bothwell lived. Likewise, Hector McClane of Duart bound himself with his "*airis* and assignais In manrent and sheruice" to Guise because she had ceded him "*hir landis...occupiit be me & myne in the Iles*."<sup>48</sup> The creation of a network of personal supporters was a testament to Guise's charisma but it did not necessarily translate into political power. Though men promised their allegiance, Guise had no means to enforce such oaths. Around half of those bound to her, or their heirs, forfeited their loyalty during the reformation rebellion of 1559–1560. Only one bondsman, Bothwell, actually fought for her. The dowager's authority was based on the voluntary support of elite landowners, and her regime fell once they withdrew it. It was for this reason that Mary I's demands in 1555 were necessarily ignored.

## ANTI-SCOTTISH POLICY UNDER SUSSEX

Sussex became lord deputy in 1556 and with him came a new, more aggressive Tudor policy for the pacification of Ireland. Almost immediately after coming to Dublin, he invaded Ulster and attacked the MacDonalds, spending a month and a half slaughtering Scottish gallowglass in minor skirmishes. By the winter of 1556/7, his efforts at stabilizing Ulster were being frustrated by the MacDonalds. Con Oge O'Neill had broken free from Knockfergus Castle with the aid of James MacDonald of Dunyvaig and the Glens, and the Scots of Antrim. They were able to capture a castle and establish a foothold in Antrim.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, the development of an alliance between the MacDonalds and Shane O'Neill greatly bolstered opposition to Sussex. The lord deputy simultaneously adopted a harsher policy against the Gaelic lords in western Leinster, where he hoped to begin implementing a plantation strategy in Offaly and Laois. While the MacDonalds were not a direct threat to settlement in the king's and the queen's counties, Sussex argued that they were the main obstacle to a successful implementation of the policy. He claimed that the instability of Ulster was a financial and military burden, which prevented him from suppressing the Leinster clans and focusing on the settlement of Englishmen in Offaly and Laois. If Ulster was lost, Sussex warned, all of Ireland would rebel, and Ulster could not be pacified unless the MacDonalds were expelled. In order to accomplish this goal, he proposed a unification of the Gaelic Irish, Old English, and New English on the basis of anti-Scottish rhetoric.

His priority immediately shifted to preventing any further migration from Scotland to Ulster since: "yt wolbe more hard to expell them... then to keape them owte before they enter."<sup>50</sup> To keep the Scots out, Sussex needed to take English troops from the Pale, Offaly, and Laois and use them to mount a full-scale invasion of Ulster. He noted that he would need £1000 to pay the soldiers, as those stationed in garrisons in Leinster would require a wage increase before they could be sent into danger. Sussex planned "with all the force of the Countrey" to march north and force the Gaelic Irish lords there to "Ioyne toguither against the Scottes."<sup>51</sup> The expulsion of the Scots and the unification of the Irish kindreds were part of the same policy for Sussex, who saw war upon the MacDonalds as an effective tool for unifying the Gaelic Irish under Tudor authority. He argued that a unification of kinship networks would contribute to the stability of Ulster and a monopoly of Tudor justice. He stated that control of Belfast and other strongholds on the

border of Antrim and Down, including Knockfergus, would allow the pursuit of a defensive strategy, which forced the MacDonalds to attack his castles. In occupying the fortresses surrounding the Belfast Lough, the lord deputy also hoped to encourage anti-Scottish sentiment among the Gaelic Irish residents of the lands surrounding the Lough. They were to use their own weapons in what Sussex envisioned as a defense of their land from Scottish invaders.

Sussex warned that the crown's policy in Ireland had been unclear, and he called for a more decisive military action to subdue Ulster. He contended that "withowte ordering of that parte of the realme (the north) the rest wyll alwayes be waveryng."<sup>52</sup> He said that in order to subdue the north, all of the English queen's garrisons in Ireland would have to be brought to Ulster, which would leave the rest of the English settlements in Ireland vulnerable to attack from recalcitrant Gaelic lords. To ensure pacification, three hundred soldiers would have to be introduced for the space of a year. Sensitive to the crown's frustration with the cost of pacifying Ireland, Sussex emphasized that this number of soldiers would be temporary and aimed narrowly at the expelling of the Scots, which he believed would allow the English soldiers to fully pacify the north. Sussex guaranteed Mary I that within 2 years, after the Scots were defeated, the same garrisons could be maintained throughout Ireland at a reduced wage. After the expulsion of the Scots was complete, Sussex said that only six hundred men would have to be paid a soldier's wage, while there would be an additional twelve hundred troops, who could man garrisons at a lower wage. Sussex assured the queen that they would have help from mercenary Gaelic soldiers, the gallowglass, who, he argued, had been supplanted by the Scottish redshanks. Apparently, he failed to recognize that many were themselves descended of Scottish origins.

Sussex sought to cultivate hostility for a foreign element in Ulster, while planting new settlers in Offaly and Laois. He argued that northern men and Welsh men were accustomed to farming in harsh climes and to defending their property in areas where royal government was weak. The frontier men of the northern borders of England and Wales would, Sussex argued, be suited to life in Leinster. The pacification of these lands by the English and Welsh frontier men would facilitate trade routes between inland villages and port towns, where the Tudor government could charge tariffs on the exports of Irish hide and tallow. Sussex was concerned primarily with utilizing Ireland's resources for the benefit of the Tudor state, describing eagerly Ireland's deposits of iron ore, timber, peat, gypsum, marble, jasper,

and coal. This was a plan for settlement aimed at transforming the land for the best use of the Tudor state and the commonwealth. It was to be accomplished by Tudor frontier men, who were English. He posited this as the most important quality of the future settlers, noting that as long as “they be Inglyshe” it did not matter “of what *contrey* they be.”<sup>53</sup> While Sussex recognized the distinctions and advantages of men from the borders and from Wales, he affirmed their status as true Englishmen, who would come to Ireland and establish a civilization built on the Tudor state’s supremacy. These men were not invaders, he argued, for they were loyal subjects, albeit from another nation under Mary’s authority. This contrasts with Sussex’s description of the Scottish MacDonalds, whom he condemns as an “enemy” and a foreign invasion force, though they had deep roots in Ulster.<sup>54</sup>

Sussex also advised Mary I to write to her most powerful nobles in Ireland to rally them to her cause of expelling the Scots. The earls of Kildare, Ormond, and Desmond were descendants of the Norman invaders of the twelfth century, and were members of Ireland’s Old English landed elite. The earls of Clanrickard and Tyrone were, by contrast, Gaelic lords incorporated under the Tudor system through surrender and re-grant. Their political distinctions as vassals of the English queen were to trump their ethnic distinctions. Sussex envisioned a multiethnic Irish nobility united by loyalty to the Tudor queen, arguing that Mary ought to command “all...the nobelles of the realme” and the “hole parliament” to band together for the expelling of the Scots; this unity he said will “gyve grete terror to the Scottes.”<sup>55</sup> Immediately after informing Mary I about the benefits of uniting the Irish lords against the MacDonalds, Sussex proceeded to explain that the Gaelic Irish lords could not be trusted without “grete force of mere Inglyshe soldyars.”<sup>56</sup> The lord deputy said that if her majesty thought she could trust her Gaelic Irish nobles then she had been deceived, and he now increased his financial request to £5000. He again reiterated that if his military requests were executed, the crown could begin its policy of plantation on its own timeline, and that the subsequent facilitation of trade between ports and inland towns would raise tariff revenues for the crown. In other words, a major military investment in Ireland would yield great economic benefit to the Tudor crown in the long run. He also emphasized that beyond the economic benefits, the queen “shalbe knowen and fered as a soverayne” by all her subjects in Ireland and the people “that be savage shall with tyme be browght to more cyvylyte.”<sup>57</sup> The lord deputy promised that his goal was only the “advancement

of her [the queen's] honer and royall power the good gouernment of the realme the reducyng of the pepell to obedeience" and went on to say that "The grete...shall no more be as prynces but shall gladly obbey as subiectes."<sup>58</sup> In other words, the expulsion of the Scots was the first step in the full pacification of Ireland and the final incorporation of the Irish lords into the Tudor state.

Mary I replied to Sussex's advice by penning a letter to the Irish nobility, asking them to cooperate with him and to follow royal policy. She emphasized the need for the nobility to assist "in the maintenance of iustice peax and tranquillite...repressing of suche as shall by any meane attempte to let or breake the same whether by...private misdemeanor and disordre or otherwyse by common assemblie tumulte, or invasion."<sup>59</sup> She also asked for a full participation within the justice system of the Tudor monarchy, from the keeping of her laws to the execution of punishment for those who broke them. Mary I asked her Irish nobles to envision themselves as part of the Tudor polity. She did not mention the Scots by name, nor did she define any specific military policy. Rather, she left this up to Sussex. The English queen told Sussex that she willed him to continue his policies as he saw fit, and to notify the Irish Parliament of her more specific directives at his "discretions."<sup>60</sup> She told Sussex that she trusted his plan better than any she could devise from London. In 1557, the queen sent Sussex the requested £5000. The goal, however, was very clear: The expelling of "the Scottes and other rebelles, who nowe are the troblers of peace and hynderers of good government and pollicie."<sup>61</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Ultimately, Sussex's assaults on the MacDonalds were inconclusive. James MacDonald, and his successor, Sorely Boy MacDonald, continued to interfere in Ulster politics until the 1570s, seeking marriage alliances with the O'Neills of Tyrone, harrying English troops in Ulster, and looking always to establish control over Antrim. While Argyll's men had left Ireland in 1556, the connections between the Campbells and the O'Donnells only grew stronger. The fourth earl of Argyll died in 1558 and his widow, Katherine MacLean, wed Calvagh O'Donnell shortly before both were kidnapped by Shane O'Neill. Through two critical marriages, the MacDonalds regained lost territory in both Kintyre and Antrim and ultimately created the basis for sustained cooperative opposition to Tudor government in Ireland.<sup>62</sup> In 1569, the fifth earl of Argyll arranged a double marriage

uniting Agnes Campbell, widow of James MacDonald of Dunyvaig and the Glens and Argyll's aunt, with Turloch O'Neill, heir of Shane O'Neill, and Fionla MacDonald, daughter of Agnes, with Hugh Manus O'Donnell. The cooperation of the MacDonalds, O'Neills, and O'Donnells ensured that resistance to Tudor control of Ulster would be a major problem for Elizabeth I.<sup>63</sup> Ultimately, the permanent presence of the MacDonalds in Ireland was confirmed by the creation of the earldom of Antrim.

Mary I's policy thus failed to establish the sovereignty she claimed and to create a unified identity around her authority. Gaelic resistance continued and eventually led to the usurpation of Gaelic lands by New English settlers. While Mary's policy failed, it is not because of a sudden shift in strategy under Sussex. It is clear that her attitude toward the Scots hardened as a result of Campbell and MacDonald intervention in Ulster and that a strategy of strict expulsion proceeded under Sussex, but the queen implied this would be a consequence of Scottish disobedience as early as 1553. The queen was flexible and pragmatic enough to embrace first integration of the Scots, secondly diplomacy, and thirdly an anti-Scottish policy as the means to achieve her aim, the unification of the peoples of Ireland under her rule. Mary sought to wield full sovereignty, as any king would have, but failed to establish it in Ireland because a monopoly of political power was inconsistent with the decentralized structures of the Gaelic world.

## NOTES

1. The National Archives (TNA) SP 51/1, f. 14r, Mary, Queen of Scots to Mary I, 1553.
2. TNA SP 51/1, f. 27r, Instructions to Thomas Challoner, February, 1555/6.
3. David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics Government and Religion, 1553–1558* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1979); Loades, *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545–1565* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1992). Robert Tittler and Jennifer Loach, eds., *The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540–1560* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980). Biographical treatments have also become increasingly sensitive: David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Eric Ives, *Lady Jane Grey: A Tudor Mystery* (Chichester: Blackwell, 2009); Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009).
4. Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1986); Judith Richards, *Mary Tudor* (New

- York: Routledge, 2008); Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). The revision of the English reformation impacted views on Mary's reign. See Rex Pogson, "Reginald Pole and the Priorities of Government in Mary Tudor's Church," *Historical Journal*, vol. 18, no. 1 (Mar., 1975): 3–20; Susan Brigdan, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Eamon Duffy, *Stripping the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Thomas Mayer *Reginald Pole: Prince and Prophet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). For an alternative view of religion in Mary's reign, see Anna Whitelock and Diarmaid MacCulloch, "Princess Mary's Household and the Succession Crisis, July 1553," *Historical Journal*, vol. 50, no. 2, (2007): 265–287.
5. Constance Jordan, "Women's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 3 (Autumn 1987): 421–451, esp. 427–428; David Loades, "Phillip II and the government of England," *Law and Government Under the Tudors. Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton*, eds. Claire Cross, David Loades and John J. Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 177–194; Amanda Shephard, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth Century England* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1994); Judith Richards, "'To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule': Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 101–121; Judith Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene': Gendering Tudor Monarchy," *The Historical Journal*, vol. 40, no. 4 (Dec., 1997): 895–924. Alexander Samson, "Changing Places: The Marriage and Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria, and Mary Tudor, July–August 1554," *Sixteenth-Century Journal*, vol. 36, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 61–84.
  6. Joseph P. Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity and Change in Early Modern London* (Stamford: Stamford University Press, 1997); Scott Oldenburg, "Toward a Multi-Cultural Mid-Tudor England: The Queen's Royal Entry Circa 1553, 'The Interlude of Wealth and Health,' and the Question of Strangers in the Reign of Mary I," *ELH*, vol. 76, no. 1 (Spring 2009): 99–129.
  7. See Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland, a Pattern Established, 1565–76* (Hassocks: Harvest, 1976). Brendan Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), esp. 267–275. Steven Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470–1603* (London: Longman, 1985). Ciaran Brady, *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536–1588* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).



8. Steven Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the British State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Jane Dawson, *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary, Queen of Scots: The Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Simon Kingston, *Ulster and the Isles in the Fifteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004); Christopher Maginn, "Gaelic Ireland's English Frontiers in the late Middle Ages," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*, vol. 110C (2010): 173–190; Martin MacGregor, "The Campbells: lordship, literature and liminality," *Textual Cultures: Texts, Contexts, Interpretation* 7(1), (2012): 121–157.
9. TNA SP 62/1, f. 5v. Instructions for Ireland, 1553.
10. Bradshaw, *Irish Constitutional Revolution*, 259–260.
11. Maginn, "Gaelic Ireland's English Frontiers," 173–190.
12. Kingston, *Ulster and the Isles*, 15–17. Gerard Hays-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland, 1565–1603* (Dublin: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1937), 13.
13. The rise of the Campbells was achieved by a combination of royal favor and effective lordship. Alison Cathcart, "A Spent Force? The Clan Donald in the Aftermath of 1493," in *The Lordship of the Isles*, ed. Richard D. Oram (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 254–70, at 255–258. See also Alexander Grant, "Scotland's Celtic Fringe in the Late Middle Ages: the MacDonalds Lords of the Isles and the Kingdom of Scotland," in *The British Isles, 1100–1500: Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections*, ed. Robert Rees Davies (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988), 118–141, esp. 133–134.
14. For a discussion of Irish clans, see Kenneth Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, LTD, 1972), 8.
15. Brendan Bradshaw, "'Manus the Magnificent': O'Donnell as a Renaissance Prince," in *Studies in Irish History Presented to R. Dudley Edwards*, ed. Art Cosgrove and Donald McCartney (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 1979), 15–37, at 29–36.
16. Kenneth Nicholls, "Scottish Mercenary Kindreds in Ireland 1250–1600," in *The World of the Gallowglass: Kings, Warlords, and Warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200–1600*, ed. Sean Duffy (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), 86–105, esp. 86–88.
17. Kingston, *Ulster and the Isles*, 200. T.E. MacNeil, "Organizing a Lordship: the Castle of the MacDonalds of Dunivaig and the Glens," in *The Lordship of the Isles*, ed. R.D. Oram (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 211–226, at 225.
18. TNA SP 62/1, 6v-7r, Instructions for Ireland, October, 1553.
19. TNA SP 62/1, 4v, Instructions for Ireland, October, 1553.



20. TNA SP 62/1, 4v, Instructions for Ireland, October, 1553.
21. TNA SP 62/1, f. 28r, Answers of Sir Anthony St Leger to Objections Surmised against him, December 18, 1555.
22. Accusations of bribery and mismanagement of the Irish treasury had haunted St Leger throughout his long career in Ireland. See Alan Bryson, "St Leger, Sir Anthony (1496–1559)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online ed., ed. David Cannadine, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24512> (accessed June 23, 2017).
23. TNA SP 62/1, f. 23v, Answers of Sir Anthony St Leger to Objections Surmised against him, December 18, 1555.
24. TNA SP 51/1, f. 27r, Instructions to Thomas Challoner, February, 1555/6.
25. The only other example can be found among Argyll's bonds and occurred in the summer of 1560, just after the royal administration of Guise had been defeated by the Duke of Norfolk's English army, acting on behalf of the lords of the congregation. See Inveraray Castle (INV) 1083, Bond of Adam Boyd of Pinkill, July 29, 1560.
26. INV 1073, Bond of Calvagh O'Donnell, July 13, 1555.
27. INV 1073, Bond of Calvagh O'Donnell, July 13, 1555; Jenny Wormald, *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442–1603* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985), 402–412.
28. John O'Donovan, ed. and trans., *Annala rioghachta Eireann/Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters (AFM)*, 7 vols. (1848–51); 2nd edn (1856), v. 5.1555.
29. The MacCalin family can be linked to Argyll through bonds of manrent. INV 1080, Bond of Alexander Cam McAllen VcRore, August 8, 1519. The individual in this bond is named as chief of Clan Ranald, not Clan MacCalin.
30. The MacDonalds controlled territory in Scotland and Ireland and were important, though not always reliable, deputies to the fourth and fifth earls of Argyll. For instance, INV 1074, Bond of Archibald McConaill of Dunnellaig and the Glens, May 27, 1566.
31. TNA SP 62/1, f. 19r, Agents of James MacDonald to Calvagh O'Donnell, April 24, 1555.
32. April 18, 1550, Acceptation by Mary Queen of Scots in *Calendar of State Paper Related to Mary, Queen of Scots*, ed. Joseph Bain, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Register House, 1894), 182.
33. TNA SP 51/1, f. 27v, Instructions to Thomas Challoner, February, 1555/6.
34. TNA SP 51/1, f. 27v, Instructions to Thomas Challoner, February, 1555/6.

35. Argyll to the Regent, August 12, 1554, in *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*, ed. Annie Cameron (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society, 1927), 388.
36. Notes of Advice for Punishment of Crime, in *Scott Corr of Mary of Lorraine*, 380. Concerning leagues and bonds, A1555/6/18, in *Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. Keith M. Brown, Gillian H. MacIntosh, Alastair J. Mann, and Roland J. Tanner, (<http://www.rps.ac.uk/>) accessed October 28, 1016. Under the governorship of the Duke of Chatelherault, James Hamilton, the Stuart government also sought to incorporate private Scottish armies into the royal state. The primary families of the Borders took an oath at Jedburgh Abbey to forsake any in their service who were condemned by the monarchy. TNA SP 50/5, f. 69r, Copy of Jedburgh Oath, March 24, 1551/2.
37. Mary of Guise has been assessed by Pamela Ritchie, who argued that she was driven not by religion but by dynastic ambition and proved a strong and adept politician. Pamela Ritchie, *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548–1560* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2002). Amy Blakeway's study of regency in Scotland concurs with Ritchie's main thesis regarding dynastic motivations, but is not necessarily willing to admit that Guise was superior to other regents. Blakeway contends there are "hints that Guise struggled financially" and says that her status as the regent for an absentee monarch, as opposed to a minor, likely inhibited her power as the Queen of Scots' consent could be acquired. Amy Blakeway, *Regency in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015), 45–46, 106.
38. TNA 51/1, f. 28r, Notes on Scottish Parliaments, 1558.
39. A1557/3/41/& 29/1, in *RPS*. TNA SP 51/1, f. 35r, Thomas Martin to the Queen, June 11, 1557.
40. Argyle to Guise, August 12, 1554, in *Scott Corr Mary of Lorraine*, 388–389; Thomas Dickson and James Balfour Paul, eds., *Accounts of the Treasurer of Scotland (TA)*, vol. 10 (Edinburgh: Morrison and Gibb, 1913), 232, 241, 287. For estimations of French company sizes for infantry, see James Wood, *The King's Army: Warfare, Soldiers, and Society During the Wars of Religion in France, 1562–1576* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 48, 87–89, 92–93. TNA SP 51/1, f. 35r, Thomas Martin to the queen, June 11, 1557.
41. For reports of pensions and salaries for offices, such as wardens, see *TA*, vol. 10, 224, 236, 236, 239, 240, 244, 265, 284, 304, 312, 348; for the wages of gunners, smiths and wrights see 298, 314, 322.
42. Sadler and Croft to Cecil, October 24, 1559, in *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth I (1559–60)*, ed. Joseph Stevenson (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1865), 54. Armies from the western highlands may have been generally larger. Jacques de

- la Brosse said that two unnamed lords of the western isles were able to raise 5000–6000 “hommes sauvaiges” in rebellion against Argyll in 1543. Jacques de la Brosse, “Discours des affaires du Royaume Descosse,” in *Two Missions of Jacques de la Brosse*, ed. Galdys Dickinson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1949), 16.
43. National Archives of Scotland (NAS), GD8/159 Bond of Robert, Lord Boyd and his son, November 6, 1557; RH2/2/14 (15) Bond of William Sinclair of Roslin, June 3, 1546; SP13/41, Bond of William, Lord Ruthven, 154–; 42, Bond of Patrick, Lord Bothwell, 1543; 44, Bond of William Cunningham of Glengarnoch, September, 1543; 48, Bond of Hector MacClane of Duart, May 24, 1546; 55, Bond of Alexander Gordon, Postulant of Caithness, January 17, 1547/8; 58, Bond of George Gordon, Earl of Huntly, April 14, 1548; 59, Bond of Robert Ramsay of Kinnard, April 14, 1548; 61, Bond of Sir Walter Scott of Branxholme, August 13, 1548; 63, John, Earl of Sutherland, February 20, 1548/9; 65, Bond of George Meldrum of Fife, March 14, 1548/9; 66, Bond of Sir William Scott of Kirkhurd, June 24, 1549; 68, Bond of John Erskine of Dun, 1548; 74, Bond of James MacGill, February 11, 1551; 78, Bond of James, Earl of Morton, November 15, 1558.
  44. NAS GD 112/24/2, ff. 8r, Bond of Marion Keller, October 1, 1550; 8r-v, Bond of David Duncanson in the Caris of Apuadull, July 25, 1552; 18v-19r, Bond of Donald Mackinnocater, October 10, 1560; f. 20v, Bond of Patrick McAllair, May 5, 1561; f. 22v, Bond of John Dow MacGillernan; INV 1080, Bond of Alexander McBrek of Legarclaw, September 17, 1526; INV 1073, Bond of Henry, Lord Methven and Jonet Stewart, April 29, 1552; NAS GD 148/173, Bond by George Houston, March 19, 1549; NAS GD25/2/27, Bond of Elizabeth Colville, July 11, 1514; NAS GD247/182/1, Bond of Gilbert Wauchop and Jonet Her, May 8, 1535; NAS GD25/2/62, Bond of Isabell Ferguson of Kilkarene, May 10, 1540; NAS GD112/24/2, f.18, Bond of Donald McKerlich McConnell and Margaret MacEwen, September 9, 1560.
  45. NAS RH2/2/14 (15), Bond of William Sinclair of Roslin, June 3, 1546.
  46. NAS GD 8/159, Bond of Robert, Lord Boyd and his Son, November 6, 1557.
  47. NAS RH2/2/14 (15), Bond of William Sinclair of Roslin, June 3, 1546.
  48. NAS SP 13/48, Bond of Hector MacClane of Duart, May 24, 1546.
  49. TNA SP 62/1, f. 69v, Thomas Fitzwalter, Lord Deputy to the Queen, January 2, 1556/7; TNA SP 62/1 93v, Articles Concerning Affairs in Ireland, April 15, 1557.
  50. TNA SP 62/1, f. 50r, A Present Remedy for the Reformation of the North and the Rest of Ireland, 1556.

51. TNA SP 62/1, f. 50r, A Present Remedy for the Reformation of the North and the Rest of Ireland, 1556.
52. TNA SP 62/1, 93r, Articles Concerning Affairs in Ireland, April 15, 1557.
53. TNA SP 62/1, f. 73r, Articles Sent by the Queen to Fitzwalter and Answered, February 5, 1556/7.
54. TNA SP 62/1, f. 73r, Articles Sent by the Queen to Fitzwalter and Answered, February 5, 1556/7.
55. TNA SP 62/1, f. 93v, Articles Concerning Affairs in Ireland, April 15, 1557.
56. TNA SP 62/1, f. 93v, Articles Concerning Affairs in Ireland, April 15, 1557.
57. TNA SP 62/1, f. 94r, Articles Concerning Affairs in Ireland, April 15, 1557.
58. TNA SP 62/1, f. 94r, Articles Concerning Affairs in Ireland, April 15, 1557.
59. TNA SP 62/1, f. 107r, King and Queen to the Nobility of Ireland, May, 1557.
60. TNA SP 62/1, ff. 114r–114v, The Queen to the Earl of Sussex, June 1, 1557.
61. TNA SP 62/1, f. 125r, The Queen to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, July, 1557.
62. Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, 137–144.
63. Cathcart, “A Spent Force?” 270; Hiram Morgan, “The End of Gaelic Ulster: A Thematic Interpretation of Events Between 1534 and 1610,” in *Irish Historical Studies* vol. 26, no. 191 (May, 1988): 8–32, esp. 14–20.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Primary Sources*

#### Manuscripts:

The National Archives (Kew):

SP 50, SP 51, SP 62.

National Archives of Scotland (Edinburgh):

GD8, GD112, GD247, GD25, RH2, SP13.

Inveraray Castle (Inveraray):

Bundles 1073–4, 1080, 1083.

#### Printed sources:

Bain, Joseph ed. *Calendar of State Paper related to Mary, Queen of Scots*. Edinburgh: Register House, 1894.

Brown, Keith M., MacIntosh, Gillian H., Mann, Alastair J., and Tanner, Roland J., eds. *Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707* (<http://www.rps.ac.uk/>).

Cameron, Annie, ed. *The Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*. Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society, 1927.

Dickinson, Gladys, ed. *Two Missions of Jacques de la Brosse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1949.

- Hamilton, Hans Claude, ed. *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth, 1509–1603*. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1860.
- O'Donovan, John, ed. and trans. *Annala rioghachta Eireann/ Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the four masters (AFM)*, 7 vols. 1848–51, 2nd edn. 1856.
- Stevenson, Joseph, ed. *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth I (1559–60)*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1865.
- Thomas Dickson and James Balfour Paul, eds., *Accounts of the Treasurer of Scotland (TA)*. Edinburgh: Morrison and Gibb, 1913.

### Secondary Sources

- Blakeway, Amy. *Regency in Sixteenth-Century Scotland*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015.
- Bradshaw, Brendan. “‘Manus the Magnificent’: O'Donnell as a Renaissance Prince.” In *Studies in Irish History Presented to R. Dudley Edwards*. Edited by Art Cosgrove and Donald McCartney, 15–37. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 1979.
- Bradshaw, Brendan. *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Brady, Ciaran. *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536–1588*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Brigdan, Susan. *London and the Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Bryson, Alan. “St Leger, Sir Anthony (1496?–1559).” In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online ed., edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24512> (accessed June 23, 2017). online ed. Jan 2008.
- Canny, Nicholas. *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland, a Pattern Established, 1565–76*. Hassocks: Harvest, 1976.
- Cathcart, Alison. “A Spent Force? The Clan Donald in the Aftermath of 1493.” In *The Lordship of the Isles*. Edited by Richard D. Oram, 254–270. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Dawson, Jane. *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary, Queen of Scots: The Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Fires of Faith*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Stripping the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Ellis, Steven. *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the British State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Ellis, Steven. *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470–1603*. London: Longman, 1985.

- Grant, Alexander. "Scotland's Celtic Fringe in the Late Middle Ages: the MacDonalds Lords of the Isles and the Kingdom of Scotland." In *The British Isles, 1100–1500: Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections*. Edited by Robert Rees Davies, 118–141. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988.
- Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Hays-McCoy, Gerard. *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland, 1565–1603*. Dublin: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1937.
- Ives, Eric. *Lady Jane Grey: A Tudor Mystery*. Chichester: Blackwell, 2009.
- Jordan, Constance. "Women's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought." In *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 3. (Autumn 1987): 421–451.
- Kingston, Simon. *Ulster and the Isles in the Fifteenth Century*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004.
- Loach, Jennifer. *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Loades, David. "Phillip II and the Government of England." In *Law and Government under the Tudors. Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton*. Edited by Claire Cross, David Loades and John J. Scarisbrick, 177–194. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Loades, David. *Mary Tudor: A Life*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Loades, David. *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545–1565*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1992.
- Loades, David. *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics Government and Religion, 1553–8*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1979.
- MacGregor, Martin. "The Campbells: Lordship, Literature and Liminality." In *Textual Cultures: Texts, Contexts, Interpretation* 7(1), (2012): 121–157.
- Maginn, Christopher. "Gaelic Ireland's English Frontiers in the late Middle Ages." In *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*. Vol. 110C (2010): 173–190.
- Maginn, Christopher and Steven Ellis. *The Tudor Discovery of Ireland*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015.
- Mayer, Thomas. *Reginald Pole: Prince and Prophet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Morgan, Hiram. "The End of Gaelic Ulster: a Thematic Interpretation of Events between 1534 and 1610." In *Irish Historical Studies* vol. 26, no. 191 (May, 1988): 8–32.
- Nicholls, Kenneth. *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, LTD, 1972.
- Nicholls, Kenneth. "Scottish Mercenary Kindreds in Ireland 1250–1600." In *The World of the Gallowglass: Kings, Warlords, and Warriors in Ireland and*

- Scotland, 1200–1600*. Edited by Sean Duffy, 86–105. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007.
- Oldenburg, Scott. "Toward a Multi-Cultural Mid-Tudor England: The Queen's Royal Entry Circa 1553, 'The Interlude of Wealth and Health,' and the Question of Strangers in the Reign of Mary I." In *ELH*, vol. 76, no. 1. (Spring 2009): 99–129.
- Pogson, Rex. "Reginald Pole and the Priorities of Government in Mary Tudor's Church." In *The Historical Journal*, vol. 18, no. 1. (Mar., 1975): 3–20.
- Richards, Judith. "'To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule': Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England." In *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 28, no. 1. (Spring 1997): 101–121.
- Richards, Judith. "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'? Gendering Tudor Monarchy." In *The Historical Journal*, vol. 40, no. 4. (Dec., 1997): 895–924.
- Richards, Judith. *Mary Tudor*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Ritchie, Pamela, *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548–1560*. East Linton: Tuckwell, 2002.
- Samson, Alexander. "Changing Places: the Marriage and Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria, and Mary Tudor, July–August 1554." In *The Sixteenth-Century Journal*, vol. 36, no. 3. (Fall 2005): 61–84.
- Shephard, Amanda. *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth Century England*. Keele: Keele University Press, 1994.
- MacNeil, Thomas. "Organizing a Lordship: The Castle of the MacDonalds of Dunivaig and the Glens." In *The Lordship of the Isles*. Edited by R.D. Oram, 211–226. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Tittler, Robert, and Loach, Jennifer, eds. *The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540–1560*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980.
- Ward, Joseph P. *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity and Change in Early Modern London*. Stamford: Stamford University Press, 1997.
- Whitelock, Anna and MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Princess Mary's Household and the Succession Crisis, July 1553." In *The Historical Journal*. vol. 50, no. 2. (2007): 265–287.
- Whitelock, Anna. *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.
- Whitelock, Anna. *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.
- Wood, James. *The King's Army: Warfare, Soldiers, and Society during the Wars of Religion in France, 1562–1576*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wormald, Jenny. *Lords and Men in Scotland: Bonds of Manrent, 1442–1603*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985.

Colonization, Piracy, and Trade in Early Modern Europe

The Roles of Powerful Women and Queens

Paranque, E.; Probasco, N.J.; Jowitt, C. (Eds.)

2017, XV, 255 p. 3 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-57158-4