



NOTES

The Lioness Roared: Introduction

1. John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, vol., 6, ed. George Townsend and Stephen Cattley (New York: AMS Press, 1965, orig. pub. 1559), p. 414.
2. Ibid.
3. Historians have not traditionally considered the female ruler, or queen regnant, in the same context as male kings. An early but potent example from the modern era is Agnes Strickland's eight volume *Lives of the Queens of England* (London: Henry Colburn, 1852). Strickland acknowledged the crucial differences between the roles of queens regnant and consort, but her contextual reasoning clearly placed queen regnant outside the context of kingship, which Strickland viewed in male terms characteristic of mid-Victorian gendered social constructs.
4. Studies of European kingship in general do not include analysis of women as kings; for a fairly recent example see Henry A. Myers, *Medieval Kingship* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1982), also *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne Duggan (London: King's College London Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 1993). Only recently have scholars begun to interpose the role of women upon the evolution of kingship, see Paul Kleber Monod, *The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999). While Monod includes discussions of female rulers in his study, they remain "exceptional, each case has to be examined separately," p. 7.
5. Since 1066, six female sovereigns (including Elizabeth II, excluding Mary II) have occupied the English throne, comprising 179 regnal years (in 2005) out of 936.
6. See John W. Houghton, "No Bishop, No Queen: Queens Regnant and the Ordination of Women," *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 67, 1 (1998), pp. 2–25.
7. England experienced the reigns of six boy kings between 1216 and 1553. The fourth of these, Henry VI (1422–1461, 1470–1471), suffered from periodic episodes of acute psychosis during his adult

- reign. George III (1760–1820) lapsed into senility and blindness, necessitating the appointment of a regency in 1811. Even so, George III remained king until his death.
8. See Judith L. Richards, “Mary Tudor: Renaissance Queen”, *High and Mighty Queens of England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 36. Richards noted how English contemporaries of Isabel of Castile, queen regnant of Castile from 1469 to 1503, referred to her as a king. In conjunction with her husband, Fernando of Aragon, the pair were referred to as “los reyes” in diplomatic documents sent to England, which were translated as “the kings” since the English could not comprehend, linguistically, a term to describe female kingly power.
 9. Historians continue to examine female rule within the context of other forms of female power, see *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John Carmi Parsons (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993), Lisa Hopkins, *Women Who Would Be Kings: Female Rulers of the Sixteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991), Dick Harrison, *The Age of Abbesses and Queens: Gender and Political Culture in Medieval Europe* (Lund, Sweden: Nordic Academic Press, 1998), *Queens and Queenship in Medieval England*, ed. Anne Duggan (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1997), Antonia Fraser, *The Warrior Queens* (New York: Vintage Books, 1988).
 10. Arthur Taylor, *The Glory of Regality: An Historical Treatise of the Anointing and Crowning of the Kings and Queens of England* (London: Payne and Foss, 1820), p. 3.
 11. *Ibid.*
 12. England’s deposed monarchs include Edward II (1327), Richard II (1399), Henry VI (1461, 1471), Edward IV (1470), Edward V (1483), Richard III (1485), Charles I (1649), and James II (1688), while in 1936 Edward VIII was prevailed upon to abdicate, as were Edward II and Richard II.
 13. Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 15.
 14. For a groundbreaking call to arms for the need to integrate women’s history within the historical discipline, see Elizabeth Fox Genovese, “Placing Women’s History in History,” *New Left Review*, 133 (May/June 1982), pp. 5–29.
 15. The implications derived from the use of gender as a mode of historical analysis have spread far and wide in the historical discipline, far beyond the scope of this project. It will suffice here to briefly outline a few seminal works that pointed the way: Joan Scott’s groundbreaking article, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis” appeared in the *American Historical Review*, 91, 5 (December 1986), pp. 1053–1075. In this work, Scott argued that

- gender represented the context of power relations between the sexes. Scott has since both modified and expanded her analyses of the usefulness of gender as a category of historical analysis, see *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000). While Scott gets much of the credit for the emergence of gender studies, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, in her 1982 article, "Placing Women's History in History," delivered a well argued pitch for the introduction of the "gender system as a fundamental category of historical analysis," 6. For further studies on the social construction of gendered hierarchies, see Christine Ward Gailey, "Evolutionary Perspectives on Gender Hierarchy," *Analyzing Gender*, ed. Beth B. Hess and Myra Marx Ferec (Newberry Park: Sage Productions, 1987), pp. 32–67. For more specialized studies of English female kingship, see Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), also A.N. McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
16. See Joan Hoff, "Gender as a Postmodern Category of Paralysis," *Women's History Review*, 3, 2 (1994), pp. 80–99.
 17. This theoretical starting point is nicely fleshed out in Bonnie Smith, *The Gender of History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).
 18. For a survey of the origins of patriarchy in Western culture, see Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986). The ambivalence of historians to utilize the word patriarchy as a descriptive term appears in a number of theoretical works: see Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1988), and Judith Bennett, "Feminism and History," *Gender and History* 1 (1989), pp. 259–263.
 19. For a recent study of medieval English women's political power, see J.A. Green, "Aristocratic Women in Early Twelfth Century England," *Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth Century Renaissance*, ed. C. Warren Hollister (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 60–72, and Susan M. Johns, *Noblewomen, Aristocracy and Power* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003). For the standard study of the early-modern aristocracy, see Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).
 20. See Duggan, *Queens and Queenship*, pp. 1–120.
 21. For a recent study of the exercise of delegated queenly sovereignty in late-medieval Spain, see Theresa Earenfight, "Maria of Castile, Ruler or Figurehead?" *Mediterranean Studies*, 4 (1994), pp. 45–61.
 22. This fundamental problem is identified in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowalski, "Introduction," *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1988), pp. 1–4.

23. See Allan G. Johnson, *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), pp. 5–7.
24. For an explanation for why Mary II is not considered a de jure female ruler, see chapter 4.
25. For an analysis of the means by which male historians through time have dismissed the historical roles of women on the basis of natural womanly deficiency, see Smith, *The Gender of History*, pp. 1–13.
26. For a recent example, see Peter Brimacombe, *All the Queen's Men: The World of Elizabeth I* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000). Brimacombe identified Mary I's previously unidentified accomplishment, noting that, "Mary's reign, unsatisfactory though it may have been, had at least been advantageous in an accustomed way to the English kingdom of a female monarch, an institution which was becoming increasingly prevalent in Europe." A backhanded compliment, but a new perspective all the same, p. 40.
27. See Myers, *Medieval Kingship*, pp. 2–13, Monod, *The Power of Kings*, pp. 6–41, for discussion of the social construct of kingship.
28. See J.L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 5.
29. For a survey of biblical and classical injunctions against women, see Diana Coole, *Women in Political Theory: From Ancient Misogyny to Contemporary Feminism* (New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf, 1993), pp. 1–37. Scholars who have demonstrated the limits of culturally hegemonic male dominance include Amy Louise Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (New York: Routledge, 1993), Merry Wiesner, "Women's Defense of Their Public Role," *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Mary Beth Rose (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986), pp. 1–22, and Alice Clark, *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 1992).
30. Some of the works that identify a dual system of accommodation and resistance to forms of male dominance include Judith Bennett, *Medieval Women in Modern Perspective* (Washington DC: American Historical Association, 2000), also Merry Wiesner, "Women's Defense," pp. 1–22.
31. For further discussion of the social and legal status of medieval and early-modern Englishwomen, see Henrietta Leyser, *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England, 450–1500* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1995), also Pearl Hogrefe, *Tudor Women* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa University Press, 1975). For studies of women in the larger context of medieval Europe, see *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Studies in Church History, Subsidia I, 1978), *Medieval Women and the Sources of Medieval History*, ed. J.T. Rosenthal (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1990), S. Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1983).

32. See Michael K. Jones, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). For a feminist viewpoint of Beaufort, see Karen Lindsey, *Divorced Beheaded Survived: A Feminist Reinterpretation of the Wives of Henry VIII* (Reading, Mass.: Perseus Books, 1995), pp. 3–11.
33. See Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger, Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Ma.: M.I.T. Press, 1989, orig. pub. 1962). Although Habermas categorically states that a recognizable public sphere only emerged in England following the Glorious Revolution (1688), he does say that “private” referred to the exclusion from the sphere of the state apparatus, p. 11. In this sense, female kings transcended the private sphere of womanhood upon their accessions.
34. For an influential description of the relationship between female agency and public and private power, see Jo Ann McNamara and Suzanne Wemple, “The Power of Women Through the Family in Medieval Europe, 500–1100,” *Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women*, ed. Mary S. Hartman and Lois Banner (New York: Harper Colophon, 1974), pp. 103–118.
35. For more discussion of the public roles played by elite Anglo-Saxon women, see Christine Fell, *Women in Anglo-Saxon England* (London: Colonnade, 1984).
36. See Leyser, *Medieval Women*, 24.
37. For further discussion of the evolution of feudal inheritance practices, see John Hudson, *Land, Law, Lordship in Anglo-Norman England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) and S.F.C. Milsom, “Inheritance by Women in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries,” *On the Laws and Customs of England*, ed. Morris S. Arnold, Thomas A. Green, Sally A. Scully, and Stephen D. White (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), pp. 60–89.
38. Jointures and dowers constituted similarly constructed incomes and or property due to a woman upon the death of her husband.
39. For a basic model of female inheritance rights, see Frederick Pollock and Frederic William Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968, orig. pub. 1898), pp. 420–428. For a survey of early-modern refinements, see Erickson, *Women and Property*.
40. For more on the career of Lucy of Lincoln, Countess of Chester, see *Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland*, ed. G.E. Cokayne, vol. 7, app. J, pp. 743–746, cited in Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), p. 92, and Johns, *Noblewomen, Aristocracy and Power*, pp. 55–61. For a study of the status of single women such as widows, see Amy M. Froide, “Marital Status as a

- Category of Difference: Single women and Widows in Early Modern England,” *Singlewomen in the European Past: 1250–1800*, ed. Judith Bennett and Amy M. Froide (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 236–269.
41. In the twelfth century, the Empress Matilda transmitted her claim to the English throne to her son Henry II. Four hundred years later, Richard, Duke of York, invoked a female inclusive rule of primogeniture as he based his claim on his descent from the Plantagenet princess, Philippa of Clarence. In turn, both a Lancastrian heiress, Margaret Beaufort, and a Yorkist heiress, Elizabeth of York, provided the hereditary claims of the House of Tudor.
 42. See Gayle Rubin, “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex,” *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), pp. 157–210.
 43. For an analysis of the origins of this plan, see E. Searle, “Women and the Legitimization of Succession of the Norman Conquest,” *Anglo-Norman Studies*, vol. 3, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1980), pp. 159–170.
 44. The single exception to this general rule was the accession of John in 1199. John overrode the claims of his nephew, Arthur, Count of Brittany, the son of John’s deceased elder brother Geoffrey, who later died in John’s custody. When John himself died in 1216, his eldest son, ten-year-old Henry III, succeeded largely because of a lack of royal adult male challengers. Nevertheless, the precedent of a successful royal minority set into place the primacy of primogeniture. See Charles Beem, *The Royal Minorities of Medieval England*, unpublished M.A. thesis (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, 1990).
 45. See William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897) II, p. 552.
 46. In December 2004, Labour peer Lord Dubs introduced a private bill to alter the succession that, among its various clauses, included a change from cognatic to lineal, or absolute, primogeniture, which would have allowed males and females to inherit equally. However, the bill was withdrawn after the Blair government said it would block the bill’s passage.
 47. See Lois L. Huneycutt, “Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth Century Churchmen,” *Medieval Queenship*, pp. 190–199.
 48. In her otherwise impressive scholarly study of Matilda’s career, Marjorie Chibnall only briefly mentions the impact of contemporary notions of gender on the course of Matilda’s career. See Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, pp. 97–98.
 49. This particular problem was first tackled by William Huse Dunham Jr., in his article “Regal Power and the Rule of Law: A Tudor Paradox,” *Journal of British Studies*, 3, 2 (May 1964), pp. 34–37.

50. Social scientists will never agree on just what the terms of civil or political society actually mean. For the purposes of this study, we shall refer to “political society” as those male voices through time providing the bulk of the primary sources utilized in this study. Thus, the political society that provides us with commentary for the career of the twelfth-century Empress Matilda is miniscule compared to those existing during the reigns of early-modern female kings. Each chapter shall include a discussion of the specific context of the political society it describes.
51. For a recent discussion of Elizabeth’s continuing historical popularity, see Susan Doran, “Elizabeth I: Gender, Power, and Politics,” *History Today*, 53, 5 (2003), pp. 29–35.
52. David Starkey, *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2000), p. x.
53. For instance, in his study of Elizabeth’s relationship with her courtiers, Neville Williams observed, “there was the significance of her sex, and where many queens found this a matter of weakness Elizabeth made it a source of strength.” Like so many other conventional historians, Williams identified the problem, but left it for gender analysis to provide the explanation. *All the Queen’s Men: Elizabeth I and Her Courtiers* (London: Cardinal, 1974), p. 14.
54. Perhaps the best example of this phenomenon is J.E. Neale, the most influential of Elizabeth’s modern biographers, who recognized and contrasted the gendered restraints upon Elizabeth with an unabashed wonder at her success as monarch. See J.E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I* (New York: Anchor Books, 1957, orig. pub. 1937).
55. Susan Bassnett sounded the feminist call to arms for a gendered analysis of Elizabeth I in her work, *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective* (Oxford: Berg, 1988). While Bassnett is often careless in her attention to factual detail, she poses a number of alternative explanations for conventional critiques of Elizabeth’s shortcomings as natural feminine deficiency.
56. Among my more recent favorites are: Elizabeth Jenkins, *Elizabeth the Great* (New York: Coward-McKann, 1959), Carolly Erickson, *The First Elizabeth* (New York: Summit Books, 1983), and Anne Somerset, *Elizabeth I* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991).
57. For a recent, edited version of this work, see William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*, ed. with intro. by Wallace McCaffery (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).
58. For recent analyses of gender perceptions in Tudor society, see Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995), also Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

59. John Aylmer, later Bishop of London, wrote his work, *An Harborowe For Faithful and Trewe Subjects* (London: 1559) as a rebuttal to John Knox's scathing critique of female rule, *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (Geneva: 1558). Aylmer's emphasis on the mixed nature of the English constitution was also incorporated into Sir Thomas Smith's political critique, *De Republica Anglorum*, ed. L. Alston (New York: Harper and Row, 1973, orig. pub. 1584).
60. Writing in the late seventeenth century, Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, considered Elizabeth's success a providential work of God, see *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, vol. 2 (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1848, orig. pub. 1665). Elizabeth also fared well in the estimation of Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke, see *Remarks on the History of England* (Dublin: G. Faulkner, 1743). Writing later on in the eighteenth century, Henry Hallam displayed no ambivalence in assigning masculine traits as an explanation for Elizabeth's remarkable talents in ruling. See *Constitutional History of England* (Boston: Wells and Lily, 1829). For a discussion of Elizabeth's seventeenth-century historical reputation, see J.P. Kenyon, "Queen Elizabeth and the Historians," *Queen Elizabeth I: Most Politick Princess*, ed. Simon Adams (London: History Today, 1983), pp. 52–55, also D.R. Woolfe, "Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory," *Canadian Journal of History*, 20 (1985), pp. 167–191.
61. For a number of analyses on nineteenth-century gender formations, see Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1987), Anna Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), and John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
62. See Rohan Amanda Maitzen, *Gender, Genre, and Victorian Historical Writing* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998).
63. Strickland, *Queens of England*, V, pp. 620, 712.
64. James Anthony Froude, *The Reign of Elizabeth*, 5 vols. (London: J.M. Dent, 1911).
65. Froude, *Elizabeth*, IV, p. 364.
66. Mandell Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Thom Y. Crowell, 1966, orig. pub. 1899), p. 29.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Ibid.*, pp. 27–28, 51, 176.
69. Creighton did not see this as a problem. Instead, it occurred to him right in the middle of his narrative that "Elizabeth discovered the advantages to be gained by combining the parts of the woman and the Queen," p. 51.

70. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth I*, p. 83.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
74. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
75. *Ibid.*, pp. 85–101.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 294. Neale here is referring to the 1558 publication, *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, by John Knox, a vitriolic indictment of female rule, directed against Mary I of England, and Mary of Guise, Regent of Scotland. Unfortunately for Knox, by the time it was published Elizabeth had ascended her throne, and was annoyed by its assertions.
77. A.L. Rowse, in his *Expansion of Elizabethan England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1955), appropriated Creighton's views on the impact of Elizabeth's gender, p. 266.
78. G.R. Elton, *England Under the Tudors* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965), p. 262.
79. *Ibid.* Elton is not the only one to use the highly gendered analogy of a housewife to describe Elizabeth; J.P. Kenyon, in his post-Whig critique of Neale, quoted a mid-seventeenth-century description of Elizabeth, "a sluttish housewife, who swept the house but left the dust behind the door." J.P. Kenyon, *Stuart England*, 2nd ed. (London: Penguin, 1978), p. 19.
80. Elton, *England Under the Tudors*, p. 398.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 262.
82. Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (New York: Longman, 1988), p. 171.
83. *Ibid.*, 172.
84. David Loades has published two major works on Mary I. The first, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 2nd ed. (London: Longmans, 1991, orig. pub. 1978) does not contain any specific references to Mary's gendered problems. The second work, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1989), contains passing references to the impact of Mary's gender on her rule, but no sustained investigation, pp. 1–3, 218.
85. See Alison Heisch, "Queen Elizabeth I and the Persistence of Patriarchy," *Feminist Review*, 4 (1980), pp. 45–75.
86. See Bassnet, p. 5, who wrote, "The great division between Elizabeth and twentieth century readers is time itself. In the four hundred years since her death, perceptions have changed so completely that we can only with great difficulty imagine how the Renaissance mind worked."
87. This line of theoretical reasoning also informs several of the essays in the volume, *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker (London: Dale University Press, 1998). In particular, see Susan Doran, "Why Did Elizabeth Not Marry?,"

- pp. 30–59, and Carole Levin, “We Shall Never Have A Merry World While the Queene Lyveth: Gender, Monarchy, and the Power of Seditious Words,” pp. 77–95.
88. See Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
89. Constance Jordan also has based much of her study on the interpretation of literary texts as a means to gauge the problems of female rule, see *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).
90. Frye’s analysis of the paternalistic pressures Elizabeth faced upon her accession is also discussed in Louis Montrose, “Shaping Fantasies: Figurations of Gendered Power in Elizabethan Culture,” *Representing the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 31–64.
91. Frye, *Elizabeth I*, pp. 26–46.
92. *Ibid.*, pp. 36–48.
93. Sydney Anglo argued persuasively for a contextual and analytical approach in his explanation for the representational power generated by Tudor royal pageantry, see *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).
94. Frye, *Elizabeth I*, pp. 26–30.
95. Levin, *Heart and Stomach*, p. 1.
96. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
98. *Ibid.*
99. Levin offered a brief discussion of the Act Concerning Regal Power, which prompted this historian to investigate the origin and motivation behind this landmark statute, *Heart and Stomach*, p. 121.
100. The recognition that Elizabeth was king and queen at the same has filtered down to popular historical surveys. For a recent example, see Simon Schama, *A History of Britain: At the Edge of the World, 3000 b.c.–a.d. 1603* (New York: Hyperion, 2000), p. 387.
101. The formidable difficulties Elizabeth encountered in the various marriage negotiations during the first twenty years of her reign are skillfully discussed in Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

I Making a Name for Herself: The Empress Matilda and the Construction of Female Lordship in Twelfth-Century England

1. *Gesta Stephani*, trans. and ed. K.R. Potter (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), pp. 118–119.
2. See Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda*, pp. 195–206.

3. For analyses of the gendered roles of medieval women, see *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, Leyser, *Medieval Women Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe Medieval Queenship*.
4. Brian fitz Count, vassal of both Henry I and Matilda, recorded his views on female inheritance in letters exchanged with Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester and King Stephen's brother. The correspondence was preserved in Richard Bury's fourteenth-century book of letters, and reproduced in H.W.C. Davis, "Henry of Blois and Brian fitz Count," *English Historical Review*, 25, (1910), pp. 297–303. Gilbert Foliot, Abbott of Gloucester, remarked and agreed on fitz Count's assessment of Matilda's legitimate claim to the English throne. See *The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot*, 2nd ed., ed. C.N.L. Brooke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 60–66.
5. The impact of clerics as "masters of the medium of communication with both contemporaries and with historians who use their texts to study the period" is discussed in M. Bennett, "Military Masculinity in England and Northern France ca. 1050–ca.1225," *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D.M. Hadley (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 71–88. See also Lois Huneycutt, "Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth-Century Churchmen," *Medieval Queenship*, pp. 189–201.
6. In his commentary on the post-Whig revisionism of Richardson and Sayles's 1963 collaboration, *The Governance of Medieval England*, R.L. Schuyler summed up their contrast with William Stubb's idealized version of a twelfth-century constitution, noting that "the idea of a definite constitution, providing the essentials of government, was not a medieval idea. Important political questions were left to be determined by chance, accident, or the will of god." See "Recent Work of Richardson and Sayles," *Journal of British Studies*, 3, (May 1964), pp. 1–23.
7. William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, trans. K.R. Potter, ed. Edmund King (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
8. Henry of Huntington, *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntington*, ed. Thomas Forester (London: Henry Bohn, 1853).
9. William of Malmesbury's *Historia Novella* was actually a more detailed version of the final chapters of Malmesbury's larger work, *William of Malmesbury's Chronicle of the Kings of England* (afterward referred to as *Malmesbury*), ed. J.A. Giles (London: Henry Bohn, 1897). Like Henry of Huntington's history, Malmesbury's chronicle reached deep into Anglo-Saxon history to provide a continuous narrative of English history down to his present day.
10. For a discussion of the possible identity of the chronicle's author, see *Gesta Stephani*, pp. xviii–xxxviii.
11. For a discussion of the *Gesta Stephani's* gendered attack on Matilda, see pp. 54–56.

12. The Worcester chroniclers have been identified as the monks Florence, writing up to 1118, and John, continuing the chronicle up to 1140. The entire chronicle is subsumed in *The Chronicle of John of Worcester* (afterward referred to as *John of Worcester*), ed. P. McGurk (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). In her work, *The Empress Matilda*, Chibnall, Matilda's sole twentieth-century scholarly biographer, cited the commentary of the Durham chronicler, see Symeon of Durham, *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, 2 vols., ed. T. Arnold, RS, 1882–85.
13. Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, vol. 6, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). Vitalis also contributed to the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni*, ed. Elisabeth M.C. Van Houts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). For an analysis of Vitalis's attitudes toward women, see Marjorie Chibnall, "Women in Orderic Vitalis," *Haskin's Society Journal*, 2 (1990), pp. 105–121.
14. Vitalis, *Historia*, pp. 455–473.
15. For a number of analyses of the principal chronicler's political biases, see C. Warren Hollister, *Henry I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 3–12, and Edmund King, "Introduction," *The Anarchy of Stephen's Reign*, ed. Edmund King (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
16. The first modern study of Matilda is found in Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, I. Strickland subsumed Matilda's career in the chapter describing Stephen's queen, Matilda of Boulogne. Betraying her own Victorian notions of proper roles for women, the empress Matilda's "Juno" like efforts to secure her inheritance are contrasted with Queen Matilda's salutary performance as her husband's helpmate, pp. 208–231. Since this time, the vast majority of historical works examining Matilda are found in the context of Stephen's reign. See R.H.C. Davis, *King Stephen*, 3rd ed. (London: Longman, 1990), H.A. Cronne, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135–1154* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970), and K.J. Stringer, *The Reign of King Stephen* (London: Routledge, 1993). Only two monographs devoted primarily to Matilda appeared in the second half of the twentieth century. The first, Nesta Pain, *Empress Matilda: Uncrowned Queen of England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), made the revelatory leap in identifying Matilda as a queen, but the work, while engaging and romantic, is not scholarly. The other, Marjorie Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, is an impressive work by a renowned editor of primary narrative sources. Chibnall, however, only briefly noted the impact of gender upon Matilda's efforts to gain the English crown, pp. 96–97. Matilda finally gained equal billing with Stephen in Jim Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War of 1139–1154* (Stroud,

- Gloucestershire: Alan Sutton, 1996). Bradbury's work is primarily concerned with military tactics, and does not concentrate on Matilda's representational strategies to gain her inheritance.
17. Mid-twentieth-century Anglo-Norman studies rarely give Matilda's career much space or analysis. See A.L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), also Frank Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England*, 2nd ed. (London: Longmans, 1961).
 18. The major twelfth-century documentary source used in this chapter is the *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* (afterward referred to as *Regesta*) 3 vols., III, ed. H.A. Cronne and R.H.C. Davis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968). The *Regesta* is a compilation of charters issued during the reign of king Stephen, ca. 1135-1154, including those of the empress Matilda, as well as Stephen's queen Matilda of Boulogne, and the empress's son Henry Plantagenet. Cronne and Davis drew from a wide sweep of manuscript sources; those whose issue dates are uncertain are conjectured.
 19. For a recent study of Anglo-Saxon kingship. See Ann Williams, *Kingship and Government in Pre-Conquest England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999).
 20. For an influential study of the relationship between the family and political power in the European Middle Ages, see Jo Ann McNamara and Suzanna Wemple, "The Power of Women Through the Family in Medieval Europe," pp. 1-28.
 21. Cited in Leyser, *Medieval Women*, p. 13. Alfred the Great of Wessex (871-899) commissioned the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a vernacular historical source. What is significant about this quote is that Seaxburgh's one-year reign was considered important enough for the chronicler to recall it two hundred years later.
 22. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, trans. and ed. Michael Swanton (London: J.M. Dent, 1997).
 23. Pauline Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 56-57.
 24. Pauline Stafford, "The King's Wife in Wessex, 800-1066," *Past and Present*, 91, (May 1981), pp. 3-27.
 25. Stafford, *Queen Emma*, pp. 56-65, 164-187.
 26. See Janet L. Nelson, "Early Medieval Rites of Queen Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship," *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, pp. 302-313.
 27. *Ibid.*
 28. Stafford, *Queen Emma*, pp. 165-187, 192-247.
 29. For a larger discussion of the *Encomium Emmae* and the *Vita Edwardi Regis*, see Stafford, "The King's Wife," p. 5, notes 15 and 16.
 30. See Christine Fell, *Women in Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 160-164.

31. Pauline Stafford, "Emma: The Powers of the Queen," pp. 3–26, Mary Strol, "Maria Regina: Papal Symbol," pp. 173–203, *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*.
32. For a study of this particular dimension of Anglo-Saxon queenship, see Stafford, "The King's Wife," pp. 3–27.
33. Stafford, *Queen Emma*, pp. 7–8, 93–94.
34. See H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, *The Governance of Mediaeval England: From the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1963), p. 139.
35. Stafford, *Queen Emma*, p. 187.
36. Richardson and Sayles, *The Governance*, pp. 25–27.
37. For a still useful study, see F.M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism, 1066–1166* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932).
38. See E. Searle, "Women and the legitimization of Succession at the Norman Conquest," *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 3 (1981 for 1980), pp. 159–170.
39. Robert Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 127–129.
40. See W.M. Aird, 'Frustrated Masculinity', The Relationship between William the Conqueror and his Eldest Son," *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, pp. 39–55.
41. *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, p. 277.
42. In his work *Land, Law, Lordship in Anglo-Norman England*, John Hudson noted a peculiar rise in the numbers of heiresses to feudal tenancies in the eleventh century, p. 111. For a classic discussion of the origins of the primacy of primogeniture, see Frederick Pollock, and Frederick William Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, I, pp. 262–278, 292–294.
43. Percy Ernst Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937) p. 152. Also see C. Warren Hollister, "Anglo-Norman Succession Debate of 1126: Prelude to Stephen's Anarchy," *Journal of Medieval History*, I (April 1975), pp. 19–42.
44. See W.L. Warren, *Henry II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), p. 10.
45. For a discussion of the dynastic importance of this marriage, see E. Searle, "Women and the Legitimization of Succession of the Norman Conquest," pp. 159–170.
46. In describing the reasoning for why Henry I first designated his daughter Matilda as his heir, William of Malmesbury emphasized the importance of her combined Anglo-Saxon and Norman bloodlines. See *Malmesbury*, p. 482.
47. Robert of Torigny recalled that Hugh Capet associated his son Robert in his kingship, see *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, p. 245.
48. See Bartlett, *England*, p. 9.

49. The Salic law prescribed royal inheritance through the male line only. For a detailed study of the succession patterns of Capetian France, see A.W. Lewis, *Royal Succession in Capetian France: Studies on Familial Order and the State* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981).
50. Contemporaries differ on the date of when these first oaths were given: William of Malmesbury dated the oaths at Christmas, 1127, while John of Worcester dated them in April 1128. See *Malmesbury*, pp. 482, 483, *John of Worcester*, pp. 176–177.
51. Malmesbury stated, “if he himself [Henry I] died without a male heir, they [the nobles of England] would immediately and without hesitation accept his daughter Matilda, formerly empress, as their lady.” *Historia Novella*, pp. 6–7.
52. Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, p. 9.
53. Fulk relinquished his county of Anjou to his son Geoffrey not only to give his son noble status prior to his marriage, but also because Fulk was affianced to Melisende, the royal heiress of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem. Although Fulk intended to rule Jerusalem as king in right of his wife, Melisende successfully forced her husband to share sovereignty with her, as her father, Baldwin II, had intended. See Bernard Hamilton, “Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem, 1100–1190,” *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker, pp. 143–174, also Sarah Lambert, “Queen or Consort? Rulership and Politics in the Latin East, 1118–1128,” *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, pp. 153–169.
54. This is the view generally held by some Anglo-Norman scholars, see Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 7–12, Bartlett, pp. 9, 145. Other scholars have minimized the extent of Angevin–Norman hostility, see Hollister, *Henry I*, pp. 323–325, Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p. 55. It is significant to note that it took Geoffrey Plantagenet eight years to subdue Normandy, ostensibly in his son’s right, while he played no part in Matilda’s efforts to gain her English inheritance.
55. Henry I’s justiciar, Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, complained to Malmesbury that “no one had been involved in arranging that marriage, or had been aware that it would take place, except Robert, earl of Gloucester, Brian fitz Count, and the bishop of Lisieux.” Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, p. 11.
56. William of Malmesbury observed that “I myself have often heard Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, saying that he was released from the oath he had taken to the empress, because he had sworn only on condition that the king should not give his daughter in marriage to anyone outside the kingdom without consulting himself and the other chief men” Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, pp. 10–11.
57. See *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, pp. 240–241.

58. Chibnall disputes the assertion of Hildebert of Lavarin's modern biographer, and conjectures that Hildebert's letter to Matilda dated from 1127, while she was still in England prior to her second marriage. Peter von Moos, in *Hildebert von Lavardin 1056–1133* (Stuttgart: Pariser Historische Studien 3, 1965), pp. 365–367, dated the letter 1129. Chibnall conjectured that Matilda was on good terms with her father in 1129, following her separation from Geoffrey Plantagenet.
59. See Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, p. 258.
60. Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, pp. 19–21.
61. For an analysis of the intersection of love and status within the context of aristocratic marriage in the twelfth century, see John Gillingham, "Love, Marriage and Politics in the Twelfth Century," *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 25 (1989), pp. 292–303.
62. Chibnall cited the Durham chronicler as stating that there was agreement in England that Geoffrey Plantagenet should succeed Henry I, and the Le Mans chronicler, who indicated Geoffrey's aspirations for England and Normandy, *The Empress Matilda*, p. 57, ns. 53, 54.
63. Vitalis, *Historia*, p. 445.
64. One high profile example of this process was Henry I's bestowal in marriage of Matilda, heiress of Miles Crispin, to Brian fitz Count, which brought Brian his late father-in-law's honor of Wallingford, see Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp. 12–13.
65. See Judith A. Green, *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 247–248.
66. For further discussions of this process, see Hudson, *Land, Law, Lordship*, pp. 111–112, Milsom, "Inheritance by Women in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries," *On the Laws and Customs of England*, ed. Morris S. Arnold, Thomas A. Green, Sally A. Saully, and Stephen D. White (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), pp. 60–89. This process is also analogous to Gail Rubin's anthropological model. See "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," *Towards an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), pp. 157–210.
67. Karl Leyser has offered provocative circumstantial evidence that the Emperor Henry V, Matilda's first husband, may have considered himself Henry I's heir, see "The Anglo-Norman Succession, 1120–1125," *Anglo-Norman Studies*, vol. 13, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (Woodridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1991), pp. 234–235.
68. Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, pp. 7–9, John of Worcester, pp. 176–179.
69. The 1131 oath, given at a great council in Northampton, is mentioned by Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, pp. 17–20; the same

- council Henry of Huntington reported had decided to repatriate Matilda back to her husband in Anjou, p. 258. A further oath in 1135, to Matilda and her eldest son, was reported long after the fact, during Henry II's reign, by Roger de Hovedon, see *The Annals of Roger de Hovedon*, I, ed. Henry T. Riley (London: Henry Bohn, 1853), p. 224. J.H. Round disputed the authenticity of both the 1131 and the 1135 oaths. See *Geoffrey de Mandeville* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1960, orig. pub. 1892), p. 31, n.2.
70. In contrast, Geoffrey's father Fulk was involved in the government of Jerusalem following his marriage to Melisende, but before the death of his father-in-law. Orderic Vitalis wrote that "His aging father in law offered him the crown; but the younger man declined to wear it in his lifetime, though he exercised authority undisturbed as his son in law and heir throughout the realm during the remaining year of the old king's life," pp. 390–391.
71. See Charlotte Newman, *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), p. 19.
72. Malmesbury reported that "After deliberating long and deeply on this matter, he . . . bound the nobles of all England . . . [to] accept his daughter Matilda . . . as their lady." Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, pp. 6, 7.
73. Ibid.
74. C. Warren Hollister has argued that the choice of Geoffrey for Matilda's second husband centered on his ability to counter the threat posed by William Clito, son of Henry I's elder brother Robert Curthose, who considered himself a legitimate claimant to the Anglo-Norman Empire. Clito's cause was aided by the efforts of Louis VI of France, who helped him gain the county of Flanders in March 1127, three months after Matilda's designation as Henry I's heir. Thus the Anglo-Norman-Angevin alliance was just one more shift in the balance of power in northern France between the dukes of Normandy and the Capetian kings of France at this time. However, as Hollister has argued, Clito's untimely death in July 1128, one month after Matilda and Geoffrey's marriage, removed the main justification for the choice of Geoffrey as Matilda's husband. See Hollister, *Henry I*, pp. 317–325.
75. See Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda*, p. 10, Hollister, *Henry I*, pp. 323–325.
76. See *Regesta*. The editors indicate in their introductory essay the problem of providing exact dates for a number of Matilda's surviving charters. By cross-referencing narrative descriptions of Matilda's movements with the locations where the charters were issued, Cronne and Davis conjecture the dates assigned. Given this, one charter bearing the style *imperatrix regum Anglie filia*, confirming Angers Abbey's possession of various English churches, could be dated as early as 1133, p. 7, n.20.

77. While Matilda was crowned Queen of the Romans at Mainz, July 25, 1110, she never received an imperial coronation from the pope. See Karl Leyser, *Medieval Germany and its Neighbors* (London: Hambledon Press, 1982), pp. 197–200.
78. *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, p. 243.
79. K. Leyser, “Anglo-Norman Succession,” p. 229.
80. For a larger discussion of Matilda’s experience as Holy Roman Empress, see Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp. 18–44.
81. *Malmesbury*, p. 481.
82. See P. Marchegay and A. Salmon, *Chroniques des Comtes d’Anjou*, vol. 1 (Paris: 1856–71), p. xv, n. 1, cited in Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, 70.
83. See Hudson, *Land, Law, Lordship*, p. 111.
84. This is the verdict of C. Warren Hollister, see *Henry I*, pp. 323–325.
85. Bernard F. Reilly, *The Kingdom of Leon-Castilla Under Queen Urraca* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982). See also Bernard Hamilton, “Women in the Crusader States: The Queens of Jerusalem 1100–90,” *Medieval Women*, ed. Baker, pp. 143–174, and Sarah Lambert, “Queen or Consort: Rulership and Politics in the Latin East 1118–1128,” *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, pp. 153–169.
86. The *Gesta Stephani* reported that Robert of Gloucester “was advised, as the story went, to claim the throne on his father’s death, deterred by sounder advise he by no means assented, saying it was fairer to yield it to his sister’s son, to whom it more justly belonged.” pp. 12–13.
87. On Edith-Matilda’s regencies, see *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, II, ed. C. Johnson and H.A. Cronne (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 971, 1000–1001, 1190, 1198.
88. *John of Worcester*, p. 167, Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, pp. 6, 7.
89. *Malmesbury*, p. 489, Vitalis, *Historia*, pp. 445.
90. The exchange of arguments concerning female inheritance between Brian fitz Count and Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, from Richard of Bury’s fourteenth-century book of letters, were reproduced by H.W.C. Davis, “Henry of Blois and Brian fitz Count,” pp. 297–303.
91. See *The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot*, pp. 60–66, n.26.
92. See above n. 90.
93. *Malmesbury*, p. 483.
94. Vitalis, *Historia*, p. 445.
95. *Ibid.*
96. Warren, *Henry I*, p. 17.
97. In Marjorie Chibnall’s otherwise impressive biography, the reasons why Matilda did not bolt for England are not discussed. Instead, Chibnall simply asserted that “Matilda, together with Geoffrey of Anjou, acted as quickly as possible to assert her rights where they were most likely to be accepted,” p. 66. Similarly, Jim Bradbury

- noted that “Matilda made no attempt to come to England, and made no overt claim to the throne. It does not appear as if she had seen herself as her father’s heir, or had been planning to take over the kingdom and the duchy,” p. 13.
98. Matilda’s third son, William, was born in July 1536.
 99. *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, pp. 264–265.
 100. *Malmesbury*, p. 490, Vitalis, *Historia*, p. 455.
 101. Chibnall has argued that Matilda and Geoffrey concentrated their efforts on those regions in Normandy where her rights were most likely to be accepted, but does not contemplate what may have happened if Matilda had immediately bolted for London, *Empress Matilda*, p. 66.
 102. *Malmesbury*, p. 518. Malmesbury described Henry of Blois’s justification for the accession of his brother Stephen; “Therefore, as it seemed long to wait for a sovereign who delayed coming to England, for she [Matilda] resided in Normandy, we provided for the peace of the country, and my brother was allowed to reign.”
 103. See William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England*, I, pp. 551–552, Richardson/Sayles, pp. 136–155, Pauline Stafford, “Emma: The Powers of the Queen,” *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, p. 22.
 104. Schramm, *English Coronation*, pp. 20–29.
 105. Vitalis, *Historia*, p. 455, *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, pp. 264–265.
 106. Orderic Vitalis reported that soon after Henry I’s death, Geoffrey of Anjou sent Matilda into Normandy to take possession of castles that formed part of her dowry. However, a year and a half later, in May 1137, Geoffrey invaded Normandy himself, “acting as his wife’s stipendiary commander,” pp. 454, 455, 482, 483.
 107. Robert of Torigny described the near-fatal complications arising from Matilda’s second pregnancy. See *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, pp. 246, 247.
 108. *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 11–13.
 109. The *Gesta Stephani* implied that Matilda’s failure to claim her inheritance justified Stephen’s accession, since there was “no one at hand who could take the king’s place and put an end to the great dangers threatening the kingdom except Stephen, who . . . had been brought to them by providence,” pp. 6, 7. For a discussion of the role the Londonders played in Stephen’s accession see M. McKisack, “London and the Succession to the Crown During the Middle Ages,” *Studies In Medieval History: Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, and R.W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), pp. 76–89.
 110. John of Worcester called Stephen’s elevation an election, *John of Worcester*, p. 215.
 111. *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 11–13.

112. Henrietta Leyser, *Medieval Women*, p. 82.
113. Orderic Vitalis simply observed that “When Stephen, count of Boulogne, heard of his uncle’s death he crossed at once to England, and after being accepted by William, archbishop of Canterbury, and the other bishops and magnates he ascended the royal throne,” pp. 454, 455. Malmesbury made no mention of Matilda other than that she delayed her journey to England, but simply recounted the steps Stephen took to gain the throne, *Historia Novella*, pp. 26–29.
114. See Schuyler, “Recent Work of Richardson and Sayles,” p. 13.
115. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p. 64.
116. *Regesta*, III, p. xxxii.
117. *Ibid.*, p. xxix.
118. Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, p. 272.
119. Orderic Vitalis may have been offended that Matilda engaged in such activities during the holy season of Lent, pp. 513–515.
120. Much of what occurred at the papal curia is discussed in a letter from Gilbert Foliot, Abbott of Gloucester, to Brian fitz Count, see *The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot*, pp. 60–66, n.26.
121. See John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). Political philosopher John of Salisbury, was a contemporary of Matilda’s son Henry II. In the *Historia Pontificalis*, Salisbury recounted Matilda’s and Stephen’s efforts in 1138 to sway the papal curia, p. 84.
122. Contemporaries and subsequent historians alike have offered a variety of explanations for why Stephen granted Matilda a safe-conduct to join her half-brother in Gloucester, see *Gesta Stephani*, 88, Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, p. 272, *Malmesbury*, p. 506. Vitalis does not say why Stephen did it, but noted “In granting this license the king showed himself either very guileless or foolish, and prudent men must deplore his lack of regard for both his own safety and the security of the kingdom,” p. 535.
123. *Regesta*, n. 20, n. 368, n. 391, n. 597, n. 628, n. 697, n. 794. All of these charters, bearing the style *imperatrix* and *Henrici regis filia*, were issued between September 1139 and April 1141.
124. Chibnall found it difficult to accept that Matilda was functioning in England without Geoffrey Plantagenet’s participation and approval. In the face of a decided lack of documentary evidence, Chibnall remarked that “his [Geoffrey’s] assent to any grant involving lands on both sides of the Channel was clearly necessary; and it is hard to believe that there was no discussion about whether he should be associated with his wife in grants in England.” Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p. 106.
125. *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 85, 87, 97.
126. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

127. Sarah Lambert drew a similar conclusion in her analysis of the narrative sources that describe the careers of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem's ruling queens, see Lambert, pp. 153–169.
128. All of the contemporary narrative sources describe the “anarchy.” Orderic Vitalis took Stephen to task for his failure to snuff out Matilda's challenge and the resultant “rapine and slaughter and the devastation of their country” pp. 534–535.
129. *Gesta Stephani*, p. 117, *John of Worcester*, pp. 293–295, Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, p. 381.
130. *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 118–119, *John of Worcester*, pp. 293–295.
131. Matilda's charters confirm that after April 7 or 8, 1141, Matilda incorporated the style *domina Anglorum* following her usual *imperatrix* and *Henrici regis filia*, see *Regesta*, III, p. xxix. A number of Matilda's charters are difficult to date exactly, and the dates the editors assign are often a matter of conjecture. However, as late as March 30, 1141, in a charter informing the Barons of the Exchequer of a grant made to the canons of Oxford, she still styled herself *imperatrix* and *Henrici regis filia*, n. 628.
132. Matilda's first reference as *domina Anglorum* in her charters occurred in early April 1141. See *Regesta*, III, p. xxix.
133. Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, I, p. 368, Schramm, *English Coronation*, p. 57.
134. See Walter de Gray Birch, *A Fasciculus of the Charters of Mathildis Empress of the Romans, and an Account of her Great Seal* (reprinted from the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*) (London: 1875), p. 381.
135. See Susan M. Johns, *Noblewomen, Aristocracy and Power* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 122–151.
136. *Ibid.*
137. Arthur Taylor, *The Glory of Regality: An Historical Treatise of the Anointing and Crowning of the Kings and Queens of England* (London: 1820), p. 9.
138. See *Regesta*, n. 76, Queen Matilda is simply styled *Matildis Anglorum Regina*. But she also occasionally added *Boloniensium comitissa* (countess of Boulogne) to her style, n.24. As Queen Matilda was the heir of Count Eustace III of Boulogne, Stephen ruled Boulogne as count in right of his wife.
139. It is interesting to note that Matilda's granddaughter-in-law, Constance, the female heir of Conan, Count of Brittany, often attested charters and grants as Countess of Brittany, despite her successive marriages to Geoffrey Plantagenet, and Ranulf II, Count of Chester, emphasizing her Breton patrimony as she downplayed her status as a wife. See Johns, *Noblewomen*, p. 138.
140. See Schramm, *English Coronation*, p. 57.

141. See Schramm, *English Coronation*, p. 57.
142. Pauline Stafford includes a discussion of the evolution of the term *domina* as a signifier of female power, see *Queen Emma*, pp. 58–59.
143. Both J.H. Round and A.L. Poole argued that Matilda’s title “Lady of the English” described an intermediate stage between recognition of the possession of kingly authority and coronation. See Round, *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, pp. 70–75, and A.L. Poole, *From Domesday Book*, p. 3, n.1. See also Birch, *A Fasciculus*, p. 383.
144. Vitalis, *Historia*, p. 547.
145. *Ibid.*, p. 549.
146. *John of Worcester*, p. 295. Henry of Huntington reported that “The whole English nation now acknowledged her as their sovereign,” p. 280.
147. *Gesta Stephani*, p. 115.
148. *Malmesbury*, p. 517. Malmesbury claims to have been personally present at these proceedings.
149. Robert of Torigny considered Matilda’s piety above and beyond the conventional religiosity usually displayed by aristocratic women, see *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, pp. 244–245. For a more detailed discussion of Matilda’s efforts to construct the image of a pious woman, see Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp. 177–194.
150. The *Gesta Stephani* asserted that the Bishop of Winchester secretly opposed Matilda, and was only playing for time, p. 119.
151. The most detailed description of Matilda’s investment as Lady of the English was Malmesbury’s, who was personally present, *Historia Novella*, pp. 88–89.
152. Schramm considered Matilda’s Winchester election, principally by clerics, “legal anarchy,” *English Coronation*, p. 157.
153. *Regesta*, III, n. 343.
154. *Ibid.* nos. 275, 343. Chibnall has reservations concerning the authenticity of some of these charters, see Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp. 102, n.47, pp. 103–104, n. 53.
155. See Birch, *A Fasciculus*, p. 379.
156. *Regesta*, III, p. xxix, also Birch, *A Fasciculus*, p. 383.
157. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p. 63.
158. Malmesbury makes no mention of Matilda’s sudden assumption of arrogance, *Malmesbury*, pp. 520–521.
159. *Gesta Stephani*, 119.
160. See Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, p. 280, *John of Worcester*, p. 297. Writing during the reign of Henry II, Roger de Hovedon served to perpetuate further the condemnation of Matilda’s behavior, writing, “However, she soon became elated to an intolerable degree of pride, because her affairs, after their uncertain state, had thus prospered in warfare,” p. 244.

161. S. Bernard, *Bernardi Opera*, vol. 8, ed. J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot, and H.M. Rochais (Rome: 1957–1977), pp. 297–298 (ep. 354), quoted in Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p. 97.
162. *Gesta Stephani*, p. 121.
163. *Ibid.*, p. 123.
164. *Ibid.*
165. *Historia Novella*, pp. 97–99.
166. *Ibid.*
167. Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, p. 280.
168. *John of Worcester*, p. 297.
169. *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 120–123.
170. *Ibid.*
171. *Historia Novella*, pp. 99–101.
172. *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 126–127.
173. *John of Worcester*, p. 299.
174. *Gesta Stephani*, p. 135.
175. See *Malmesbury*, pp. 522, 524, for the most detailed description of the rout of Winchester, also Huntington, *Henry of Huntington*, pp. 280–281. Other contemporaries expressed amazement that Matilda, in her flight from Winchester, rode her horse in the manner of a man, *John of Worcester*, p. 301.
176. *Gesta Stephani*, p. 135.
177. Graeme J. White countered the long held notion that Henry II's succession to Stephen was inevitable. See "The End of Stephen's Reign," *History*, 75 (February 1990), pp. 3–22.
178. *Regesta*, III, n. 794. In a charter sealed at Falaise, June 10, 1148, Matilda is simply styled *imperatrix Henrici regis filia*.
179. *Regesta*, III, n. 635.
180. See A.L. Poole, "Henry Plantagenet's Early Visits to England," *English Historical Review*, 47 (1910), pp. 447–450.
181. *Regesta*, III, n.43. In this charter issued in 1144 at Devizes, Matilda and Henry granted Geoffrey Ridel his inheritance in England and Normandy.
182. The *Regesta* includes a grant dated October 1147, issued by Geoffrey Plantagenet, which mentioned the consent of Matilda, when she was still in England, III, no. 599. Chibnall has argued that the grant must have been misdated, and was really in the year 1148, to bolster her assertion that in 1148 Matilda resided with her husband and children in Rouen, *Empress Matilda*, p. 153.
183. See Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, pp. 151–176.
184. Matilda had recommended against Becket's appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury, but was overruled. Commenting on the letters Becket's adherents forwarded to her, Matilda wrote to her son, asking his intentions, and remarking, "when I know his

wishes I consider that any efforts of mine can accomplish anything, I will do all in my power to bring about peace between him and the church,” *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, V, ed. J.C. Roberston, (London: 1872), pp. 144–151, cited in Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, p. 169.

2 Her Kingdom’s Wife: Mary I and the Gendering of Regal Power

1. “Announcing the Accession of Queen Mary I,” London, July 1553 19, *Tudor Royal Proclamations, 1553–1587*, vol. 2, ed. P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), p. 3, n. 388.
2. See John Foxe, *The Actes and Monuments of John Foxe*, VI, ed. George Town send (New York: AMS Press, 1965), p. 414.
3. See Ernst Kantorwicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), and Marie Axton, *The Queen’s Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).
4. Mary was the target of a number of religiously motivated attacks against female rule. The most famous of these works, John Knox’s *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (Geneva: 1558), drew upon scripture and classical authority to demonstrate why the accession of a female ruler was a violation of the divinely ordained subjugation of women to men. Similarly, in his work *How Superior Powers Ought to be Obedyed of their Subjects, and Wherein They May Lawfully by god’s word be Disobeyed and Resisted* (Geneva: 1558), Christopher Goodman pointed to the fact that women were not allowed magistracies of any kind in England, and concluded that it was a grave error to allow one to assume the supreme magistracy of a kingdom. Other works that attacked Mary because of her Catholicism include Anthony Gilby’s, *Admonition to England and Scotland to Call them to Repentance* (Geneva: 1558), and Thomas Becon’s *Humble Supplication Unto God for the Restoring of Hys Holye Woorde unto the Church of England* (Geneva: 1558). For a discussion of these works, see Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism*, pp. 117–118, and “Women’s Rule in Sixteenth Century Thought,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40, (Autumn 1987), pp. 436–443. Also Patricia Ann Lee, “A Bodye Politique to Gouverne: Aylmer, Knox, and the Debate on Queenship,” *Historian*, 52 (February 1990), pp. 242–262.
5. See above note. 1.
6. Barbara J. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women 1450–1550* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 1–26.

7. See James Anthony Froude, *History of England*, V (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893). Froude erected the first modern model of Mary's mediocrity as monarch. While G.R. Elton did much to challenge and modify the findings of the first generation of modern Tudor-era scholars, he adopted the conventional interpretation of Mary I's reign, see his *Reform and Reformation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), p. 376, while John Guy, in his *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), summed up a century of historical interpretation, declaring that "despite the efforts of modern historiography to boost her reputation, Mary I will never appear creative," p. 226. For a concise analysis of the evolution of Marian historiography, see David Loades, "The Reign of Mary Tudor: Historiography and Research" *Albion* 21 (1989), pp. 547–558.
8. At the dawn of the Whig era, during the exclusion crisis of the early 1680s, Mary I's role as a "popish prince" gained new relevance as a warning to the succession of James II, see [anonymous] "Memoirs of Mary's Days, wherein the Church of England, and all the Inhabitants, may plainly see (if God hath not suffered them to be infatuated) as in a glass, the sad Effects which follow a Popish successor enjoying the Crown of England," *Harleian Miscellany*, ed. William Oldys and Thomas Park, 6 vols (London: 1808), I, pp. 212–215.
9. Mary I has been the subject of a number of popular biographies of the twentieth century; H.F.H. Prescott, *Mary Tudor* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1952), Jasper Ridley, *The Life and Times of Mary Tudor* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), Milton Waldman *The Lady Mary: A Biography of Mary Tudor* (New York: Scribner, 1972), and Carolly Erickson, *Bloody Mary* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978).
10. David Loades posed the first substantial challenge to conventional Marian historiography in a pair of monographs, see *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, and *Mary Tudor: A Life*. In these works, Loades stressed the efforts of Mary's government to resolve the formidable economic and administrative problems inherited from Edward VI's minority government. In the second work, *A Life*, Loades identified and briefly discussed the gendered obstacles Mary faced in establishing her authority, pp. 1–8. More recent works have centered on the history of parliament during her reign, as Mary sought statutory sanction for her religious changes. See Jennifer Loach, *Crown and Parliament in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), Michael Graves, *Early Tudor Parliaments* (London: Longman, 1990), and Robert Tittler, *The Reign of Mary I* (London: Longman, 1991).

11. This process was first begun by Paula Louise Scalingi, in her article "The Sceptre or the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516–1607," *Historian*, 41 (November 1978), pp. 59–75. In this work, Scalingi called for debate on the emergence of gynecocracy, noting that too little attention has been paid to the issue of women's government in sixteenth-century historical studies. Twelve years later, Elizabeth Russell met this challenge in her article "Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 152 (October 1990), pp. 263–276, suggesting that Mary consciously utilized her perceived political weaknesses as a strategy to override opposition to both her religious changes and her projected marriage to Philip of Spain. While Scalingi and Russell imply the impact of gender on Mary's efforts to stabilize her rule, Mary was subject to a more full blown gender analysis in a pair of articles by Judith L. Richards, "Mary Tudor as a 'Sole Quene?': Gendering Tudor Monarchy," *The Historical Journal*, 40, 4 (1997), pp. 895–924, and "To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 28 (1997), pp. 101–121. In these works, Richards challenged the assumption that the works of John Knox and Christopher Goodman defined contemporary attitudes toward female rule (see note 1) as she noted the permeability of socially constructed gender roles in Tudor England. However, Richards also noted the gendered complexity of Mary's efforts to construct a female royal persona and contract a foreign marriage.
12. The one exception to this rule was the accession of John in 1199. John overrode the claims of his elder brother's son, Arthur of Brittany. See Dominica Legge, "William Marshall and Arthur of Brittany," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 55 (May 1982), pp. 18–24. The subsequent ascendancy of primogeniture as the primary means to determine the succession resulted in a series of six royal minorities from 1216 to 1553. It is more than a bit ironic that the last of the royal minors, Edward VI, was succeeded by the first queen regnant.
13. William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England*, II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897), p. 126, F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward: The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947) II, pp. 732–733, 788. For a recent analysis of the fourteenth-century succession, see Michael Bennett, "Edward III's Entail of the Succession," *English Historical Review* 113, 452 (June 1998), pp. 580–609.
14. Richard II was the son of Edward, Prince of Wales, "The Black Prince," the eldest son of Edward III.
15. *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France During the Reign of Henry VI*, ed. J. Stevenson (2 vols. Rolls Series, 1861–64) II, p. 770.

16. See Mortimer Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems, 1460–1571* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1973), p. 129.
17. In the mid-fifteenth century, Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the Bench under Henry VI, wrote a treatise, “*De Titulo Edwardi Comitis Marchiae*,” attacking the Yorkist claim to the throne. Fortescue cited scripture and classical authorities, such as Aristotle, to refute the right of women to inherit thrones, in effect recognizing an English form of Salic law. In his political theory, Fortescue anticipated John Knox’s a century earlier. However, once Edward IV became king, Fortescue modified his position to allow for female transmission of royal inheritance. See *The Life and Works of Sir John Fortescue (Lord Chief Justice Under Henry VI)*, ed. Thomas Fortescue and Lord Clermot (London: 1869), pp. 78–81, 193, 254–258.
18. The Beauforts were the illegitimate children of John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford. When Gaunt subsequently married Swynford, Richard II legitimized their children by letters patent. Henry IV reconfirmed their legitimacy, with the added codicil that they may not inherit the crown. Nevertheless, the Beauforts served as a cadet branch of the Lancastrian Royal House until their male line was extinguished during the Wars of the Roses.
19. In 1525, Cardinal Wolsey outfitted Mary with a household and council and sent her to Wales, as the formal head of marcher administration. Even so, her father did not create her “Princess of Wales.” See W.R.B. Robinson, “Princess Mary’s Itinerary in the Marches of Wales 1525–27: A Provisional Record,” *Historical Research*, 71, 175 (1998), pp. 233–252.
20. Charles was the eldest son of Juana “*La Loca*,” Queen of Castile, eldest surviving sister of Catherine of Aragon, and Philip, “The Handsome,” of Burgundy, son of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I.
21. From a Garter manuscript, Sir. H. Nares Collection, folio MS, p. 22, cited in Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, III, 514, n. 4.
22. Henry VIII’s elder sister Margaret Tudor married James IV of Scotland in 1503.
23. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. 4, ed. John S. Brewer, James Gairdner and Robert H. Brodie (London: 1875), pp. 600, 767. For a brief analysis of the marriage negotiations between Mary and James V of Scotland, see Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems*, pp. 51–53.
24. For a discussion of the relationship between Mary’s marriage negotiations and English continental policy, see Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, pp. 21–29.
25. Edward Hall, *Hall’s Chronicle*, ed. Henry Ellis (London: 1809), pp. 754–756.
26. In August 1537, the privy council recommended that Henry’s daughters be married, but nothing apparently came of this

- proposal, see *State Papers of Henry VIII*, vol. 1 (London: 1830), pp. 545–546. In 1542, negotiations for a marriage between Mary and a son of Francis I of France fell through because Henry VIII would not allow her to be declared legitimate, while in 1545–46, after Mary had been restored to the succession by statute, marriage negotiations with the Hapsburgs, as well as a Protestant nephew of the elector Palatine came to nothing. For an analysis of these negotiations, see J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), pp. 434, 460, 469.
27. *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 3, Anno 35, Henrici VIII, c. 1. For an analysis of the Act's marriage qualifications, see Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems*, pp. 74–75, and Stanford E. Lehmberg, *The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 24, 193–194.
 28. The fact that Mary took a husband after becoming queen formed the theoretical base of the Dudley conspiracy of 1555, as the conspirators claimed that Mary had vacated her right to the throne by not consulting the surviving Edwardian councilors for their approval on her marriage, thus violating the terms of Henry VIII's will! See Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966), p. 153.
 29. See Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems*, pp. 74–75.
 30. Judith Richards briefly also discussed the gendered complexities surrounding the marriage of a queen regnant, see *Mary Tudor as Sole Quene*, p. 96.
 31. Prior to the plot to topple Protector Somerset in October, 1549, Mary was approached by conservative and Catholic magnates for support, which she refused to extend, while the Imperial ambassador reported a rumor that she was to be made regent. See *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish* (15 vols.) (afterword referred to as *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*) IX, ed. Royall Tyler (London: 1914), p. 459.
 32. See Retha Warnicke, *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983), pp. 54–55.
 33. See David Starkey, *Elizabeth I: Apprenticeship*, pp. 94–104. Starkey's analysis emphasized Elizabeth's and Mary's positions as powerful independent female magnates during their brother's reign.
 34. Mary's and Elizabeth's ability to play a quasi-public political role during their brother's reign is consistent with Pearl Hogrete's analysis of the permeability of gendered roles for sixteenth-century English women, see *Tudor Women: Commoners and Queens*, pp. xii–xiii, 9–10.
 35. John Foxe recounted in detail Mary's opposition to the religious changes of her brother's government, VI, pp. 7, 1–22.
 36. Imperial ambassador Scheyfve reported one of these visits, during Christmas 1550, to Mary of Hungary, Charles V's regent in the Netherlands, see *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, IX, pp. 410–411.

37. Edward VI conducted a sustained effort in his correspondence with Mary to induce her to abandon her Catholicism, pp. 308, 323–324, also Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, pp. 11–12.
38. Jane Grey was the granddaughter of Mary Tudor, younger sister of Henry VIII. The Third Act of Succession also gave statutory force to Henry's will, which named his younger sisters heirs to succeed failing his own children. The will ignored the descendants of Henry's elder sister Margaret, who married James IV of Scotland.
39. The question of who was the primary instigator of the attempt to disinherit Mary—Edward VI or Northumberland—is, like the princes in the tower, a largely unsolvable historical controversy. This historian will simply ask the reader to consider how possible it was for Northumberland to manipulate, against his will, an extremely intelligent fifteen-year-old king who knew he was dying. For a larger analysis of this historiographical debate, see Charles Beem, "The Minority of Edward VI," *The Royal Minorities of Medieval England*, pp. 263–267.
40. For a study of Edward VI's attempt to alter the succession, see W.K. Jordan, *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1970), pp. 515–517.
41. *Literary Remains of Edward VI*, pp. 571–572.
42. See William Huse Dunham, Jr., "Regal Power and the Rule of Law," pp. 24–56.
43. See Loades, *Mary Tudor; A Life*, pp. 182–183.
44. See Alison Weir, *The Children of Henry VIII* (New York: Ballantine, 1996), pp. 167–168.
45. See Robert Tittler, Susan L. Battley, "The Local Community and the Crown in 1553: The Accession of Mary Tudor Revisited," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57, 136 (1984), pp. 131–149. In this article, Tittler and Battley challenged the conventional dictum that the entire realm supported Mary's candidacy based upon statutory and dynastic principles.
46. Mary's first royal proclamation, announcing her accession, was issued July 19, 1553 in London, see *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, p. 3.
47. For a contemporary account from a Catholic, East Anglian point of view, see Robert Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," *Camden Miscellany*, 4th series, vol. 29 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1984), pp. 181–301.
48. Recent historiographical assessments suggest a more powerful conservative religiosity present in Edwardian/Marian England than identified in the Whig tradition. See Jennifer Loach, "Conservatism and Consent in Parliament," *The Mid-Tudor Polity*, ed. Robert Tittler and Jennifer Loach (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 12–19.
49. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 130.

50. Charles Wriothesley, Windsor herald, wrote a concise summary of Mary's accession. See *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton (London: Camden Society, 1877), pp. 87–89.
51. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, vol. XI, p. 73.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," p. 260.
54. By 1542, when Mary was 26, she was convinced she would never marry while her father lived. See *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, XVII, pp. 220–221.
55. For a discussion of women's status as their male kinsmen's wards, which prevailed in sixteenth-century English aristocratic and gentry social practice, see Warnicke, *Women*, pp. 7–9, Hogrete, *Tudor Women*, pp. 10–24.
56. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, p. 3, n. 388. Mary's use of the term sovereign lady echoed that of sovereign lord used by kings. As in the use of the term queen, which changed in meaning upon Mary's accession, so the usage of the term lady was analogous to the empress Matilda's sovereign title *domina Anglorum*.
57. This situation was remedied by Mary's first parliament, October 1553, which repealed those portions of the First Act of Succession relating to her parent's marriage, see *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, I Mary, st. 2, cap. I.
58. Henry Machyn, *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1848), p. 35. Chronicler Charles Wriothesley also observed upon Mary's accession, "the people were so joyful, both man, woman, and childe," p. 89.
59. See Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, pp. 1–7. Merry Wiesner has further argued that early-modern women who wished to assume male gendered economic and social roles did not seek to overturn patriarchy, but to create mitigating circumstances that allowed the occasional woman to fulfill such a role. See "Women's Defense of Their Public Role," pp. 1–28.
60. A number of contemporary descriptions exist for Mary's October 1553 coronation. See *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and the first Two years of Mary*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1850), pp. 28–31, also Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," pp. 275–277, John Stow, *Annales, or a Generall Chronicle of England* (London: 1631), p. 617, and Machyn, *The Diary*, pp. 45–47. For a foreign account, see *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, pp. 261–262.
61. See Laynesmith, *Medieval Queens*, pp. 82–110.
62. A number of contemporaries drew attention to Mary's creation of knights of the bath. See Machyn, *The Diary*, p. 45, and Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," p. 275.
63. Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," p. 265.

64. See Glyn Redworth, "‘Matters Impertinent to Women’: Male and Female Monarchy Under Philip and Mary," *English Historical Review* (June 1997), pp. 596–613, 599.
65. Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), pp. 34–37.
66. Simon Renard related the coronation ritual to Prince Philip, describing the ritual surrounding the creation of Knights of the Bath, which required the monarch’s presence in front of naked men, remarking that "the Queen being a woman, the ceremony was performed for her by the Earl of Arundel, her Great Master of the Household." *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 262.
67. Antonio de Guaras, *The Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. Richard Garnett (London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1892), p. 121.
68. Contemporary narrative sources describing Mary’s coronation are unanimous in their insistence that the ceremony was a traditional one in its rituals and outward forms, see *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 30, Stow, p. 617, and Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," p. 276.
69. Contemporary accounts vary widely on what kind of attire Mary wore for her coronation. The interpretation followed here reflects Judith L. Richard’s assessment. See "Mary Tudor as Sole Queen," p. 901.
70. See Laynesmith, *The last Medieval Queens*, pp. 92–94.
71. Following Elizabeth I’s reign, and her own identification as her kingdom’s wife, James I reversed the gender identity of his kingdom, as he identified himself as England’s husband. See A.N. McLaren, "The Quest for King: Gender, Marriage, and Succession in Elizabethan England," *Journal of British Studies*, 41 (July 2002), pp. 259–290.
72. For studies of sixteenth-century gender perceptions, see Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England*, pp. xv–xix.
73. John Foxe described Mary’s devotion to the "popish religion." See *Actes and Monuments*, VI, pp. 390–391.
74. Catherine was serving as regent when the Earl of Surrey defeated the Scots at Flodden Field, September 9, 1513. Catherine sent the bloody shirt of James IV of Scotland to Henry in France. The standard account of Catherine’s life remains Garrett Mattingley, *Catherine of Aragon* (Boston: Little Brown, 1941). For more recent analyses of Catherine’s tenure as queen, see Karen Lindsey, *Divorced Beheaded Survived*, pp. 1–50, and David Starkey, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003), pp. 11–248.
75. Wingfield, "Vitae Mariae Angliae," p. 271. Following her accession, only Northumberland and his closest aides were executed, as Mary initially spared Jane Grey, and forgave a number of her brother’s former councilors. While Mary easily forgave political treason, her animus toward the leading Protestant clerics, notably Archbishop

- Cranmer, is primarily responsible for Mary's popular reputation as "bloody." For a study on why Mary was considered bloody, see David Loades, "Why Queen Mary was Bloody," *Christian History*, 14 (1995), pp. 4–8.
76. The envoy of Philip II of Spain in London, Count Feria, wrote that "She (Elizabeth) seems to me incomparably more feared than her sister, and gives her orders and has her way as absolutely as her father did," cited in J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I*, p. 67.
 77. Imperial ambassador Simon Renard voiced these concerns to the Bishop of Arras, September 9, 1553, *Cal. St. Pap.*, XI, p. 228.
 78. See Russell, "Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins," pp. 263–276. The best study on Renard's and Noailles's diplomatic machinations remains E. Harris Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1970, orig. pub. 1940). Although Harbison offered a detailed analysis of the ambassador's motivations, he assigned Mary herself little agency concerning her role and influence upon the marriage negotiations.
 79. Catherine of Aragon requested the Spaniard humanist, Juan Luis Vives, to write a work especially for the edification of her daughter, *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, which emphasized women's divine subjection to men, as it heralded chastity as a woman's primary virtue. See *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*, ed. Foster Watson (London: Edward Arnold, 1912).
 80. Carole Levin has suggested that Mary's image as a chaste and devout woman bolstered her attempt to adapt the mystical attributes of kingship to the female gender, in particular, touching for scrofula, the king's evil, a ritual Elizabeth continued to perform. See Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, p. 24.
 81. William, Lord Paget was Renard's probable source for the inner workings of the queen and her privy council; Paget later likened Mary's government to a "republic" in a letter to the emperor, November 14, 1555, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XIII, p. 88. Later theoretical discussions of female rulership published during Elizabeth's reign stressed the "mixed" nature of the English constitution as a built in restraint on feminine political inadequacy. See John Aylmer, *A Harborowe For Faithful and Trewe Subjects*, h 3, and Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum*, pp. 78–88.
 82. Letter from the Ambassadors in England to the emperor, September 30, 1553, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 259.
 83. In November 1555, Paget advised the emperor, following the marriage of Mary and Philip, that "the Queen's gentle character and inexperience in governing, would be that the king (Philip) should take over the task himself with the assistance of the best qualified Englishmen in Council." *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XIII, p. 88.

84. Letter from the ambassadors in England to the emperor, August 2, 1553, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 132.
85. In her first interview with the imperial ambassadors, July 29, 1553, Mary “declared she had never thought of marrying before she was Queen, and called God to witness that as a private individual she would never have desired it, but preferred to end her days in chastity.” *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 132. Three months later, following Mary’s interview with a parliamentary delegation which attempted to sway her from a foreign match, Simon Renard reported that Mary still insisted that marriage “was contrary to her own inclination,” p. 364.
86. Mary’s Yorkist cousin, Reginald Pole, appeared to be the only notable to suggest that Mary abstain from marriage, and rule as a virgin queen, see *England Under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary*, II, ed. Patrick Fraser Tytler (London: Richard Bentley, 1839), p. 232.
87. Protestant chronicler Richard Grafton, writing in the first decade of Elizabeth I’s reign, observed that “the subjects of Englande were most desirous thereof” that Mary marry Courtenay. Richard Grafton, *Grafton’s Chronicle: a Chronicle of the History of England* (London: 1569), p. 1327.
88. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, IX, pp. 73–73.
89. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 131.
90. John Fox, *Fox’s Book of Martyrs*, 3 vols. (London: George Virtue, 1851), II, p. 1001.
91. Elizabeth Russell first suggested the inconsistencies of Renard’s opinion of Mary’s political abilities, see “Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins,” pp. 274–275.
92. The emperor to Prince Philip, January 21, 1554, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 36.
93. Grafton, p. 1330.
94. [Miles Hogherde], *Certayne Questions Demanded and Asked By the Noble Realme of Englande of her True Natural Chyldren and Subjectes of the same*, (London, 1555), p. 1–8.
95. Writing in November 1555, Paget informed the emperor that “England, which had always been a monarchy, was now governed by a crowd that it was much more like a republic.” *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XIII, p. 88.
96. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 312.
97. Simon Renard to the emperor, November 17, 1553, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 312. While this evidence is obviously hearsay, the initial printed volumes of the *Journal of the House of Commons* lack detailed descriptions of parliamentary debates for Mary’s reign.
98. Parliament’s gendered encroachment on the issue of the marriage of a ruling queen illustrates a crucial difference between

- contemporary perceptions of sixteenth-century male and female rulership; for a recent analysis of male politician's perceived rights to counsel Elizabeth I, see A.N. McLaren, *Political Culture in the Reign of Elizabeth I*, pp. 2–11, also Louis Montrose, "Shaping Fantasies: Figurations of Gendered Power in Elizabethan Culture," pp. 31–64.
99. Paget's central role in the marriage negotiations is emphasized in Samuel Rhea Gammon, *Statesman and Schemer: William, First Lord Paget, Tudor Minister* (Hamden, Conn: Archon Books), 1973.
 100. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 290.
 101. See introduction, note 59.
 102. Renard to Emperor, November 29, 1553, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 399.
 103. Ambassadors in England to the emperor, January 7, 1554, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 11. In his work *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, Vives wrote "it becometh not a maid to talk, where her father and mother be in communication about her marriage," *Vives*, p. 109.
 104. Ambassadors in England to the emperor, January 12, 1554, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 12.
 105. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 178.
 106. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
 107. *Ibid.*, XII, pp. 2–4.
 108. *Ibid.*
 109. *Statutes of the Realm*, I Marie, sess. 3, cap. II, pp. 222–224.
 110. *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, I, pt. 2 (London: 1920), p. 1277, n. 2958.
 111. *Ibid.*, XIV, pt. 2 (London: 1895), p. 108, n. 286.
 112. See J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, pp. 433–35.
 113. Simon Renard to the emperor, December 8, 1553, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XI, p. 415.
 114. *Cal. St. Pap. Span.*, XII, pp. 4–6.
 115. Philip never came to terms with the limitations imposed by the marriage treaty. Writing in October 1555, a year and three months after the marriage, Venetian ambassador Frederico Badoer wrote to the Doge and Senate, "I have been told on good authority that the King of England has written to the Queen his consort, that he is most anxious to gratify her wish for his return, but that he cannot adapt himself to it, having to reside there in a form unbecoming his dignity, which requires him to take part in the affairs of the realm." *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, I, pt. 1, ed. Rowdon Brown (London: Longman, 1877), p. 212.
 116. See Elizabeth Lehfeldt, "Ruling Sexuality: The Political Legitimacy of Isabel of Castile," *Renaissance Quarterly* 53, 1 (Spring 2000), pp. 31–56.

117. For a recent study of the controversies surrounding the reign of Juana of Castile, see Bethany Aram, "Juana 'The Mad's' Signature: The Problem of Invoking Royal Authority, 1505–1507," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 29 (Summer 1998), pp. 331–358.
118. See Daniel R. Doyle, "The Sinews of Hapsburg Governance in the Sixteenth Century: Mary of Hungary and Political Patronage," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 31, 2 (2000), pp. 349–360.
119. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 35.
120. *Ibid.*
121. Ambassadors in England to the emperor, January 27, 1554, *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 51.
122. Quoted from *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 43. Also see John Proctor, *The History of Wyates Rebellion* (London: 1554). David Loades has argued that the threat of Spanish domination was Wyatt's primary motivation. See *Mary Tudor: A Life*, p. 212.
123. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, 65.
124. Foxe, *Actes*, VI, p. 414.
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Ibid.*
127. Jennifer Loach wondered why such a "curious act was passed in Mary's second, and not her first session of Parliament." See *Crown and Parliament in the Reign of Mary Tudor*, pp. 217–218.
128. See Froude, *History of England*, V, pp. 386–387. Froude discussed what he called the "Act for the Queen's authority," suggesting that one of its main impulses was policing powers. A.F. Pollard simply assumed that the act "gave once and for all a statutory quietus to the doubts, which troubled many a generation of Englishmen, whether a woman could reign in England or not" *The Political History of England, 1547–1603* (London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1910). Later twentieth-century scholars have depended on William Fleetwood's 1575 Treatise, *Itineratum ad Windsor*, for an explanation for the motivation behind the passage of the act. In a 1964 article, William Huse Dunham Jr. accepted the historical veracity of the treatise in his interpretation of Mary as a "parliamentary" monarch, see "Regal Power and the Rule of law: A Tudor Paradox," pp. 24–56. Mortimer Levine also accepted the treatise uncritically in his explanation for the act's passage, see *Tudor Dynastic Problems*, p. 90. Rhetorician Dennis Moore cast doubts on the authenticity of the conversations described in the treatise, see "Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor Queenship Controversy," *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1987), pp. 235–251, while historian J.D. Alsop argued for the essential veracity of Fleetwood's narrative, see "The Act for the

- Queen's Regal Power," *Parliamentary History*, 13, 3 (1994), pp. 261–276. Other scholars insist that the doubts raised by common law lawyers concerning the possible alienation of royal prerogative by a ruling queen's marriage was the primary impetus for the act's passage, see David Loades, "Philip II and the Government of England," p. 177.
129. *Journals of the House of Commons*, I, 1547–1628 (London: 1803), p. 33.
130. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, pp. 15–16.
131. David Loades, "Philip II and the Government of England," p. 177.
132. *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 15.
133. *Ibid.*, p. 220.
134. William Fleetwood, "Itineratum ad Windsor" (afterward referred to as "Itineratum"). Several manuscript versions exist: *A*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner MS. 84, fols. 202–217v, *B*, British Library, Harleian MS 6234, fols. 10–25, *C*, British Library, Harleian ms. 168, fols. 1–8v. My thanks to Dennis Moore for his unpublished edited version, which draws from all three manuscript versions. The following citations follow the Harleian MS 6234 version.
135. "Itineratum," p. 21.
136. "Itineratum," p. 22. In his article "The Act For the Queen's Power, 1554," J.D. Alsop suggested that the "chancellor of the dukedome of Mediolanum" was in fact Simon Renard, pp. 267–68. While intriguing, this interpretation contradicts Renard's efforts to secure ratification and consummation of the marriage.
137. Renard reported to the emperor that the marriage treaty was "passed by all members present, without any opposition or difficulty," *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 215, as did the Venetian ambassador, Giacomo Soranzo, reporting back to the Senate, see *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian* (afterword referred to as *cal. St. Pap., Ven.*), V, ed. Rowdon Brown (London: Longman, 1873), p. 561.
138. Renard reported to the emperor on March 8 that "trustworthy and catholic men were going to be called to help Parliament not make trouble." *Cal. St. Pap., Span.*, XII, p. 141.
139. *Cal. St. Pap., Ven.*, V, p. 561.
140. "Itineratum," pp. 20–21.
141. *Ibid.*
142. *Ibid.*
143. *Ibid.*
144. *Ibid.*
145. *Statutes*, I. Mary st. 3 cap I, 222.
146. See Hogherde, *Certain Questions*, pp. 1–8.
147. "The Marriage of Queen Mary and King Philip," *The Chronicle of Queen Jane*, appendix 9, pp. 167–172.

148. John Elder, *The Copie of a Letter Sent into Scotlande of the Arrival and landing of the most illustre Prince Philippe, Prince of Spain, to the moste excellente Princes Marye Quene of Englande* (London: 1554), p. 6.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
150. On July 27, 1554, Mary issued a proclamation authorizing the use of the style Philip and Mary for all subsequent enactments of their joint reign. *Rymer's Feodera*, 20 vols, ed. Thomas Rymer and Robert Sanderson (London: 1727–35), VI (May 1509–July 1586), p. 31.
151. David Loades has argued that Mary retained significant autonomy as queen following her marriage to Philip, see “Philip II and the government of England,” pp. 177–194. Glyn Redworth has challenged this interpretation in his article, “‘Matters Impertinent to Women,’” pp. 597–613. Both historians offer intriguing evidence to support their assertions, which suggests that a gender analysis of Philip and Mary’s political marriage is long overdue.
152. Although Elizabeth never married, Mary and Philip’s marriage treaty served as a blueprint for her possible marriage to the duke of Anjou, see “Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. Marquis of Salisbury,” *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, IX, pt. 2, pp. 243, 288–293, 543–544. For a revisionist analysis of the historical legacy of Mary and Philip’s marriage, see Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtship of Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), pp. 8–9, 81.
153. Hackett, *Virgin Mother*. Hackett’s main argument is that the cult of Elizabeth replaced that of the Virgin Mary, a process that wide segments of her subjects participated in, in the creation of a particularly protestant iconography.
154. Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, pp. 16, 24–26, and Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony*, pp. 7–8.

3 “I Am Her Majesty’s Subject”: Queen Anne, Prince George of Denmark, and the Transformation of the English Male Consort

1. Stuart J. Reid, *John and Sarah Duke and Duchess of Marlborough: Based Upon Unpublished Letters and Documents of Blenheim Palace* (London: John Murray, 1915), p. 106. This anecdote is also cited in Agnes Strickland, *The Lives of the Queens of England*, VIII, p. 157. Strickland noted “This is one of those floating anecdotes which may be almost considered oral; it is, however, printed in the antiquary Hutton’s visit to London, being a tour through Westminster-abbey, the Tower, &c., published in the Freemason’s Magazine, 1792 to 1795.”

2. Portions of this chapter first appeared in my article, "I Am Her Majesty's Subject: Prince George of Denmark and the Transformation of the English Male Consort," *Canadian Journal of History*, 39 (December 2004), pp. 457–487, and are reprinted with the kind permission of the journal.
3. Out of forty-one English kings since the Norman Conquest, only thirteen were married upon their accessions: William the Conqueror (1066), Henry II (1154), Edward II (1307), Edward III (1327), Henry IV (1399), James I (1603), James II (1685), George I (1714), George II (1727), George IV (1820), William IV (1837), Edward VII (1901), and George VI (1936). Of the female kings of England, only Anne (1702) and Elizabeth II (1952) were married upon their accessions. Both of their husbands, Prince George of Denmark and Prince Philip of Greece, held the informal position of consort.
4. Post-Whig assessments of the Glorious Revolution fail to include the demise of the male consort as one of the consequences of the Revolution settlement. See Robert J. Frankle, "The Formulation of the Declaration of Rights," *Historical Journal*, 5, 3 (June 1974) pp. 265–279, J.R. Jones *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York: W.W.Norton and co., 1972), Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy, and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977), Lois G. Schworer, *The Declaration of Rights 1689* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981), and Evelyn Cruickshank, *The Glorious Revolution* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000). Recent scholarship has stressed the importance of the Anglo-Dutch relationship, and makes no mention of George of Denmark. See *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives On the Revolution of 1688–89*, ed. Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996). Also, Jonathan Israel, "The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution," *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
5. See Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England*, pp. i–xv. In his introduction, Fletcher identified a system of structural patriarchy at work in early-modern England, which denied women access to the public sphere of politics. At the same time, reflecting Judith Bennett's deconstruction of the term patriarchy, Fletcher defined patriarchy as "an unstable historical construct," constantly under pressure amid the social and political changes of the early-modern period. Within this dynamic process, Fletcher argues that "the essence of gender scheme is overlap," allowing men and women to negotiate and transgress the boundaries between socially constructed gender roles. Within Fletcher's model,

- Mary II and Anne present a striking contrast in attitudes toward their positions as royal heiresses.
6. "And that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in and executed by the said Prince of Orange in the names of the said Prince and Princess during their joynt lives," *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 6 (London: 1819), William and Mary, sess. 2, chap. 2, p. 143.
 7. Mary II, *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, (1689–1693)*, ed. R. Doebner (London: David Nutt, 1886). Doebner edited Mary II's political journal, one of its kind in the history of female kingship. Mary's observations over the course of her short reign display a wifely concern for her husband's political problems, as well as her domestic contentment with her consort-like role. For a recent analysis of Mary II's reputation as a model of domestic virtue, see Lois Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II, 1689–1695," *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, 4 (Winter 1989), pp. 717–48, and Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, The Family, and Political Argument in England 1680–1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999) pp. 113–116.
 8. Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha, Or the Natural Power of Kings* (London: 1680).
 9. For analyses of seventeenth-century patriarchal theory, see James Daly, *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), and Elizabeth Ezell, *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).
 10. John Locke, *Second Treatise on Civil Government (an essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and end of civil government), and A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. J.W. Gough (New York: Macmillan, 1956). For an analysis of the patriarchal qualities of Locke's contract theory, see Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Oxford: Polity, Basil Blackwell), pp. 34, 93–95.
 11. For a recent study of the Glorious Revolution's succession dilemma, see Howard Nenner, *The Right To Be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603–1702* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 149–249.
 12. See Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, VIII, pp. 142–143. Writing in the 1850s, Strickland observed that "The law by which prince George of Denmark was excluded from ascending the British throne has hitherto eluded our search, and it seems passing strange that a lawless precedent should be followed." Historians since have not considered the question of why George did not become king, or have simply stated that George's exclusion was unconstitutional. See William Coxe, *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818) p. 155, M.R. Hopkinson, *Anne of England* (New York: Macmillan, 1934), p. 173, David Green, *Queen Anne* (London: Collins,

- 1970), p. 94. In his work, *Queen Anne* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), Edward Gregg considered George's ill health the primary reason why he was not elevated to the royal dignity, p. 80.
13. For a succinct recent assessment of Anne's historiographical evolution, see Richard Wilkinson, "Queen Anne," *History Review*, 31 (September 1998), pp. 39–45.
 14. Richard Lodge, *The Political History of England, 1660–1702* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910). In this work, the first survey able to take full advantage of the cataloguing, editing, and publication of British historical sources in the nineteenth century, Lodge observed "Prince George was a nonentity in English affairs," p. 232. Fifty-seven years later, in what remains a still standard political study, Geoffrey Holmes assigns very little agency to prince George, remarking that on the only occasion when Anne turned to her husband for political support, she did so only because of her estrangement from Godolphin, Harley, and both of the Marlboroughs. See *British Politics in the Age of Queen Anne* (London: Macmillan, 1967), p. 212.
 15. Of all the historical figures associated with Anne's life and career, Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough remains the most fascinating. David Green, in a pair of back-to-back monographs, *Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough* (Collins: London, 1967), and *Queen Anne* (1970), assigned Anne increased historical agency in his detailed studies of two strong-willed women. For a more recent study of Sarah's political influence, see Frances Harris, *A Passion for Government* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
 16. This process started with George Macaulay Trevelyan's multivolume *The Reign of Queen Anne* (London: Longman's Green and Co., 1930–34). Trevelyan's analysis constitutes the final phase of Whig Stuart historiography, as he recognized Anne as an active historical agent: "She did not leave affairs to her favorites or even wholly to her Ministers. In order to do what she thought right in Church and State, she slaved at many details of government. II, p. 169. While a number of popular or literary treatments of Anne's reign appeared over the later twentieth century, Gregg's definitive 1980 biography, *Queen Anne*, demonstrated the complexity of Anne's role as monarch amid the political turbulence of the early eighteenth century. Gregg's analysis dispelled the myth of Anne's political dependence upon the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough and Sidney Godolphin, and demonstrated her resolve to reconcile the party divisions of Tory and Whig, which plagued her entire reign. More recently, in his work on court ritual, R.O. Bucholz has demonstrated an additional context to monarchical political power, see "Nothing But Ceremony: Queen Anne and the Limitations of

- Court Ritual,” *Journal of British Studies*, 30 (1991), pp. 288–323, “Queen Anne: Victim of Her Virtues?” *Queenship in Britain: 1660–1837*. ed. Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), pp. 94–129, and *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993). Bucholz summed up the evolution of Anne’s historical image, remarking that “For it is only in recent years that the traditional Whig picture of Anne as well intentioned but weak, dull, and easily led has begun to be seriously questioned,” p. 68.
17. John Tosh articulated an argument for the relevance of incorporating the study of masculinity in gender analysis, see “What Should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth Century Britain,” *History Workshop Journal*, 38 (Autumn 1994), pp. 179–202. Further studies of early-modern masculinity include Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain, 1660–1800* (London: Longman, 2001), Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England* (London: Longman, 1999), and Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen, “Introduction,” *English Masculinities 1660–1800*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen (London: Longman, 1999).
 18. This was one of the major tenets of the Whig interpretation of the seventeenth century. See J.P. Kenyon, *Stuart England*, pp. 1–56. For a more recent analysis of this phenomenon see Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, pp. 91–120, and McLaren, “The Quest For A King,” pp. 269–290.
 19. For a discussion of the evolution of Elizabeth I’s seventeenth-century historical reputation, see J.P. Kenyon, “Queen Elizabeth and the Historians,” pp. 52–55, D.R. Woolfe, “Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen’s Famous Memory,” pp. 167–191, and the “Conclusion” in Christopher Haigh’s *Elizabeth I*, pp. 164–174.
 20. As Henry VIII’s line ended with Elizabeth I’s death, James I based his accession on his lineal descent from Henry VII, through his great-grandmother Margaret Tudor, eldest daughter of Henry VII, the Tudor progenitor.
 21. For a recent study of the evolution of conceptual kingship over the course of Elizabeth I’s reign, see McLaren, “The Quest For a King,” pp. 259–290.
 22. See John Aylmer, *An Harborowe For Faithful and Trewe Subjects*. Aylmer’s work was a rebuttal to John Knox’s *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, the most voracious of sixteenth-century tracts attacking female rule. For a discussion of these works, see Jordan, “Women’s Rule in Sixteenth Century British Thought,” pp. 436–443, and Lee, “A Bodye politique to Govern: Aylmer, Knox, and the Debate on Queenship,” pp. 242–262.

23. James VI and I, *The True Law of Free Monarchies and The Basilikon Doron*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Toronto: Center For Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1996), *passim*.
24. See *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 132–137.
25. Quoted in Kenyon, “Queen Elizabeth and the Historians,” p. 52.
26. See Nenner, *The Right to Be King*, pp. 36–37.
27. See note 18.
28. The classic study of these historical process remains Edward Hyde, the first earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888, orig. pub. 1702–04).
29. For a recent study, see Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).
30. Both Mary and Anne Stuart received training in languages, some history, but more importantly singing, dancing, and painting. See Nellie M. Waterson, *Mary II Queen of England 1689–1694* (Durham N.C.: Duke University Press, 1928), pp. 3–9, also Henri and Barbara Van der Zee, *William and Mary* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973), pp. 57–58.
31. See Starkey, *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship*, pp. 97–104.
32. See Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed* (New York: Penguin, 1997), pp. 316–317. Although Kishlansky offered a humorous characterization of Anne’s proclivity for gambling, his overall analysis is post-Whig, arguing for Anne’s historical agency in the face of bitter, post-Glorious Revolution partisan politics.
33. See Gila Curtis, *The Life and Times of Queen Anne* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), p. 28.
34. *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. 9, ed. A.A. Ward and A.R. Walker (New York: G. Putnam, 1908), p. 449.
35. William of Orange’s mother was Mary Stuart, daughter of Charles I of England, which placed him in the English line of succession, after his wife and her sister Anne.
36. Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet’s History of his Own Time*, 5 vols. (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1833 , orig. pub. 1724–34) II, p. 132. Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, was both an historian and contemporary commentator. Decidedly Whig in political outlook, Burnet enjoyed favor under William III, but Anne despised him. Nonetheless, Burnet generally commented favorably on George of Denmark in his *History*, without the political bias he leveled toward Anne. For a recent assessment of Burnet’s *History*, see Philip Hicks, *Neoclassical History and English Culture* (London: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 126–131.
37. “Marriage Treaty of Mary and William.” The treaty outlined Mary’s freedom to worship Anglican in Holland, assigned her a considerable

- dower, and required the King of England's advice and consent for the marriages of any children resulting from the marriage. British Library, Sloane add. mss. 38329, f. 23.
38. See Stephen Baxter, *William III and the Defence of European Liberty, 1650–1702* (Westport Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1966). Baxter's work remains the most comprehensive analysis of William's continental and English careers.
 39. David Ogg remarked that, following Anne's marriage to George, "William could no longer claim to be the sole exponent in the family of virtue and Protestantism." *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 651. See also Baxter, *William III*, pp. 187–188.
 40. In a letter from the earl of Sutherland to the earl of Rochester, May 3, 1683, Sutherland remarked that "it [the marriage] ought to have been communicated to the council—that is to say, it ought to have been prevented." British Museum add. MS 17017, f. 130.
 41. Burnet, *History*, II, p. 391.
 42. See J.P. Kenyon, *Robert Spencer, Earl of Sutherland, 1641–1702* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1958), p. 87. In a letter to the Earl of Conway, May 26, 1683, Francis Gywn recounted the swift coordination of the marriage treaty and the arrival of Prince George in England, printed in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Charles II, January–June, 1683*, ed. F.H. Blackburne Daniell (London, 1933) p. 296.
 43. "Ratification of the Marriage Treaty between Anne Stuart and Prince George of Denmark," Public Records Office, SP-108–547.
 44. Sunderland's underhanded role in the marriage arrangements is described in a series of letters included in British Library add. MS. 17017, ff. 129, 130, 135.
 45. See Green, *Queen Anne*, p. 34.
 46. John Macky, *Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, esq., During the Reigns of King William, Queen Anne, and George I* (London: 1733), b2. Macky, a spy in the service of William III and his successors, published a volume of pen portraits of the leading political figures of his day, including Prince George of Denmark. Macky's description of George, while not exactly malicious, clearly labeled him as a jolly nonentity, reflecting Macky's awareness of George's transgression of socially constructed norms of masculinity.
 47. William's belief that his marriage carried a vested interest in the English crown was made explicit in his Declaration of 1688, which stated, "And since our dearest and most entirely beloved consort the Princess, and likewise ourselves, have so great an interest in this matter and such a right, as all the world knows, to the succession of the crown," William III, *The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, By the Grace of God, Prince of Orange, &c. Of the*

- Reasons inducing him to appear in Arms in the kingdom of England, for preserving of the Protestant religion, and for restoring the Laws and Liberties of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London: 1688).
48. *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde*, K.P., New Series, VII (London: 1912), p. 22.
 49. During the negotiations for George and Anne's marriage, the French ambassador Barillon wrote to Louis XIV, reporting that the Danish attempted to have William of Orange displaced in the English succession. See Baxter, *William III*, p. 187.
 50. Writing in 1710, one observer remarked that "For the security of the Protestant interest and religion, our Queen was happily marry'd to his royal highness, Prince George of Denmark," William Cockburn, *An Essay Upon the Propitious and Glorious Reign of Our Gracious Sovereign Anne* (London: 1710) p. 10.
 51. Macky, Memoirs, b3. In his brief pen portrait of George, Macky described him as "a great lover of the High Church of England, the nearer it comes to Lutheranism."
 52. Writing at the time of Anne's marriage to George, the Marquess of Ormonde acknowledged that the marriage "is a French match and contrived to carry that interest." Yet Ormonde also insisted that "None of them can deny but that it is time that the lady should be married, and that it is fit she should have a Protestant, and where to find one so readily, they that mislike this match cannot tell," *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde*, VII, p. 22.
 53. For a recent study of the exclusion crisis, see Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Still useful is R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678–83* (New York: Greenwood, 1985, orig. pub. 1961).
 54. Cockburn, *An Essay*, p. 13. Cockburn's essay, published two years after George's death in 1708, recounted his bravery in the service of his brother, the king of Denmark.
 55. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series—Charles II, 1683*, p. 244.
 56. John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, vol. 3, intro. and notes by Austin Dobson (London: Macmillan, 1906), p. 107. John Evelyn (1620–1706), a royalist supporter of Charles II who enjoyed royal patronage during the Restoration, kept a lively diary from 1640 until his death, recording his impressions of the major figures of his day, including this brief mention of Prince George.
 57. Burnet, *History*, V, p. 351. Burnet observed that George, "knew more than he could well express, for he spake acquired languages ill and ungracefully."
 58. Burnet, *History*, III, p. 49.
 59. *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, IX, part 2 (London: 1884), p. 458.

60. Macky, *Memoirs*, b2.
61. [Anonymous], *The History of the Life and Reign of her late Majesty Queen Anne* (London: 1740), p. 276. In this popular history published twenty-six years after Anne's death, her marriage still enjoyed a popular reputation as a happy one.
62. See Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 2.
63. [Anonymous], *The Present State of Matrimony* (London: 1749), p. 3.
64. *Ibid.*
65. In a letter to the earl of Albemarle, March 1, 1697/98, Matthew Prior commented on George's conjugal fidelity, "the (French) dauphin he dismissed—much like prince George, except that the one only makes love to the princess, and the other every girl at the opera without distinction." *Reports of the Royal Manuscripts Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Earl of Bath*, III (Prior papers) (London: 1908), p. 195. See also M.R. Hopkinson, *Anne of England* (New York: Macmillan, 1934), pp. 89–91.
66. Macky, *Memoirs*, b3.
67. Reid, *John and Sarah*, p. 141.
68. This recognition implicit upon Mary I's accession in 1554, was made explicit upon Elizabeth I's in 1558. See William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*, p. 18. Legal opinions incorporating recognition of the theory of the king's two bodies date from the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I. This theory provided a theoretical bolster to the authority of female kings. See Kantorwicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, and Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*.
69. Anne's need for a male proxy in the public spaces of government mirrored the restrictions placed on women of property in their own public dealings. See Mary Louise Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England*, pp. 1–113, also Susan Moller Okin, "Patriarchy and Married Women's Property in England: Questions on Some Current views," *Eighteenth Century Studies*, 17 (Winter 1983/84) pp. 121–138, for a background on propertied women's status under the Stuarts.
70. *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and his Brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester*, II, ed. Samuel Weller Singer (London: Henry Colburn, 1828), pp. 314–315.
71. Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714*, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857) II, p. 51. Luttrell's political diary briefly recorded many of Prince George's public appearances and political tasks from 1683 until his death in 1708.
72. Luttrell, *State Affairs*, I, pp. 287, 312.
73. See *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K.P.*, new series, VII (London: 1912), pp. 264–265.

74. *The Order of the Installation of Prince George of Denmark, Charles, Duke of Somerset, and George, Duke of Northumberland. Knights and Companions of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London: 1684).
75. In her political journal, Mary of Orange clearly stated her total identification with a conventional social women's role, accepting of a secondary, domestic role within her marriage. See Mary II, *Memoirs*, pp. 11, 20, 23.
76. In an often quoted letter from Anne to Sarah Churchill in 1692, Anne clearly looked forward to her own "sunshine day" when she would inherit the throne. In this letter, as in many others between the two, Anne referred to Sarah as "Mrs. Freeman," and herself as "Mrs. Morley," so they could correspond as social equals, while the men of the cockpit, Marlborough, Prince George, and later Sidney Godolphin, were referred to as "Mr. Freeman," "Mr. Morley," and "Mr. Montgomery," respectively. See *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne*, ed. Beatrice Curtis Brown (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1935), pp. 60–61.
77. Luttrell, *State Affairs*, I, pp. 328, 330.
78. On July 2, 1685, James II gave his "Regement of foote" to George of Denmark, see *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensbury, K.G., K.T.*, II, part 1 (London: 1903) p. 82. For an analysis of the military aspects of James II's reign, see J.R. Western, *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972), pp. 142–143.
79. Kenyon, *Robert Spencer*, p. 171.
80. See above n. 46.
81. See Lois G. Schworer, "Women and the Glorious Revolution," *Albion*, 18, 2 (Summer 1986) pp. 195–218. In his declaration to the convention parliament, William reiterated his suspicion that "the pretended prince of Wales was *not* born by the Queen—many both doubted of the Queen's bigness and the birth of the child," *Journal of the House of Commons*, X (December 26, 1688–October 26 1693), p. 4.
82. For a contemporary account of James II's desertion, see *The History of the Desertion, or an Account of all public affairs in England, From the beginning of September 1688 to the Twelfth of February following. With an Answer to a Piece call'd the Desertion discussed In a letter to a Country Gentlemen* (London: 1689).
83. From the Earl of Clarendon's diary, November 26, 1688, cited in Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England From the Reign of James II*, 3 vols (New York: American Book Exchange, 1880) II, p. 81.
84. *Ibid.*
85. See Nenner, pp. 147–249.

86. Ibid. See also Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy, and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977), pp. 1–49.
87. *The Parliamentary History of England*, V, 1688–1702 (London: Hansard, 1809), p. 101.
88. For a recent analysis of William’s matrimonial claims to the English crown, see Nenner, pp. 178–181.
89. See Ogg, 227.
90. *Parliamentary History*, V, p. 63.
91. “And that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in and executed by the said Prince of Orange in the names of the said Prince and Princess during their joynt lives,” *Statutes of the Realm*, VI (London: 1819), William and Mary, sess. 2, chap. 2, p. 143. For a contemporary explanation for why regal power was reserved for William alone, see “The Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen Jointly, and for placing the executive Power in the Prince alone” (London: 1689), *Harleian Miscellany*, VI, pp. 606–607.
92. For an analysis of Whig perceptions of William as an elected monarch, see Tony Claydon, “William III’s Declaration of Reason and the Glorious Revolution,” *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996) pp. 87–108. For contemporary tracts that explicitly labeled William and Mary’s elevation as an election, see “Political Remarks on the Life and Reign of William III” (ca. 1702), *Harleian Miscellany*, III, pp. 350–360, and “Reasons For Crowning the Prince and Princess Jointly,” p. 606.
93. Mary II, *Memoirs*, p. 11.
94. During William’s and Mary’s coronation, Mary was crowned in the fashion of a queen consort; according to Strickland, ‘neither girt with the sword, nor assumed the spurs or armilla, like the two queens regnant, her predecessors, Mary I and Elizabeth I’ VII, p. 25.
95. Roger Morrice, “The Ent’ring Book. Being an Historical Register of Occurances from April 1677 to April 1691,” vol. 2, *Dr. Williams Library*, MS 31 Q, 393. Cited in Nenner, p. 162.
96. For a further discussion of the gendered aspects of Mary II’s role as queen, see Weil, *Political Passions*, pp. 110–116.
97. [anonymous], *The History of the Life and Reign of her Late Majesty Queen Anne*, p. 19.
98. Gilbert Burnet, *An Inquiry into the Present State of Affairs: and in particular, Whether We Owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? And whether we are bound to Treat with Him, and call him back again, or not?* (London: 1689), p. 10.
99. “Reasons for crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange jointly, and for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone,” *Harleian Miscellany* (London: 1689) VI, pp. 606–607.

100. Burnet, *History*, V, p. 7.
101. *Clarendon Correspondence*, II, p. 189.
102. For a medical reconstruction of Anne's efforts to further the protestant succession and its devastating effects on her health, see H.E. Emson, "For the Want of an Heir: The Obstetrical History of Queen Anne," *British Medical Journal*, 304 (May 1992), pp. 66–67.
103. Luttrell, *State Affairs*, III, p. 55.
104. *Statutes of the Realm*, VI, I William and Mary, sess. 2, private, "For the naturalizing of the most noble Prince George of Denmark, and settling his precedence," p. 155. See also Luttrell, *State Affairs*, I, p. 519.
105. Luttrell, *State Affairs*, I, p. 590.
106. George of Denmark was an avid horseracing fan. See John Ashton, *Social Life in Queen Anne's Reign* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1919), p. 229.
107. See Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy, and Politics*, p. 67. Horwitz speculated on William's attitude towards George, writing "From the onset of the reign, the King had found his Danish brother-in-law an encumbrance."
108. Abel Boyer, *The History of Queen Anne* (London: 1735), p. 6.
109. One contemporary account only mentioned George's participation in William's Irish campaign in the context of a "person of quality" accompanying the king. See Samuel Mulleneaux, *A Journal of the Three months Royal Campaign of His Majesty in Ireland, together with a true and Perfect Diary of the siege of Limerick* (London: 1690), p. 7. One recent study of the Irish campaign also offered no details for George's actions, see Richard Doherty, *The Williamite War in Ireland, 1688–1691* (London: Four Courts Press, 1998). Prince George's regiment was disbanded for its allegedly catholic composition. See J.R. Western, *Monarchy and Revolution*, p. 143.
110. Mary II recorded in her journal her belief that the impetus for George to go to sea lay with her sister Anne. See Mary II, *Memoirs*, p. 38.
111. Anne's quest for a parliamentary subsidy was the occasion for a rather dramatic confrontation between her and her sister, Queen Mary. When asked, Anne replied sheepishly that it was her friends in the Commons that had initiated the request, to which Queen Mary replied, "Pray, what friends have you but the King and me?" See Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough, *An Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough* (London: 1742), p. 29.
112. Macaulay, III, pp. 86–87.
113. Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 86.
114. Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 39.

115. This episode is also described in Luttrell's political diary, *State Affairs*, II, p. 225.
116. Mary II considered her sister the prime motivator for Prince George's decision to go to sea, to bolster her political affinity, see Mary II, *Memoirs*, p. 38.
117. Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 103.
118. Luttrell, *State Affairs*, II, p. 365.
119. *Ibid.*, p. 391.
120. See *Journal of the House of Commons*, XI, pp. 566–567.
121. Luttrell, *State Affairs*, II, pp. 133, 150.
122. References to George's attendance in William's privy councils are found in *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Reports on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensbury*, II, pp. 260–300.
123. Luttrell recorded that, "following Mary's death [the] Prince of Denmark was yesterday to console the King, but his majestie being asleep did not see him." *State Affairs*, III, p. 419.
124. Sarah Churchill mentioned one other occasion of William's ill usage of George: "Prince George, following the death of his brother the King of Denmark, found means to get my Lord Albemarle to ask the King's leave that the Prince might be admitted in his mourning, to wish his majesty joy. The answer was, that the king would not see him, unless he came in colors; and the Prince was persuaded to comply, though he did it with great uneasiness." Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 114.
125. Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 98.
126. Letter from T. Brydges to Baron Leibnitz (Hanoverian ambassador to England), January 4, 1695, *State Papers and Correspondence Illustrative of the Social and Political State of Europe, From the Revolution to the Accession of the House of Hanover*, ed. John Kemble (London: John W. Parker, 1857), p. 164.
127. See Horwitz, *Parliament*, p. 205.
128. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
129. *Ibid.*
130. See Baxter, *William III*, pp. 373–374, also Horwitz, *Parliament*, p. 260.
131. See *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Fourteenth Report, appendix, part 4, The Manuscripts of Lord Kenyon (London: 1894), p. 422.
132. Van der Zee, *William and Mary*, p. 444.
133. Quoted in Trevelyan, *The Reign*, II, p. 169.
134. See William Coxe, *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818), p. 78.
135. See Van der Zee, *William and Mary*, p. 457, Horwitz, *Parliament*, p. 268.
136. The Jacobites were those extreme Tories who only recognized the legitimacy of an indefeasible royal succession, so named for their

- support of James Stuart, the son of James II and Mary of Modena, and half-brother to Mary II and Anne. James was known as the Old Pretender, while his son Charles, “Bonnie Prince Charlie,” was known as the Young Pretender. As in the supposed catholic threat, the Jacobite threat was more apparent than real; though Anne was rumoured to have favored the succession of her brother, Anne placed no obstacles in the way of the smooth succession of the Elector of Hanover. The Jacobites continue to fascinate historians: see Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Cause* (Glasgow: R. Drew in association with the National Trust of Scotland, 1986), Jeremy Block and Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Jacobite Challenge* (Edinburgh: J. Donald; Atlantic Highlands, 1988), and Murray Pitcock, *Jacobitism* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998).
137. See *Sources of English Constitutional History*, 2 vols., ed. Carl Stephenson and George Marcham (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), II, pp. 610–612.
 138. *Ibid.* Following Anne in the line of succession was Sophia, electress dowager of Hanover, granddaughter of James I and the nearest Protestant heir. Because of the eventuality of a series of women monarchs, the Act of Settlement bore a striking similarity to Mary I and Philip of Spain’s marriage treaty, in its articles barring foreigners from foreign office or inducing England to go to war in defense of lands not attached to the crown.
 139. *Ibid.*
 140. As a member of the House of Lords, George of Denmark took no steps into insinuate himself in Act of Settlement, or to oppose the prohibitions against foreign councilors and office holders also included in the statute.
 141. For a recent analysis of the shift in perception from “estate” to “office,” see J.R. Jones, “The Revolution in Context,” *Liberty Secured: Britain Before and After 1688*, ed. J.R. Jones (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 11–52.
 142. For a contemporary example of Anne’s perception as an autonomous and sovereign monarch, see Joseph Gander, *The Glory of her Sacred majesty Queen Anne in the Royal Navy and her Absolute Sovereignty as Empress of the Sea; Asserted and Vindicated* (London: 1703).
 143. John Sharp, Archbishop of York, *A Sermon Preached at the Coronation of Queen Anne* (London: 1702).
 144. *Ibid.*
 145. Sir Thomas Craig, *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England in Two Books*, trans. James Gatherer (London: 1703), p. 83. Craig originally wrote the work in Latin prior to James I’s 1603 English accession, to bolster James’s legitimacy through female descent.

- Gatherer's 1703 translation was a timely bolster to Anne's position as a married monarch.
146. Cockburn, *An Essay*, pp. 12–13.
 147. See note 1.
 148. Thomas Lediard, *The Life of John, Duke of Marlborough*, 2 vols. (London: 1743), II p. 137. Lediard remarked that, of a plan to elevate George to the royal dignity, “nothing of that nature, as I have already observed, being proposed, or so much hinted at, either in the Queen's speech or otherwise, by any member of either House.”
 149. See Coxe, *Memoirs*, p. 155.
 150. Lediard, II, p. 136.
 151. Winston Churchill, *Marlborough: His Life and Times*, 5 vols. (London: George C. Harrapond, 1933–38), II, p. 36.
 152. An alleged Tory plot to make George a king was mentioned in a letter to Robert Harley, Speaker of the House of Commons, September 1702, cited in Holmes, p. 90, and Lediard, II, p. 136.
 153. Burnet, *History*, V, p. 55.
 154. *A Letter to a Member of Parliament in Reference to his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark*, British Library, misc. 85/1865 ca. 19 (100).
 155. *Ibid.*
 156. *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. VIII (London: 1831) 1 Anne, sess. 2, cap.2, “An Act for Enabling Her Majesty to Settle a Revenue for Supporting the Dignity of His Royal Highness Prince George.”
 157. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Anne, vol. 1, 1702–1703*, ed. Robert Pentland McNaffy (London: 1916), pp. 85, 466.
 158. George was often reported to be ill. See Luttrell, *State Affairs*, III, p. 488, 502, 5, 201, 230. *Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, ed. Henry L. Snyder (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), pp. 737, 1124, *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Twelfth Report, Appendix, part 3, The Manuscripts of the Earl Cowper, III (London: 1889), p. 283.
 159. Letter from Robert Molesworth to his wife, November 5, 1702. “The Manuscripts of the Hon. Frederick Lindley Wood, M.L.S. Clemonts, esq., and S. Philip Unwin, esq.,” *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Reports on the Manuscripts in Various Collections*, VII, p. 226.
 160. Sir Jonathan Trelawny, *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Queen and Both Houses of Parliament at the Cathedral Church of St. Pauls*, November 12, 1702 (London: 1702).
 161. Coxe, *Memoirs*, p. 113.
 162. *The Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, p. 103.
 163. In 1708, N. Tate, poet laureate to Queen Anne, composed a largely fictitious poem lauding Prince George's contributions to British naval victories in his official capacity as Lord High

- Admiral. See N. Tate, *A Congratulatory Poem to his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark Upon the Glorious Successes at Sea* (London: 1708).
164. *Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, pp. 208, 296.
165. Much evidence attests that George went to the office regularly, see Luttrell, *State Affairs*, vol. 5, pp. 179, 183, British Library, Sloane add. 5440, f. 125, 128, add 5443, f. 215, 221, 223, Huntington Library hm 774, f. 3, 18–19, 23–24, 4041, *Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1702–1704* (London, 1910), 124, 228, 504, 511, 512, 535, 1704–1706, 8, 109, 112, 119–30, 133, 135, 142, 150, 160, 375, 1706–1708, 100, 108, 115, 195, 203, 207, 225, 361, 369, 418, 419, 525, 1708–1710, 33, 34, 64–70, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 216.
166. A.S. Turberville, *The House of Lords in the XVIII Century* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), p. 53.
167. Sir David Brewster, *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton* (New York and London: Johnson reprint, 1965, reprinted from the Edinburgh edition of 1855) pp. 209–210, 219.
168. “Autobiography of Dr. George Clark” *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Reports of Manuscripts of F.W. Leybourne-Popham, Esq.* (London: 1899), p. 282.
169. Burnet, *History*, V, p. 392.
170. Letter from Lord Raby to Baron Leibnitz, January 17, 1708 (179), *State Papers and Correspondence Illustrative of the Social and Political State of Europe*, p. 464.
171. Marlborough wrote to his Duchess, “The prince would not hear of George Churchill’s resignation.” *Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, p. 1035.
172. See Jonathan Swift, “Memoirs Relating To that Change Which Happened in the Queen’s Ministry in the Year 1710,” ed. Herbert Davis and Irvin Ehrenpreis. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift: Political Tracts, 1713–1719*, 8 vols. (Oxford: 1954) I, pp. 112–13. According to Swift, “The Prince, thus intimated by [George] Churchill, reported to the Queen, that Marlborough would quit if Godolphin was turned out, so Harley was turned out.”
173. *The Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, p. 999.
174. *The Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, p. 1045. George Macaulay Trevelyan, the last historian to consider George of Denmark’s political worth, “Prince George the Dane was too stupid or too shrewd to govern her (Anne’s) political action.” *England Under Queen Anne- Blenheim*, p. 177.
175. In 1707, Parliament passed a regency act, “An Act For the Security of her Majesty’s Person and Government and the Succession to the Crown of Great Britain in the Protestant Line,” to govern in the interim between Anne’s death and the arrival in Britain of the Hanoverian claimant. As Lord High Admiral, George was

- appointed to this council. *English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 138–142.
176. See *The Diary of Sir David Hamilton*, ed. Philip Roberts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 4. Anne's physician, Hamilton remarked, "I shall pass by the trouble which the Prince's death caused her, because of the happiness of her marry'd state, and her inward concern of mind, which follow's his death are so well known."
177. Boyer, *The History*, p. 357.
178. Cockburn, *An Essay*, p. 13.
179. Lord Melbourne, Queen Victoria's first prime minister, considered George of Denmark "a very stupid fellow," as he recounted to Victoria the story of James II and "*est-il possible?*" ed. Viscount Esher *The Training of a Sovereign* (Anne, Queen of Great Britain, 1819–1901. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912) (afterwards referred to as Diaries), p. 129.
180. See Robert Rhodes James, "Prince Albert: The First Constitutional Monarch?" *Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain*, 64 (1992), pp. 5–21.
181. Sir Charles Cotteril, *The Whole Life and Glorious Actions of Prince George of Denmark* (London: 1708), p. 8.

4. "What Power Have I Left?" Queen Victoria's Bedchamber Crisis Revisited

1. Royal Archives, Windsor, (afterward referred to as RA), RA VIC/C1/27, Queen Victoria to Viscount Melbourne, May 9, 1839.
2. Explanations for the Bedchamber Crisis in political histories are usually frustratingly brief. See E.L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939), p. 105, who betrayed a decided lack of historical interest, writing "It is difficult to assign responsibility for this absurd business." For most political historians and scholarly biographers, the queen's emotional dependence on Melbourne and her lack of political understanding were her primary motivations. In his work *Peel and the Conservative Party* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1964), p. 424, G. Kitson Clark offered a charitable if patronizing summation to his analysis: "She had some excuses and reason on her side, and in palliation of all it must be remembered that she was only nineteen." In a similar vein, Cecil Woodham-Smith wrote "The simple truth in this case is that the queen could not endure the thought of parting with Melbourne, who is everything to her." *Queen Victoria: From her Birth to the Death of the Prince Consort* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), p. 174. See also Elizabeth Longford, *Queen Victoria: Born to Succeed*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), Norman Gash, *Sir Robert Peel* (London: Longman, 1972),

- pp. 222–225, Dorothy Marshall, *Lord Melbourne* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979), p. 144.
3. See *The Nineteenth Century Constitution*, ed. A. J. Hanham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969). In the introduction, Hanham wrote, “Queen Victoria made it virtually impossible for Peel to form a government by refusing to change the Whig ladies of her household—a matter of minor importance,” p. 29. Similarly, G.H.L. Le May observed that “The Bedchamber Crisis was much less a constitutional landmark than a contest of personalities.” *The Victorian Constitution* (London: Duckworth, 1979), p. 43.
 4. Charles Greville, *Greville Memoirs, vol. 4*, ed. Henry Reeve (London: Longmans, 1896), p. 166. The brackets are Greville’s.
 5. Lytton Strachey, *Queen Victoria* (New York: Blue Ribbon Press, 1921), p. 115.
 6. See Richard Francis Spall, Jr., “The Bedchamber Crisis and the Hastings Scandal,” *Canadian Journal of History*, 22 (April 1987), pp. 19–39. Spall’s examination of the press war surrounding the Flora Hastings affair, in which one of the Duchess of Kent’s ladies was falsely accused of pregnancy, argued that accusations of immorality leveled at Victoria’s chief ladies extended into and affected the Bedchamber Crisis itself. See also Karen Chase and Michael Levenson, “‘I Never Saw A Man So Frightened’: The Young Queen and the Parliamentary Bedchamber,” *Remaking Queen Victoria*, ed. Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 200–218. Chase and Levenson, for the first time, subject the Bedchamber Crisis to a gender analysis, calling attention to the contested male and female spaces that constituted the obviously gendered aspects of the Crisis. While both of these studies demonstrate the complexity of the Bedchamber Crisis, they are not concerned with the Crisis’s place or significance in modern British political evolution, or its relationship to the reigns of other female rulers. In her own work on Victoria’s relationship with the evolution of nineteenth-century British culture, Margaret Homans offered a brief gender analysis of the Bedchamber Crisis. Homans identified Victoria’s insistence that the bedchamber constituted a private female sphere distinct from public politics. See Margaret Homans, *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 14–15.
 7. See Stanley Weintraub, *Queen Victoria: An Intimate Memoir* (New York: Truman Talley Books, 1987), p. 123. Weintraub saw no gendered distinctions between male and female household officers, discounting Victoria’s assertion that bedchamber ladies were her “own affair,” as he stated, “By custom, however, they were not, and court appointments reflected the power balance in parliament.”

8. It should be noted that the edited and published editions of the queen's letters and journals are not complete. Victoria's youngest daughter Beatrice edited her journals after her death, on her instructions, and destroyed the originals. However, for the period of 1837 to February 1840 there exist typed copies of the original journal, which are known as the Esher volumes. Nevertheless, Victoria's surviving letters and journal entries from May 1839 still offer a comprehensive body of evidence used to formulate the interpretation offered here.
9. For discussion of women's status in Medieval and early modern England, see Henrietta Leyser, *Medieval Women*.
10. Barbara J. Harris, "Women and Politics in Early Tudor England," *Historical Journal* 33, 2 (1990), pp. 259–281.
11. For a discussion of the Medieval evolution of the royal household, see Chris Given-Wilson, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England, 1360–1413* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
12. See David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (Totowa N.J.: Barnes and Noble, 1987), pp. 32–36, 54–59, and Pam Wright, "A Change in Direction: The Ramifications of a Female Household, 1558–1603," *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey (London and New York: Longman, 1987), pp. 147–160.
13. *Statutes of the Realm*, 1 Marie, sess. 1 caps. 1 and 2. Following her marriage to Philip of Spain in July 1554, Mary continued to formally hold the powers and prerogatives of kingship, as outlined in the Act Concerning Regal Power and the marriage treaty. As a de facto king consort, Philip received a separate royal household.
14. Mary I's bedchamber ladies lent their support to the queen's own determination to marry Philip of Spain, see *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, XI, pp. 252, 289, 328, XII, p. 180.
15. Quoted in Carolly Erickson, *The First Elizabeth* (New York: Summit Books, 1983), p. 350.
16. Neil Cuddy, "The Revival of the Entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625," *The English Court*, pp. 173–225.
17. For a recent analysis of the gendered aspects of Mary II's role as queen, see Weil, *Political Passions*, pp. 110–116.
18. See John Christopher Sainty and R.O. Bucholz, *Officers of the Royal Household, vol. 1* (London: University of London, Institute of Historical Research, 1997). The second of these works provides a complete listing of household officers from the reigns of Charles II to William IV, two years before Victoria's accession.
19. Both Sarah Churchill and Jonathan Swift contributed to the perception that Anne was led by the nose by her bedchamber ladies, see Churchill, *Account*, and Jonathan Swift, *The Last Four Years of the*

- Queen* (London: 1758). The extent of the political influence of Anne's bedchamber ladies remains hotly contested among historians. See Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, pp. 210–217, Bucholz, “Nothing But Ceremony,” pp. 288–323, and Frances Harris, “The Honorable Sisterhood: Queen Anne's Maid of Honor,” *The British Library Journal*, 19, 2 (1993), pp. 181–198.
20. See Anne Somerset, *Ladies In Waiting* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), p. 192.
 21. *Ibid.*, pp. 193–195.
 22. The Duchess of Somerset replaced the Duchess of Marlborough as Groom of the stole on January 24, 1711. See Sainty and Bucholz, *Officers of the Royal Household*, p. 7.
 23. Victoria was the last of the English Hanoverian monarchs, George I (1714–1727), George II (1727–1760), George III (1760–1820), George IV (1820–1830), and William IV (1830–1837).
 24. Still useful are Basil Williams, *The Whig Supremacy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), Archibald Foord, *His Majesty's Opposition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), and Lewis Bernstein Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, (London: Macmillan, 1957). For an example of recent eighteenth-century revisionism, see Linda Colley, *In Defiance of Oligarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), and *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Other surveys have combined social, economic, and religious factors with political analysis: see Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727–1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984) and J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1688–1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
 25. Archibald Foord, “The Waning of the Influence of the Crown,” *English Historical Review*, 62 (October 1947), pp. 484–507. For a more recent survey of the evolution of parliament, see B.W. Hill, *British Parliamentary Parties 1742–1832* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1985).
 26. See E. Neville Williams, *The Eighteenth-Century Constitution, 1688–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 67–135.
 27. See J.H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1950), p. 138, and John Cannon, *The Fox-North Coalition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 1–64.
 28. RA/VIC/QVJ/1839 (E) (afterward referred to as *Journal*), May 16, 1837, p. 223.
 29. *Ibid.*
 30. In a draft of a letter to Peel, Tory peer Lord Shrewsbury noted the similarities between the 1812 failure of a proposed ministry to require household changes and the Bedchamber Crisis. See

- Sir Robert Peel: From His Private Papers*, ed. Charles Stuart Parker (London: John Murray, 1899), p. 406.
31. *Journal*, May 16, 1839, p. 223.
 32. RA/VIC/C43/20, letter from Melbourne to the queen, May 9, 1839. In this letter, Melbourne outlined to the queen the recent precedents relating to household changes, emphasizing the point “no part of the household was removed except those that were in parliament.”
 33. See A.W. Purdue, “Queen Adelaide: Malign Influence or Consort Maligned?” *Queenship in Britain*, pp. 265–283.
 34. See Philip Ziegler, *William IV* (London: Collins, 1971), pp. 149–157. Ziegler quoted a letter from Whig prime minister Lord Grey, from the Lieven–Grey correspondence in the Howick MSS, which stated, “Queen Adelaide does needlework, talks a good deal, but never about politics,” p. 156.
 35. For more discussion of the concept and ideology of separate spheres for men and women in Victorian society, see Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), pp. 357–396. Davidoff and Hall’s analysis of separate spheres ideology has been subject to critical analysis; see Amanda Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women’s History,” *Historical Journal* 36, 2 (June 1993), pp. 383–414. For an analysis of the male role that emerged in the private and domestic space of the family and home, see John Tosh, *A Man’s Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
 36. Feminist historians make this concept explicit. See Homans, *Royal Representations*, pp. xx.
 37. Dorothy Thompson, *Queen Victoria: Gender and Power* (London: Virago, 1990), p. 23. Thompson quoted a contemporary observation that “Coming after a an imbecile, a profligate, and a buffoon, as the three kings that preceded her have been described, she had much in her favor.” For a still useful and entertaining study of Victoria’s immediate predecessors, see Roger Fulford, *The Wicked Uncles* (London: Duckworth, 1933).
 38. For a comprehensive work on visual representations of Victoria, see Helmut and Alison Gernsheim, *Victoria R* (New York: G.N. Putnam’s Sons, 1959).
 39. C.R. Sanders, “Carlyle’s Pen Portraits of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert,” *Carlyle: Past and Present*, ed. K.J. Fielding and Rodger L. Tarr (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976), p. 216.
 40. Victoria’s father, the Duke of Kent, the fourth son of George III, died on January 23, 1820, eight months after Victoria’s birth.
 41. Letter from Lord Palmerston to Sir Frederick Lamb, cited in C.K. Webster, “The Accession of Queen Victoria,” *History*, 22 (June 1937), p. 22.

42. For descriptions of Victoria's education, see Dormer Creston, *The Youthful Queen Victoria* (New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1954), Monica Charlot, *Victoria the Young Queen* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991), Webster, "The Accession," 17, and Woodham-Smith, *Queen Victoria*, pp. 87–138.
43. See Lynne Vallone, *Becoming Victoria* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 62–72. Vallone's work emphasized the political nature of Victoria's education, and the Duchess of Kent's efforts to win support for the curriculum she provided for Victoria.
44. See James, "Prince Albert: The First Constitutional Monarch?," pp. 5–21.
45. By the time of his 1830 accession, William IV was 65 years old. Although he produced a bumper crop of illegitimate children earlier in his life, William IV and his youthful wife, Queen Adelaide, failed to produce living heirs, making Victoria, the daughter of William's younger brother, the Duke of Kent, heir presumptive.
46. Letter from Leopold to Victoria, 1834, *The Letters of Queen Victoria*, I (afterward referred to as *Letters*), ed. Viscount Esher and Christopher Benson (London: John Murray, 1908), p. 48.
47. Victoria to Leopold, October 1834, *Letters*, p. 49.
48. Leopold to Victoria, June 1837, *Letters*, p. 106.
49. See Le May, pp. 54–60. Also, for an analysis of the political prerogative of late-twentieth-century monarchy, see Lord Simon of Glaisdale, "The Influence and Power of the Monarchy in the United Kingdom Monarchy," *Current* (September 1982), pp. 56–60.
50. In 1880, more than forty years following the Bedchamber Crisis, Liberal prime minister William Gladstone feared Victoria might dismiss his government. See Frank Hardie, *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria* (London: Frank Cass, 1963), p. 172.
51. Walter Bagehot, *The English Constitution* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966, orig. pub. 1867), p. 168.
52. *Letters*, p. 134.
53. *Letters*, p. 91.
54. RA/VIC/Z 493/27, letter from Victoria to Leopold, October 1834, recounting the fifteen-year-old Victoria's delight in "making tables of the Kings and Queens," adding that she had "lately finished one of English sovereigns *and their consorts* (emphasis is mine)
55. *Journal*, December 15, 1838, p. 194
56. See Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, also Marie Axton *The Queen's Two Bodies*.
57. See Vallone, p. 120
58. Victoria's conversations with Melbourne concerning her female predecessors were often light and amusing, but also revealing in the gendered differences between male and female monarchs that

- arose during these discussions. See *Diaries*, pp. 129, 223, 227–228, 230, 266, 292, 295–296, 302, *Letters*, p. 50.
59. *Diaries*, p. 295.
 60. *Diaries*, pp. 266–67. Victoria's attitude toward Elizabeth I reflects a conventional nineteenth-century attitude toward a queen who disdained wifely domesticity, see Maitzen, *Gender, Genre, and Victorian Historical Writing*, pp. 161–197.
 61. See Vallone, *Becoming Victoria*, p. 120.
 62. *Diaries*, p. 302.
 63. *Letters*, p. 50.
 64. *Diaries*, p. 129. The statement “my heart is entirely English” was first made by Elizabeth I upon her own accession, later co-opted by Anne for hers.
 65. *Diaries*, p. 298.
 66. *Diaries*, p. 309.
 67. *Diaries*, p. 273.
 68. While British women had to wait until 1918 to vote or stand for parliamentary seats, in the second half of the nineteenth century women began to obtain the right to vote for candidates offices in local and municipal government and administration.
 69. During a discussion with the queen concerning Henry VIII's mistresses, Melbourne remarked, “it was always more the woman's fault than the man's.” *Diaries*, p. 228.
 70. *Diaries*, pp. 287–88.
 71. Quoted in Gernsheim, *Victoria R*, p. 162.
 72. See Anna Clark, *The Struggle For the Breeches* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), Sonya O. Rose, *Limited Livelihood: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), Frank Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth Century England* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981), and Vickers, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres?,” pp. 383–414.
 73. *Girlhood of Victoria: A Selection From Her Majesty's Diaries*, ed. Viscount Esher (New York: Longman, Grenn, and Co., 1912) pp. 103–104.
 74. Cited in Longford, *Queen Victoria*, p. 170.
 75. See W.M. Torres, *Memoirs of Lord Melbourne* (London: Ward, Locke and Co., 1890), p. 438. Melbourne noted that Victoria “was disposed to think that the establishment of a queen consort would be sufficient for her.”
 76. Letter from Lord Liverpool to Sir Robert Peel, May 20, 1839. Liverpool reminded Peel that “when her majesty's female household was first formed, upon her accession, it was the wish of her uncle, King Leopold, which also was acquiesced in by her majesty, that persons of all parties should compose it, and certainly it is but

- fair and just for me to say that no objection was made by Lord Melbourne in several instances to appointments or offers of appointments to persons of adverse politics to himself." Parker, ed., *Peel*, p. 402.
77. See Webster, "The Accession," pp. 26–27.
 78. Greville, *Greville Memoirs*, p. 169.
 79. See Michael Brock, *The Great Reform Act* (London: Hutchinson, 1973).
 80. See Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, pp. 150–153, also Anna Clark, "Queen Caroline and the Sexual Politics of Popular culture" *Representations* v. 31 (summer 1990) pp. 47–68.
 81. Lord Brougham, *Recollections of a Long life* (New York: AMS Press, 1968, orig. pub. 1910), p. 194.
 82. See above note 58.
 83. Greville, *Greville Memoirs*, p. 169.
 84. See L.G. Mitchell, *Lord Melbourne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 232.
 85. Brougham, *Recollections*, p. 193.
 86. Greville, *Greville Memories*, pp. 160–61, *Journal*, May 7, 1839, p. 164.
 87. *Journal*, May 7, 1839, p. 163.
 88. Greville, *Greville Memories*, p. 161.
 89. The standard study of Peel remains Gash. Recent studies have attempted to qualify Gash's analysis of Peel as the central figure of the first half of the nineteenth century, see Ian Newbould, "Sir Robert Peel and the Conservative Party, 1832–1841: A Study in Failure?" *English Historical Review*, 98 (July 1983), pp. 529–538, Donald Read, *Peel and the Victorians* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), and T.A. Jenkins, *Sir Robert Peel* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999).
 90. Parker, ed., *Peel*, p. 393.
 91. RA/VIC/C 1/27, Queen Victoria to Lord Melbourne, May 9, 1839.
 92. See Spall, "The Bedchamber Crisis," pp. 19–39.
 93. *Letters*, p. 196.
 94. *Journal*, May 7, 1839, p. 168.
 95. *Hansard's Parliamentary Series*, 3rd series, 2 Victoriae, 15th April–5th June 1839, May 14, 1839, col. 1015, Melbourne's address to the House of Lords.
 96. *Journal*, May 8, 1839, p. 174.
 97. *Ibid*, p. 177.
 98. *Ibid*.
 99. Parker, ed., *Peel*, p. 389.
 100. See Mitchell, *Lord Melbourne*.
 101. *Diaries*, p. 227.
 102. Peel's familial relations are intermittently discussed in Gash. For a brief discussion of Peel's relationship with his daughter Julia, see Gash, *Sir Robert Peel*, pp. 179–180.

103. For a detailed study of emergent male domesticity in the private sphere of the middle class family, see Tosh, *A Man's Place*.
104. RA/VIC/C1/29, Victoria to Melbourne, May 9, 1839.
105. Peel recapitulated his conversation to Victoria in the letter he sent to her on May 10, the day he resigned his commission to form a government. See Wellington Papers (University of Southampton), mss. 2/58/162.
106. *Journal*, May 9, 1839, p. 180.
107. *Ibid*.
108. For the queen's version of this meeting, see *Journal*, May 9, 1839, p. 181. For Peel's, see *Hansard*, cols. 979–991.
109. *Journal*, May 9, 1839, 184.
110. *Ibid*.
111. *Ibid*.
112. *Journal*, May 11, 1839, 192.
113. RA/VIC/C1/27, Victoria to Melbourne, May 9, 1839.
114. Greville, *Greville Memoirs*, 162.
115. RA/VIC/C1/29, Victoria to Melbourne, May 9, 1939.
116. *Journal*, May 9, 1839, 182.
117. RA/VIC/C1/27, Victoria to Melbourne, May 9, 1939.
118. *Ibid*.
119. RA/VIC/C1/29.
120. See Woodham-Smith, *Queen Victoria*, pp. 176–177.
121. RA/VIC/C 1/28, Victoria to Peel, May 9, 1839.
122. A copy of Peel's letter to Victoria is in the Wellington MSS, 2/58/162.
123. Greville, *Greville Memoirs*, 163.
124. *Hansard*, col. 989.
125. Parker, ed. *Peel*, p. 4. 6.
126. *Hansard*, col. 997.
127. *Hansard*, col. 998.
128. *Hansard*, col. 999.
129. Wellington MSS. 2/58/162.
130. Parker, ed. *Peel*, p. 427.
131. Greville, *Greville Memoirs*, p. 168.
132. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
133. For a succinct narrative of these events, see Woodham-Smith, *Queen Victoria*, p. 236.
134. One unconventional and amusing indicator of Peel's place in British history was his inclusion in the photographic montage that adorned the cover of the Beatles 1967 album *Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Heats Club Band*, the only British prime minister accorded this recognition.
135. RA/VIC/L 17/58.
136. Bagehot, *English Constitution*, p. 168.

137. Later in her reign, the one exception the mature Victoria made to the exclusion of women from formal political functions were her daughters, some of whom married German monarchs, while her youngest daughter Beatrice served as an unofficial private secretary with access to government documents. See E.F. Benson, *Queen Victoria's Daughters* (New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938), and Jerrold Packard, *Victoria's Daughters* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1998).
138. RA/VIC/Y 89/37, Victoria to Leopold, May 14, 1839.

Conclusion: Does the Lioness Still Roar?

1. Scholars are generally reticent to discuss the impact of monarchy on the creation of English and British national identity in any comprehensive fashion. This leaves royal biographers and journalists as the main purveyors of such analysis. For a thoughtful introduction into this concept, see Philip Ziegler, *Crown and People* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978).
2. Both statutes remain part of the constitution. As one recent constitutional scholar has noted, the British constitution is unwritten and uncodified. See Vernon Bogdanor, *The Monarchy and the Constitution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
3. See A.N. Wilson, *The Rise and Fall of the House of Windsor* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1993). Wilson brings a journalistic tone to this discussion of Elizabeth II's transition to a media monarch. While Wilson barely hides his republican sympathies, he gives noticeable credit to Elizabeth II personally as monarch, as he derides both her family as well as Margaret Thatcher.
4. Like her namesake Elizabeth I, Elizabeth II has generated a number of popular biographies. But any assessment of her political role must await the availability of her private papers. In the meantime, for the best scholarly analysis of Elizabeth II's career, see Ben Pimlott, *The Queen: A Biography of Elizabeth II* (London: HarperCollins, 1996).
5. See Sarah Bradford, *Elizabeth* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1996). Bradford's popular biography includes a brief discussion of the queen's gendered approach to her office, pp. 247–285.
6. For an account of Elizabeth II's coronation, see C. Frost, *Coronation June 2, 1953* (London: Arthur Hacker Ltd., 1978).
7. In 1917, in an effort to distance the crown from its undeniable German heritage, George V changed the name of the royal house from Saxe-Coburg-Gotha to Windsor, prompting Kaiser Wilhelm II to request a production of “the Merry wives of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.” The origins of the Queen's declaration in council,

- April 10, 1952, that the royal house would remain Windsor, resulted from Dowager Queen Mary of Teck's hearing of the boast of Earl Louis of Mountbatten that the House of Mountbatten now reigned. Queen Mary informed Churchill, who reportedly persuaded the queen to recognize the continuity of the royal line through her. See Pimlott, pp. 183–186. Philip's protest was especially ironic, since Mountbatten was an anglicization of his mother's family name, Battenburg. See E.H. Cookridge, *From Battenburg to Mountbatten* (London: Arthur Baker, Ltd., 1966).
8. See John Parker, *Prince Philip: A Critical Biography* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1990), pp. 149–158.
 9. For the most recent scholarly study of the life and career of Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, see Robert Rhodes James, *Prince Albert: a Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983).
 10. For an early study of Queen Elizabeth II's married life, see H. Cathcart, *The Married Life of the Queen* (London: W.H. Allen, 1970). A more recent study is C. Higham and R. Mosesely, *Elizabeth and Philip: The Untold Story* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1991). Both of these works are popular biographies, reflecting a social interest in the queen and Philip's highly public marriage.
 11. For a succinct discussion of the queen's current prerogative powers, see Glaisdale, "The Influence and Power of the Monarchy in the United Kingdom Monarchy," pp. 56–60.
 12. See Bogdanor, *The Monarchy*, pp. 84–112.
 13. The "horrible" events of 1992 included the break up of the marriages of the queen's two sons, Charles, Prince of Wales, and Andrew, Duke of York, and a fire at her favorite residence, Windsor Castle.
 14. *The New York Times*, 11/2/02, v. 152, p. A1.
 15. For a study of the modern evolution of the monarch's philanthropic role, see Frank Prochaska, *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
 16. Victoria did endure gossip concerning the nature of her relationship with her Scottish servant John Brown during the early years of her long widowhood; however, during the course of her marriage to Prince Albert, she created a public image of domestic tranquility and fidelity. See Thompson, *Queen Victoria: Gender and Power*, pp. 30–61.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources

- British Library, London: Harleian Mss. 168, ff. 1–8v, Mss. 6234, ff. 10–25, Sloane add. Mss. 17017, ff. 129, 130, 135, 5431, f. 1, 5440, ff. 125, 128, 5443, ff. 215, 221, 223, 38329, f. 21, Misc. 85/1865 c.19 (100).
- U.K. Public Records Office: Kew, SP-108–547.
- Royal Archives, Windsor: RA/VIC/Y89/37, RA/VIC/C1/27, C1/28, C1/29, RA/VIC/Y65/48, RA/VIC/Y89/37, RA/VIC/C43/20, C43/34, RA/VIC/QJV/.
- University of Southampton: Wellington Papers, 2/58/162.

Printed Primary Sources

- Acts of the Privy Council of England*, ed. John R. Dasent, 32 vols., London: 1890–1907.
- The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, trans. and ed. Michael Swanton, London: J.M. Dent, 1997.
- The Annals of Roger de Hovedon*, ed. Henry T. Riley, London: Henry Bohn, 1853.
- Aylmer, John. *An Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subjects*, London: 1559.
- Becon, Thomas. *Humble Supplication for the Restoringe of Hys Holy Woorde Unto the Church of England*, Geneva: 1558.
- Bernard, St. *Bernardi Opera*, vol. 8, ed. J. Leclercq, C.H. Talbot and H.M. Rochais, Rome: 1957–77.
- Boyer, Abel. *The History of Queen Anne*, London: 1735.
- Brougham, Lord. *Recollections of a Long Life*, New York: AMS Press, 1968 (orig. pub. 1910).
- Burnet, Gilbert. *An Inquiry into the Present State of Affairs: And in Particular, Whether We Owe Allegiance to the King in These Circumstances? And Whether We are Bound to Treat with Him, and Call him Back, or Not?* London: 1689.
- . *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*, 5 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833 (orig. pub. 1724).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Anne I*, 1702–1703, ed. Robert Petland, London: 1916.

- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Charles II, January–June, 1683*, ed. F.H. Blackburne Daniell, London: 1933.
- Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, vols. 9–13, ed. Royall Tyler, London: 1912–1949.
- Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, vols. 5–6, ed. Rowdon Brown, London: 1873–1877.
- The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. 9, ed. A.A. Ward and A.R. Walker, New York: G. Putnam, 1908.
- Camden, William. *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England*, ed. with intro by Wallace McCaffery, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990.
- Carlyle Past and Present*, ed. K.J. Fielding and Rodger L. Tarr, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976.
- Certain Questions Demanded and Asked by the Noble Realme of Englande of Her True Natural Children and Subjectes of the Same*, attributed to Miles Hogherde, London: 1555.
- The Chronicle of Henry of Huntington*, ed. Thomas Forester, London: Henry Bohn, 1853.
- The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, vol. 3, trans. and ed. P. Mcgurk, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Mary*, ed. John Gough Nichols London: Camden Society, 1850.
- Churchill, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough. *An Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough*, London: 1742.
- Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, Vol. I, 1066–1625*, ed. William Cobbett, London: Hansard T. Curson, 1806.
- Cockburn, William. *An Essay Upon the Propitious and Glorious Reign of Our Gracious Sovereign Anne*, London: 1710.
- The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and His Brother Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester*, vol. 2, ed. Samuel Weller Singer, London: Henry Colburn, 1828.
- Cotteril, Charles. *The Whole Life and Glorious Actions of Prince George of Denmark*, London: 1708.
- Craig, Sir Thomas. *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England*, trans. James Gatherer, London: 1703.
- De Guaras, Antonio. *The Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. Richard Garnett, London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1892.
- Dekker, Thomas. *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyat*, London: 1607.
- The Diary of Sir David Hamilton*, ed. Philip Roberts, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Elder, John. *The Copie of a Letter Sent into Scotlande of the Arrival and Landing of the Most Illutre Prince Philippe, Prince of Spain, to the Moste Excellente Princes Marye Quene of Englande*, London: 1554.
- England Under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary*, vol. 2, ed. Patrick Fraser Tytler, London: Richard Bentley, 1839.

- English Historical Documents*, ed. David C. Douglas, New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Esher, Viscount, ed. *Girlhood of Queen Victoria: A Selection From Her Majesty's Diaries*, New York: John Murray, 1912.
- . ed. *The Training of a Sovereign . . . Being Her Diaries, 1832–1840*, London: John Murray, 1914.
- Esher, Viscount, and Arthur Christopher Benson, eds. *The Letters of Queen Victoria*, vol. 1, London: John Murray, 1908.
- Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*, vol. 4, intro. and notes by Austin Dobson, London: Macmillan, 1906.
- Filmer, Robert. *Patriarcha, or the Natural Power of Kings*, London: 1680.
- Fortescue, John. *The Life and Works of Sir John Fortescue, (Lord Chief Justice Under Henry VI)*, ed. Thomas Fortescue, Lord Clermot, London: 1869.
- Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, vol. 6, ed. George Townsend and Stephen Cattley, New York: AMS Press, 1965 (orig. pub. 1559).
- Gesta Normanorum Ducam of William Jumieges, Oderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*, vol. 2, books v–viii, ed. Elisabeth M.C. van Houts, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Gesta Stephani*, ed. K.R. Potter, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Gilby, Anthony. *Admonition to England and Scotland to Call Them to Repentance*, Geneva: 1558.
- Goodman, Christopher. *How Superior Powers Ought to be Obeyed of Their Subjects, and Wherein They May By God's Word be Disobeyed and Resisted*, Geneva: 1558.
- Grafton, Richard. *Grafton's Chronicle: A Chronicle of the History of England*, London: 1569.
- Greville, Charles. *The Greville Memoirs*, vol. 4, ed. Henry Reeve, London: Longmans, 1896.
- Hall, Edward. *Hall's Chronicle*, ed. Henry Ellis, London: 1809.
- Hansard's Parliamentary Series*, third series, 2 Victoriae 1839, xlvii, 15th April–5th June, 1839.
- Harleian Miscellany*, 6 vols., ed. William Oldys and Thomas Park, London: 1808–1810.
- Henry of Huntington. *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntington*, ed. Thomas Forester, London: Henry Bohn, 1853.
- History of the Desertion, or An Account of All public Affairs in England, From the Beginning of September 1688 to the Twelfth of February following. With an Answer to a Piece Call'd the Desertion Discussed In a Letter to a Country Gentleman*, London: 1689.
- [Anonymous], *The History of the Life and Reign of Her Late Majesty Queen Anne*, London: 1740.
- Hovedon, Roger de. *The Annals of Roger de Hovedon*, vol. 1, ed. Henry T. Riley, London: Henry Bohn, 1853.

- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888 (orig. pub. 1702–04).
- James VI and I. *The True Law of Free Monarchies and the Basilikon Doron*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1996.
- . *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- John and Sarah, Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, Based on Unpublished Letters and Documents at Blenheim Palace*, ed. Stuart Reid, London: John Murray, 1915.
- John of Salisbury. *Historia Pontificalis*, trans. and ed. Marjorie Chibnall, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Journals of the House of Commons*, vol. 1, 1547–1628, London: 1803, vol. 10, Dec 26 1688–Oct. 26 1693,
- Knox, John. *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, Geneva: 1558.
- Lediard, Thomas. *The Life of John, Duke of Marlborough*, vol. 1, London: 1743.
- Leslie, John. *A Defence of the honour of Marie Quene of Scotland*, London: 1569.
- The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot*, second edition., ed. N. Brooke, Dom Adrian Morey, and C.N.L. Brooks, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne*, ed. Beatrice Curtis Brown, New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1935.
- Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols., ed. John S. Brewer, James Gairdner, and Robert H. Brodie, London: 1920–32.
- [Anonymous], *The Life of Queen Anne*, London: 1721.
- Literary Remains of Edward VI*, ed. John Gough Nichols, London: Roxburgh Club, 1858.
- Locke, John. *Second Treatise on Civil Government (an essay Concerning the True original, Extent, and end of Civil government), and a Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. J.W. Gough, New York: Macmillan, 1956.
- Luttrell, Narcissus. *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714*, 6 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857.
- Machyn, Henry. *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. John Gough Nichols, London: Camden Society, 1848.
- Macky, John. *Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, esq., During the Reigns of King William, Queen Anne, and George I*, London: 1733.
- Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1702–1704, 1704–1706, 1706–1708, 1708–1710*, London: 1910–1921.
- The Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, six volumes, ed. Henry I. Snyder, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

- Mary II. *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England (1689–1693)*, ed. R. Doebner, London: David Nutt, 1886.
- Mulleneaux, Samuel. *A Journal of the Three Months Campaign of His Majesty in Ireland, Together with a True and Perfect Diary of the Siege of Limerick*, London: 1690.
- The Order of the Installation of Prince George of Denmark, Charles, Duke of Somerset, and George, Duke of Northumberland. Knights and Companions of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, London: 1684.
- The Parliamentary History of England*, vols. 3–6. London: 1762–1810.
- [Anonymous], *The Present State of Matrimony*, London: 1749.
- Proctor, John. *The Historie of Wyates Rebellion*, London: 1554.
- Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, vol. 2, ed. C. Johnson and H.A. Cronne, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- . vol. 3, ed. H.A. Cronne and R.H.C. Davis, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Ninth Report, part II, London: 1882, Twelfth Report, Appendix, part III, The manuscript of the Earl Cowper, K.G., London: 1889, Twelfth Report, Appendix, part V, The manuscripts of the Duke of Rutland, K.G., ii, London: 1889, Fourteenth Report, Appendix, part IV, The Manuscripts of Lord Kenyon, London: 1894, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honorable Marquis of Salisbury, K.G. (The Cecil Papers), pts 1 and 2, London: 1896, Report on the Manuscripts of F.W. Leybourne-Popham, esq., London: 1899, Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Ormonde, II, London: 1899, new series, VII, London: 1912, Fifteenth Report, Appendix, part VII, The Manuscripts of the Duke of Somerset, the Marquis of Ailesbury, and the Rev. Sir T.H.G. Puleston, Bart., London: 1898, Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensbury, II, parts I and II, London: 1903, Report on the Manuscripts in Various collections, viii, The Manuscripts of the Honorable Frederick Lindley Wood, M.L.S. Clements, esq., S. Philip Unwin, esq., London: 1913.
- Rymer's Foedera*, ed. Thomas Rymer and Robert Sanderson, 20 vols., London: 1727–35.
- Sharp, John, Archbishop of York. *A Sermon preached at the coronation of Queen Anne*, London: 1702.
- Sir Robert Peel: From His Private Papers*, ed. Charles Stuart Parker, London: John Murray, 1899.
- Smith, Thomas. *De Republica Anglorum*, ed. L. Alston, New York: Harper and Row, 1973 (orig. pub. 1584).
- Sources of English Constitutional History*, vol. 2, ed. Carl Stephenson and George Frederick Marcham, New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- State Papers and Correspondence Illustrative of the Social and Political State of Europe From the Revolution to the Accession of the House of Hanover*, ed. John Kemble, London: John Parker and Sons, 1857.

- State Papers of Henry VIII*, vol. 1, London: 1830.
- Statutes of the Realm*, 35 Henry VIII, cap. I, 1 Marie, sess. 2, cap. I, 1 Marie, sess. 3, cap. II, 1 William and Mary, sess. 2, cap. II, private, 7 and 8 William III, cap. 30, 1 Anne, sess. 2, cap. 2, 1 Vic, cap. 77.
- Stow, John. *Annales, or a Generall chronicle of England*, ed. Edmund Howes, London: 1631.
- Swift, Jonathan. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift: Political Tracts, 1713–1719*, ed. Herbert Davis and Irwin Ehrenpreis, 8 vols., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- . *The Last Four Years of the Queen*, London: 1758.
- Tate, N. *A Congratulatory Poem to His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark Upon the Glorious Successes at Sea*, London: 1708.
- Torres, W.M., ed., *Memoirs of Lord Melbourne*, London: Ward, Locke, and Co., 1890.
- Trelawny, Sir Jonathan. *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Queen and Both Houses of Parliament at the Cathedral of St. Pauls, Nov. 12, 1702*, London: 1702.
- Tudor Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, ed. P.L. Hughes and J.L. Larkin, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Vitalis, Orderic. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, vol. 6, ed. Marjorie Chibnall, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*, ed. Foster Watson, London: Edward Arnold, 1910.
- William III, King of England, *Declaration of His Highness William Henry, By the Grace of God Prince of Orange, & of the Reasons Inducing Him to Appear in Arms in the Kingdome of England for Preserving the Protestant Religion*. London: 1688.
- William of Malmesbury's Chronicle of the Kings of England*, ed. J.A. Giles, London: Henry Bohn, 1897.
- William of Malmesbury's Historia Novella*, ed. Edmund King, trans. K.R. Potter, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Wingfield, Robert. "Vitae Mariae Angliae Reginae," *Camden Miscellany*, fourth series, 29, London: Royal Historical Society, 1984, pp. 181–301.
- Wriothesley, Charles. *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton, London: Camden Society, 1877.

Secondary Sources

- Alsop, J.D. "The Act for the Queen's Regal Power," *Parliamentary History*, 13, 3 (1994), pp. 261–276.
- Ambiguous Realities*, ed. Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Amussen, Susan. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Analyzing Gender*, ed. Beth B. Hess and Myra Marx Ferec, Newberry Park: Sage Productions, 1987.

- The Anarchy of Stephen's Reign*, ed. Edmund King. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan Israel, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Anglo, Sydney. *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*, second ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Aram, Bethany. "Juana 'the Mad's' Signature: The Problem of Invoking Royal Authority, 1505–1507," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 29 (Summer 1998), pp. 331–358.
- Ashton, John. *Social Life in Queen Anne's Reign*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1919.
- Axton, Marie. *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession*, London: Royal Historical Society, 1977.
- Bagehot, Walter. *The English Constitution*, Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966 (orig. pub. 1867).
- Barlow, Frank. *The Feudal Kingdom of England*, second ed., London: Longmans, 1961.
- Bartlett, Robert. *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Bassnet, Susan. *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective*, Oxford: Berg, 1988.
- Baxter, Stephen. *William III and the Defense of European Liberty*, London: Macmillan, 1966.
- Beem, Charles E. *The Royal Minorities of Medieval England*, M.A. Thesis, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, 1990.
- Bennett, Judith. "Feminism and History," *Gender and History*, 1 (1989), pp. 259–263.
- . *Medieval Women in Modern Perspective*, Washington D.C.: American Historical Association, 2000.
- Benson, E.F. *Queen Victoria's Daughters*, New York and London: D. Appleton-Century co., 1938.
- Bindoff, S.T. *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons*, vol. 3, London: Secker and Warburg, 1982.
- Birch, Walter de Gray. *A Fasciculus of the Charters of Mathildis Empress of the Romans and an Account of her Great Seal* (reprinted from the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*), London: 1875.
- Bloch, Marc. *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*, trans. J.E. Anderson, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Block, Jeremy, and Evelyn Cruickshanks. *The Jacobite Challenge*, Edinburgh: J. Donald; Atlantic Highlands, 1988.
- Bogdanor, Vernon. *The Monarchy and the Constitution*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Bradbury, Jim. *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War, 1139–1154*, Stroud, Gloucestershire: Alan Sutton, 1996.
- Bradford, Sarah. *Elizabeth*, New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1996.

- Brewster, Sir David. *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton*, New York and London: Johnson Reprint, 1965, reprinted from the Edinburgh edition of 1851.
- Brewster, Sir David. *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton*, New York and London: Johnson Reprint, 1965, reprinted from the Edinburgh edition of 1855.
- Briacombe, Peter. *All the Queen's Men: The World of Elizabeth I*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Briggs, Asa. *A Social History of England*, New York: Viking, 1983.
- Brock, Michael. *The Great Reform Act*, London: Hutchinson, 1973.
- Bucholz, R.O. "Nothing But Ceremony: Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual," *Journal of British Studies*, 30, (July 1991), pp. 288–323.
- . *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Burnet, Gilbert. *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, vol. 2, New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1848 (orig. pub. 1665).
- Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. 9, ed. A.A. Ward and A.R. Walker, New York: G. Putnam, 1908.
- Carter, Philip. *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain, 1660–1800*, Singapore: Pearson Education, 2001.
- Cathcart, H. *The Married Life of the Queen*, London: W.H. Allen, 1970.
- Chapman, Hester. *Queen Anne's Son*, London: Abdre Deutsch, 1954.
- Charlot, Monica. *Victoria the Young Queen*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- Chibnall, Marjorie. *The Empress Matilda*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- . "Women in Orderic Vitalis," *Haskins Society Journal*, 2 (1990), pp. 105–121.
- Churchill, Winston. *Marlborough: His Life and Times*, five vols., London: George C. Harrapond, 1933–38.
- Clark, Alice. *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*, New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Clark, Anna. *The Struggle For the Breeches*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- . *Scandal: The Sexual Politics of the British Constitution*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Clark, G. Kitson. *Peel and the Conservative Party*, Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1964.
- Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1688–1832*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1985.
- Clifford, Henry. *The Life of Jane Dormer*, ed. James Stephenson, London: 1887.
- Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women*, ed. Mary S. Hartman and Lois Banner, New York: Harper Colophon, 1974.
- Colley, Linda. *In Defiance of Oligarchy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

- Coole, Diana. *Women in Political Theory: From Ancient Misogyny to Contemporary Feminism*, New York: Harvester/Wheatshaft, 1993.
- Coxe, William. *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough*, London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818.
- Creighton, Mandell. *Queen Elizabeth*, New York: Thom Y. Crowell, 1966 (orig. pub. 1899).
- Creston, Dormer. *The Youthful Queen Victoria*, New York: G. Putnam and Sons, 1954.
- Cronne, H.A. *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135–1154: Anarchy in England*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.
- Cruikshanks, Evelyn. *The Glorious Revolution*, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2000.
- Curtis, Gila. *The Life and Times of Queen Anne*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.
- Daly, James. *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Daughters, Wives, and Widows*, ed. Joan Larsen Klein, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1987.
- Davis, R.H.C. *King Stephen*, third ed., London: Longman, 1990 (first pub. 1967).
- Davis, W.H.C. "Henry of Blois and Brian Fitzcount," *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), pp. 297–303.
- Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker, London: Dale University Press, 1998.
- Doherty, Richard. *The Williamite War in Ireland, 1688–1691*, London: Four Courts Press, 1998.
- Doran, Susan. *Marriage and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- . "Elizabeth I: Gender, Power, and Politics," *History Today*, 53, 5 (2003), pp. 29–35.
- Doyle, Daniel. "The Sinews of Hapsburg Governance in the Sixteenth Century: Mary of Hungary and Political Patronage," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 31, 2 (2000), pp. 349–60.
- Dunham, William Huse Jr. "Regal Power and the Rule of Law: a Tudor Paradox," *Journal of British Studies*, 3 (May 1964), pp. 24–56.
- Earenfight, Theresa. "Maria of Castile, Ruler or Figurehead?" *Mediterranean Studies*, 4 (1994), pp. 45–61.
- Elton, G.R. *England Under the Tudors*, New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.
- . *Reform and Reformation*, London: Edward Arnold, 1977.
- Emson, H.E. "For Want of an Heir: The Obstetrical History of Queen Anne," *British Medical Journal*, 304, May 1992, pp. 66–67.
- The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey. London and New York: Longman, 1987.

- English Masculinities, 1660–1800*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen, London: Longman, 1999.
- Erickson, Carolly. *Bloody Mary*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.
- . *The First Elizabeth*, New York: Summit Books, 1983.
- Erickson, Mary Louise. *Women and Property in Early Modern England*, New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Evan, Eric J. *Sir Robert Peel: Statemanship, Power, and Party*, London: Routledge, 1991.
- Ezell, Margaret J.M. *The Patriarch's Wife*, Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Fell, Christine. *Women in Anglo-Saxon England*, London: Colonnade, 1984.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England*, New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Foord, Archibald. "The Waning of the Influence of the Crown," *English Historical Review*, vol. 62 (Oct. 1947), pp. 484–507.
- . *His Majesty's Opposition*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "Placing Women's History in History," *New Left Review*, 133 (May/June 1982), pp. 5–29.
- Foyster, Elizabeth A. *Manhood in Early Modern England*, London: Longman, 1999.
- Frankle, Robert J. "The Formulation of the Declaration of Rights," *Historical Journal*, 5, 3 (June 1974), pp. 265–79.
- Fraser, Antonia. *The Warrior Queens*, New York: Vintage Books, 1988.
- Frost, C. *Coronation June 2 1953*, London: Arthur Hacker Ltd., 1978.
- Froude, James Anthony. *History of England*, vol. 5, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893.
- . *The Political History of England, 1547–1603*. London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1910.
- . *The Reign of Elizabeth*, 5 vols., London: J.M. Dent, 1911.
- Frye, Susan. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Fulford, Roger. *The Prince Consort*, New York: Macmillan, 1945.
- . *The Wicked Uncles*, London: Duckworth, 1933.
- Gammon, Samuel Rhea. *Statesman and Schemer: William, First Lord Paget, Tudor Minister*, Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1973.
- Gash, Norman. *Sir Robert Peel*, London: Longman, 1972.
- Gernsheim, Helmut, and Alison Gernsheim. *Victoria R*, New York: G. Putnam and Sons, 1959.
- Gillingham, John. "Love, Marriage, and Politics in the Twelfth Century," *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 25 (1989), pp. 292–303.
- Given-Wilson, Chris. *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics And Finance in England, 1360–1413*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Graves, Michael. *Early Tudor Parliaments*, London: Longman, 1990.
- Green, David. *Sarah Duchess of Marlborough*, London: Collins, 1967.

- . *Queen Anne*, London: Collins, 1970.
- Green, Judith. *The Government of England Under Henry I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- . "Aristocratic Women in Early Twelfth Century England," *Anglo-Norman Political Culture in Early Twelfth Century England*, ed. C. Warren Hollister, Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1997, pp. 60–72.
- Gregg, Edward. *Queen Anne*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Guy, John. *Tudor England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence, Cambridge Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1982.
- Hackett, Helen. *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Haigh, Christopher. *Elizabeth I*, New York: Longman, 1988.
- Hallam, Henry. *Constitutional History of England*, Boston: Wells and Lily, 1829.
- Harbison, E. Harris. *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary*, Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1970 (orig. pub. 1940).
- Hardie, Frank. *The Political Influence of Queen Victoria*, London: Frank Cass, 1963.
- Harris, Barbara J. "Women and Politics in Early Modern England," *Historical Journal*, 33, 2 (1990), pp. 259–81.
- . *English Aristocratic Women 1450–1550*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Harris, Frances. *A Passion for Government*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Harrison, Dick. *The Age of Abbesses and Queens: Gender and Political Culture in Medieval Europe*, Lund, Sweden: Nordic Academic Press, 1998.
- Heisch, Alison. "Queen Elizabeth and the Persistence of Patriarchy," *Feminist Review*, 4 (1980), pp. 45–75.
- Hicks, Philip. *Neoclassical History and English Culture*, London: Macmillan, 1996.
- High and Mighty Queens of England: Realities and Representations*, ed. Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barrett-Graves, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Higham, C., and R. Mosesley. *Elizabeth and Philip: The Untold Story*, London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1991.
- Hill, Bridget. *Women, Work, and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth Century England*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Hoff, Joan. "Gender as a Postmodern Category of Paralysis," *Women's History Review*, 3, 2 (1994), pp. 80–99.
- Hogrete, Pearl. *Tudor Women*, Ames, Iowa: Iowa University Press, 1975.
- Hollister, C. Warren. "The Anglo-Norman Succession Debate of 1126: Prelude to Stephen's Anarchy," *Journal of Medieval History*, 1 (April 1975), pp. 19–42.
- . *Henry I*, completed and edited by Amanda Clark Frost, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2001.

- Holmes, Geoffrey. *British Politics in the Age of Queen Anne*, London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Homans, Margaret. *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837–1876*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Women Who Would Be Kings: Female Rulers of the Sixteenth Century*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Hopkinson, M.R. *Anne of England*, New York: Macmillan, 1934.
- Horwitz, Henry. *Parliament, Policy, and Politics in the Reign of William III*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977.
- Houghton, John W. "No Bishop, No Queen: Queens Regnant and the Ordination of Women," *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 67 (1998), pp. 2–25.
- Hudson, John. *Land, Law, Lordship in Anglo-Norman England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Hutchings, Michael. "The Reign of Mary Tudor: A Reassessment," *History Review* (March 1999), pp. 1–21.
- Hutton, Ronald. *Charles the Second, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- James, Robert Rhodes. *Prince Albert*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.
- . "Prince Albert: First Constitutional Monarch?" *Proceedings of the Royal Institute of Great Britain*, 64 (1992), pp. 5–21.
- Jenkins, Elizabeth. *Elizabeth the Great*, New York: Coward-McCann, 1959.
- Jenkins, T.A. *Sir Robert Peel*, London: Macmillan, 1999.
- Johns, Susan M. *Noblewomen, Aristocracy and Power*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Johnson, Allen. *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997.
- Jones, Michael. *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jones, R. *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678–83*, New York: Greenwood 1985 (orig. pub. 1961).
- Jordan, Constance. "Women's Rule in Sixteenth Century British Thought," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (Autumn 1987), pp. 421–51.
- . *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*, Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Jordan, W.K. *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power*, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1970.
- Kantorwicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Theology*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kenyon, J.P. *Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, 1641–1702*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.
- . *Stuart England*, second ed., London: Penguin, 1978.
- . *The Stuart Constitution, 1603–1688*, second ed., New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed., Anne Duggan. London: Kings College London Centre for Late Antique and medieval Studies, 1993.
- Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603–1714*, New York: Penguin, 1997.
- Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Langford, Paul. *A Polite and Commercial People: England, 1727–1783*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Law and Government Under the Tudors*, ed. Clair Cross, David Loades, and J.J. Scarisbrick, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Laynesmith, Jane. *The Last Medieval Queens*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lee, Patricia Ann. "A Bodye Politique to Govern: Aylmer, Knox, and the Debate on Queenship," *Historian*, 52 (February 1990), pp. 242–262.
- Legge, Dominica. "William Marshall and Arthur of Brittany," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 55 (May 1982), pp. 18–24.
- Lehfeldt, Elizabeth. "Ruling Sexuality: The Political Legitimacy of Isabel of Castile," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, 1 (2000), pp. 31–56.
- LeMay, G.H. L. *The Victorian Constitution*, London: Duckworth, 1979.
- Lenman, Bruce. *The Jacobite Cause*, Glasgow: R. Drew in association with the National Trust of Scotland, 1986.
- Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Levin, Carole. *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1994.
- Levine, Mortimer. *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- . *Tudor Dynastic Problems, 1460–1571*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1973.
- Lewis, A.W. *Royal Succession in Capetian France: Studies on Familial Order and the State*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University press, 1981.
- Leyser, Henrietta. *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women In England, 450–1500*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1995.
- Leyser, Karl. *Medieval Germany and Its Neighbors*, London: Hambledon Press, 1982.
- . "The Anglo-Norman Succession, 1120–1125," *Anglo-Norman Studies*, xiii, ed. Marjorie Chibnall, Woodridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1991.
- Liberty Secured: Britain Before and After 1688*, ed. J.R. Jones, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Lindsey, Karen. *Divorced Beheaded Survived: A Feminist Reinterpretation of the Wives of Henry VIII*, Reading, Mass.: Perseus Books, 1995.
- Loach, Jennifer. *Crown and Parliament in the Reign of Mary Tudor*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

- Loades, David. *The Tudor Court*, Totowa N.J.: Barnes and Noble, 1987.
- . “The Reign of Mary Tudor: Historiography and Research,” *Albion*, 21 (1989), pp. 547–58.
- . *Mary Tudor: A Life*, London: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- . *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, second ed., London: Longmans, 1991.
- . “Why Queen Mary was Bloody,” *Christian History*, 14 (1995), pp. 4–8.
- Lodge, Richard. *The Political History of England, 1660–1702*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910.
- Longford, Elizabeth. *Queen Victoria: Born to Succeed*, New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *The History of England From the Reign of James II*, 3 vols., New York: American Book Exchange, 1880.
- Maitzen, Rohan Amanda. *Gender, Genre, and Victorian Historical Writing*, New York: Garland, 1998.
- Marshall, Dorothy. *Lord Melbourne*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979.
- Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D.M. Hadley, London: Longman, 1999.
- Mattingly, Garret. *Catherine of Aragon*, Boston: Little Brown, 1941.
- McCaffery, Wallace. *Elizabeth I*, New York: Edward Arnold, 1993.
- McLaren, A.N. *Political Culture in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Queen and Commonwealth, 1558–1585*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . “The Quest for a King: Gender, Marriage, and Succession in Elizabethan England,” *Journal of British Studies*, 41 (July 2002), 259–290.
- Medieval Queenship*, ed. John Carmi Parson, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993.
- Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker, Oxford: Studies in Church History, Subsidia I, 1978.
- The Mid-Tudor Polity*, ed. Robert Tittler, and Jennifer Loach, Totowa N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980.
- Mitchell, L.G. *Lord Melbourne, 1779–1848*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Monod, Paul Kleber. *The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe*, New Haven, Conn.: 1999.
- Muller, James Arthur. *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*, New York: Macmillan, 1926.
- Myers, Henry A. *Medieval Kingship*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1982.
- Namier, Lewis Bernstein. *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, London: MacMillan, 1957.
- Neale, J.E. *Queen Elizabeth I*, New York: Anchor Books, 1957 (orig. pub. 1934).

- Nenner, Howard. *The Right To Be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603–1702*, Chapel Hill N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Newbound, Ian. "Sir Robert Peel and the Conservative Party: A Study in Failure?," *English Historical Review*, 98 (July 1983), pp. 529–538.
- Newman, Charlotte. *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- The New York Times*, 11/02/02, v. 152, p. A1.
- The Nineteenth Century Constitution*, ed. A.J. Hanham, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Ogg, David. *England in the Reign of Charles II*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Okin, Susan Muller. "Patriarchy and Married Women's Property in England: Questions on Some Current Views," *Eighteenth Century Studies*, 17 (Winter 1983/84), pp. 121–138.
- On the Laws and Customs of England*, ed. Morris S. Arnold, Thomas A. Green, Sally A. Scully, and Stephen D. White, Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- The Oxford Illustrated History of England*, ed. Kenneth O. Morgan, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Packard, Jerrold. *Victoria's Daughters*, New York: St. Martins Griffin, 1998.
- Pain, Nesta. *Empress Matilda: Uncrowned Queen of England*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978.
- Parker, John. *Prince Philip: A Critical Biography*, London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1990.
- Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*, Oxford: Polity Press, 1988.
- . *The Disorder of Women*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.
- Pimlott, Ben. *The Queen: A Biography of Elizabeth II*, London: Harper Collins, 1996.
- Pitcock, Murray. *Jacobinism*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Plumb, J.H. *England in the Eighteenth Century*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1950.
- Pollard, A.F. *The Political History of England, 1547–1603*, London: Longman, Green, and Co., 1910.
- Pollock, Frederic, and Frederic Maitland. *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1968 (orig. pub. 1898).
- Poole, A.L. "Henry Plantagenet's Early Visits to England," *English Historical Review*, 47 (1932), pp. 447–450.
- . *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Prescott, H.F.M. *Mary Tudor*, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1952.
- Prochaska, Frank. *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth Century England*, Oxford, 1980.

- Prochaska, Frank. *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Queen Elizabeth I: Most Politick Princess*, ed. Simon Adams, London: History Today, 1983.
- Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne Duggan, Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1997.
- Queenship in Britain: 1660–1837*, ed. Clarissa Campbell Orr, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Read, Donald. *Peel and the Victorians*, Oxford: Basil Blackwe, 1987.
- Redworth, Glyn. "Matters Impertinent to Women": Male and Female Monarchy Under Philip and Mary, *English Historical Review* (June 1997), pp. 597–613.
- . *In Defence of the Church Catholic: The Life of Stephen Gardiner*, Cambridge, Mass.: B. Blackwell, 1990.
- Reilly, Bernard F. *The Kingdom of Leon-Castilla Under Queen Uracca*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Remaking Queen Victoria*, ed. Margaret Homans and Adrienne Munich, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Representing the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Richards, Judith M. "Mary Tudor as a 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy," *The Historical Journal*, 40, 4 (1997), pp. 895–924.
- . "To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 28 (1997), pp. 101–121.
- Richardson, H.G., and G.O. Sayles. *The Governance of Medieval England: From the Conquest to Magna Carta*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1963.
- Ridley, Jasper. *The Life and Times of Mary Tudor*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.
- Rose, Sonya. *Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Round, J.H. *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, New York: Burt Franklin, 1960 (orig. pub. 1892).
- Rowse, A.L. *Expansion of Elizabethan England*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1955.
- Russell, Elizabeth. "Mary Tudor and Mr. Jorkins," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 152 (October 1990), pp. 263–76.
- Sainty, John Christopher, and R.O. Bucholz. *Officers of the Royal Household*, vol. 1, London: University of London, Institute of Historical Research, 1997.
- Scalingi, Paula Louise. "The Sceptre or the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516–1607," *Historian*, 41 (November 1978), pp. 59–75.
- Scarisbrick, J.J. *Henry VIII*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Schama, Simon. *A History of Britain: At the Edge of the World, 3000 b.c.–a.d. 1603*, New York: Hyperion, 2000.

- Schramm, Percy Ernst. *History of the English Coronation*, trans. Leopold G. Wickham Legge, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Schuyler, Robert Livingston. "Recent Work of Richardson and Sayles," *Journal of British Studies*, 3 (May 1964), pp. 1–23.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. *The Declaration of Rights, 1689*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.
- . "Women and the Glorious Revolution," *Albion*, 18, 2 (Summer 1986), pp. 195–218.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?" *American Historical Review*, 91, 5 (December 1986), pp. 1053–1075.
- . *Gender and the Politics of History*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Searle, E. "Women and the Legitimization of Succession of the Norman Conquest," *Anglo-Norman Studies*, iii, ed. Marjorie Chibnall, Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1980, pp. 159–170.
- Shahar, S. *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*, London: Methuen, 1983.
- Simon of Glaisdale, Lord. "The Influence and Power of the Monarchy in the United Kingdom Monarchy," *Current* (September 1982), pp. 56–60.
- Singlewomen in the European Past, 1250–1800*, ed. Judith Bennett and Amy M. Froide, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Smith, Bonnie G. *The Gender of History*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Somerset, Anne. *Ladies in Waiting*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1984.
- . *Elizabeth I*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991.
- Spall, Richard F. Jr. "The Bedchamber Crisis and the Hastings Affair: Morals, Politics and the Press at the Beginning of Victoria's Reign," *Canadian Journal of History*, 22 (April 1987), pp. 19–39.
- St. John, Henry, Lord Bolingbroke. *Remarks on the History of England*, Dublin: G. Faulkner, 1743.
- Stafford, Pauline. "The King's Wife in Wessex, 800–1066," *Past and Present*, 91 (May 1981), pp. 3–27.
- . *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh Century England*, Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell publishers, 1997.
- Starkey, David. *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship*, London: Chatto and Windus, 2000.
- . *The Six Wives of Henry VIII*, New York: Harper Collins, 2003.
- Stenton, F.M. *The First Century of English Feudalism*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- . *Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500–1800*, New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

- Strachey, Lytton. *Queen Victoria*, New York: Blue Ribbon Press, 1921.
- Strickland, Agnes. *The Lives of the Queens of England*, 8 vols., London: Henry Colburn, 1852.
- Stringer, K.J. *The Reign of King Stephen*, London: Routledge, 1993.
- Stubbs, William. *The Constitutional History of England*, 3 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894–97.
- Studies in Medieval History: Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, and R.W. Southern, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.
- Taylor, Arthur. *The Glory of Regality: An Historical Treatise of the Anointing and Crownings of the Kings and Queens of England*, London: 1820.
- Thompson, Dorothy. *Queen Victoria: Gender and Power*, London: Virago, 1990.
- Tittler, Robert, and Susan L. Battle. "The Local Community and the Crown in 1553: The Accession of Mary Tudor Revisited," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 57, 136 (1984), pp. 131–49.
- Tittler, Robert. *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, London: Longman, 1991.
- Tosh, John. "What Should Historians Do With Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth Century Britain," *History Workshop Journal*, 38 (Autumn 1994), pp. 179–202.
- . *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. *The Reign of Queen Anne*, 3 vols., London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1930–34.
- Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays For G.R. Elton From His American Friends*, ed. Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, 109–123.
- Turberville, A.S. *The House of Lords in the XVIII Century*, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970.
- Vallone, Lynn. *Becoming Victoria*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Van Der Zee, Henri, and Barbara Van Der Zee. *William and Mary*, London: Macmillan, 1973.
- Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?: A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *Historical Journal*, 36, 2 (June 1993), pp. 383–414.
- Waldman, Milton. *The Lady Mary: A Biography of Mary Tudor*, New York: Scribner, 1972.
- Warnicke, Retha. *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation*, Westport Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Warren, W.L. *Henry II*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Waterson, Nellie M. *Mary II Queen of England, 1689–1694*, Durham N.C.: Duke University Press, 1928.

- Webster, C.K. "The Accession of Queen Victoria," *History*, 85 (June 1937), pp. 14-33.
- Weil, Rachel. *Political Passions: Gender, the Family, and Political Argument in England, 1680-1714*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Weintraub, Stanley. *Queen Victoria: An Intimate Memoir*, New York: Truman Talley Books, 1987.
- Weir, Alison. *The Children of Henry VIII*, New York: Ballantine, 1996.
- Western, J.R. *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s*, Totowa N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.
- White, Graeme J. "The End of Stephen's Reign," *History*, 75 (February 1990), pp. 3-22.
- Wilkinson, Richard. "Queen Anne," *History Review*, 31 (September 1998), 39-45.
- Williams, Ann. *Kingship and Government in Pre-Conquest England*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Williams, Basil. *The Whig Supremacy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- Williams, E. Neville. *The Eighteenth Century Constitution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Williams, Neville. *All the Queen's Men*, London: Cardinal, 1974.
- Wilson, A.N. *The Rise and Fall of the House of Windsor*, New York: Norton and Co., 1993.
- Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1988.
- Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Mary Beth Rose, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Woodham Smith, Cecil. *Queen Victoria: From Her Birth to the Death of the Prince Consort*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.
- Woodward, E.L. *The Age of Reform*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- Woolfe, D.R. "Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Memory," *Canadian Journal of History*, 20 (1985) pp. 167-191.
- The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89*, ed. Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Ziegler, Philip. *William IV*, London: Collins, 1971.
- . *Crown and People*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.



INDEX

- Act Concerning Regal Power 22,
92–96, 97, 98, 118, 128, 129, 141,
145, 153, 174, 179
- Act of Settlement 101, 127, 129, 132,
149, 179
- Acts of Succession 69, 70, 71, 77, 119
- Adelaide, consort of William IV
149, 157, 168
- Adele, countess of Flanders 33, 34,
36, 39
- A Harborowe For Trewe Subjects* 86,
129, 177
- Albert of Saxe-Coberg-Gotha,
consort of queen Victoria 137,
154, 157, 169, 175
- Anjou 35, 37, 40, 44, 49, 75
- Anne, queen of Great Britain 5, 10,
11, 23, 101, 102; accession
127–128; attempt to secure
European command for George
of Denmark 134, 135–138, 141,
142, 146, 147, 153, 154, 168, 175,
177, 178; birth of duke of
Gloucester 121, 123; dynamics
of marriage 112, 113; education
108; growing political
independence 124;
historiography 103–104, 105;
marriage to George of
Denmark 110; perception as
“good wife” 133; plan to make
George of Denmark a king
consort 131–132; political role
as heiress 115, 116, 119;
representation as monarch
129–130; status as William and
Mary’s heir, 120
- Anne of Cleves, consort to Henry
VIII 88
- Arthur, prince of Wales
68, 69
- Aylmer, John, Bishop of London
14, 86, 129, 177
- Bassnet, Susan 20
- Beaufort, Margaret, Countess of
Richmond 7, 68
- Becket, Thomas, Archbishop of
Canterbury 61
- Bedchamber Crisis 11, 142,
historiography 143, 144,
149, 154, 158–169, 170,
171, 172
- Blair, Tony 177
- Blathwayt, William 111
- Boleyn, Anne, consort of Henry
VIII 69, 70
- Braganza, Catherine, consort of
Charles II 107, 127
- Brian fitz Count 27, 43
- Brougham, Lord Henry 157
- Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury
110, 119, 120, 131, 135
- Butler, James, Marquess of
Ormonde 110, 116
- Butler, R.A. 176

- Camden, William 14, 15
 Carlyle, Thomas 150
 Catherine of Aragon, consort to Henry VIII 69, 70, 79, 80, 127
 Cecil, William, Lord Burghley 15, 17, 121
 Charles I, King of England and Scotland 106, 107, 110
 Charles II, King of England and Scotland 105, 106; arranges marriages for Mary and Anne 109–110, 111; death of 114; opinion of George of Denmark 112
 Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor 70, 73, 75, 76, 81, 83, 84, 87, 88, 90, 91; political relationship to Mary I 81, role in marriage negotiations 87
 Charlotte, daughter of George IV 151
 Churchill, George 135–136
 Churchill, John, Duke of Marlborough 103, 104; efforts to secure command for George of Denmark 135, 136, 137; political relationship to Anne, 115, 116, 121–123, 125, 131, 132
 Churchill, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough 103; opinion of George of Denmark 113, 122, 123, 136, 146, 147
 Churchill, Winston 175, 176
 Clark, Dr. George 135
 Clito, William 35, 36, 38
 Convention Parliament of 1688/89 102, 117
 Courtenay, Edward, Earl of Devon 76, 82, 83, 86
 Creighton, Mandell 16–18, 21, 22
 Cromwell, Oliver 105, 107
 Cromwell, Thomas 70
 Curthose, Robert 33, 34, 36, 45, 58
 David, King of Scotland 56
 Deborah, Hebrew judge 86, 130, 179
 Diana, Princess of Wales 176
 Dudley, John, Duke of Northumberland 73, 74, 75–78, 83
 Edith, consort of Harold II, 32–33
 Edith/Matilda, consort to Henry I marriage to Henry I 35, 39, 42, 51
 Edward (the Confessor) King of England 32, 78
 Edward I, King of England 67, 95
 Edward III, King of England 6, 67
 Edward IV, King of England 82
 Edward V, King of England 26–27
 Edward VI, King of England 16, 65, 71, 72; efforts to disbar Mary from throne 73, 74, 76, 77, 81, 83, 119, 145
 Elder, John 97
 Elizabeth, consort of George VI 177
 Elizabeth I, Queen of England 3, 5, 10; historiography 12–23, 55, 65, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 80, 91, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 117, 121, 129, 130, 141, 145, 153, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178
 Elizabeth II, Queen of Great Britain 151, 173–180
 Elizabeth of York, consort of Henry VII 68, 117
 Elton, G.R. 16, 18, 21, 22
 Emma, consort of king Aethelred, 32–33
 Eustace, count of Flanders 46
 Eustace, son of king Stephen 56, 57
 Evelyn, John 112
Feme covert 8, 119
Feme sole 7, 46
 Fernando, King of Aragon 80, 90

- Filmer, Robert 102
- Fitzalan, Henry, Earl of Arundel 78
- Fleetwood, William, City Recorder of London 94–95
- Foliot, Gilbert, Abbott of Gloucester 43
- Fox, Charles James 147
- Foxe, John 65, 91
- Francis I, King of France 70, 89
- Froude, James Anthony 15, 16
- Frye, Susan 20–21
- Fulk, Count of Anjou 35, 41
- Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, Lord Chancellor 69, 82, 85, 91, 94–96
- Geoffrey de Mandeville, Earl of Essex 49
- George I, King of Great Britain 141
- George II, King of Great Britain 151
- George III, King of Great Britain 147, 148, 151, 168
- George IV, King of Great Britain 148, 150, 152, 157, 159
- George V, King of Great Britain 175
- George VI, King of Great Britain 175, 177
- George, prince of Denmark: accompanies James II to Salisbury 116, 120; arrival in England 111–112; conduct as lord admiral 134; consort of queen Anne 10, 11, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105; contemporary opinions of 113, 137; death of 137, 138–139; declining health 133–134; friendship with Isaac Newton 135; marriage to Anne 110; offers homage to Anne 130; opposition figure to William III 126; plan to make George king 131–132; relationship to Anne's title 129; role in political crisis of 1708 136; role as political proxy 114, 121, 122; called to William and Mary's privy council 121, 122–125
- Gesta Stephani* 26, 42, 45, 49, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61
- Glorious Revolution 101, 102, 103, 104, 117–120, 141, 145, 179
- Godolphin, Sidney 103, 134, 136, 137
- Greville, Charles 143, 156, 157, 158, 167, 169
- Grey, Lady Jane 73, 74, 75, 81, 83, 90
- Grey, lord Charles 148, 149, 166, 167, 168
- Haigh, Christopher 18–19, 178
- Harley, Robert, Earl of Oxford 103, 132, 147
- Harold II, King of England 32
- Hastings, Lady Flora 143, 160
- Heich, Alison 20
- Henry I, King of England 8, 26, 34; death of 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 58, 61, 75; efforts to secure Matilda's recognition as heir 36–37, 38–41
- Henry II, King of England 6, 9, 13, 26, 38, 42, 47, 54, 59, 60, 61, 67
- Henry III, King of England 9
- Henry VI, King of England 67, 117
- Henry V, King of England 6, 13, 67
- Henry V, Holy Roman Emperor marriage to empress Matilda 36, 38, 40, 41, 47, 49, 55
- Henry VI, King of England 68
- Henry VII, King of England 7, 13, 68, 76, 117
- Henry VIII, King of England 13, 18, 65, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 88, 89, 108, 119, 145

- Henry (of Blois), Bishop of Winchester 45, 47; abandons Empress Matilda 58, 59; designates empress Matilda as Lady of the English 53, 56, 57
- Henry of Huntington 28, 37, 47, 54, 57
- Hobbes, Thomas 108
- Home, Alec Douglas 176
- House of Commons *see* parliament
- House of Lords *see* parliament
- Hyde, Anne, Duchess of York 107
- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon 107
- Hyde, Henry, Earl of Clarendon 113, 116, 121, 136
- Isabel, Queen of Castile 80, 90
Itinerarium ad Windsor 94–95
- James II, King of England and Scotland 102, 105, 106; abdicates throne 117, 118, 121, 122, 134; efforts to impose Catholic toleration 115; opinion of George of Denmark 116; position as Charles II's heir 107, 110, 111, 112, 114
- James V, King of Scotland 69–70
- James VI and I, King of England and Scotland 14, 106, 107
- Jenkinson, Robert, Lord Liverpool 148
- John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster 67
- Juana, Queen of Castile 90
- “King’s Two Bodies” 44, 63–64, 129, 153
- Lamb, William, Lord Melbourne 138, 142, 147, 148, 152, 153, 154; advice to Victoria after resignation 161–163, 164, 165, 166; gendered opinions of women 155, 156; political relationship to Victoria 157–158; recalled to office 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 176; resignation of government 158, 159, 160
- Leopold of Saex-Coberg-Gotha, King of the Belgians 150–152, 154, 155, 172
- Lerner, Gerda 3
- Levin, Carole 20–22
- Loades, David 19
- Locke, John 102
- London, city of 45, 46, 55, 57, 58, 61, 74, 76, 83, 91, 97
- Louis XII, King of France 88
- Louis XIV, King of France 109, 115
- Macmillan, Harold 176
- Margaret of Austria, regent for the Netherlands 90
- Mary I, Queen of England 1, 3, 5, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23, 55; coronation 78–79; early marriage negotiations 69–70; efforts to secure consent to marriage 80–6; efforts to secure succession 73–75; entry to London as queen 75, 76; guildhall speech 91–92, 93–96; heiress to Henry VIII's throne 69–73; historiography 65–66; marriage to Philip 97, 98–99, 101, 103, 104, 107, 108, 117, 124, 128, 129, 132, 138, 141, 145, 153, 175, 177, 178, 179; marriage treaty to Philip 88–90; political posturing 80; role in marriage negotiations 86–87; status as heiress 71–73
- Mary II, Queen of England 11, 102, 105; death of 125, 128; education 108; marriage 109, 110, 111, 114, 115; political relationship to William of orange 116; public image as

- queen 129, 145, 146, 153; rift with Anne 123, 124; role in Glorious Revolution 117–120
- Mary, Duchess of Suffolk 88
- Mary of Hungary, regent for the Netherlands 90
- Mary of Modena, consort of James II 111, 115, 116
- Mary, Queen of Scots 20
- Masham, Abigail 103, 146
- Mason, Sir John 81
- Matilda, consort of William I 33, 42
- Matilda; consort to king Stephen 38, 51, 54; efforts to oppose empress Matilda 56, 57; persuades bishop of Winchester to abandon empress 58, 59, 61
- Matilda, Holy Roman Empress: claims throne 46–47; designation as Henry I's heir 36; *Domina Anglorum* 5, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 25, 26; election as *Domina Anglorum* 53, 54; failure to claim throne 44–45; gains possession of king Stephen 50, 51, 52; historiography 27–9, 30; lands in England 48–49; marriage to Geoffrey Plantagenet 37, 38, 39; marriage to emperor Henry V 35; opposition to 55–59, 60–64, 66, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 98, 104, 121, 173, 175, 178; status as father's heir 40, 41–43
- Melisende, Queen of Jerusalem 41, 55
- Miles of Gloucester 49
- Monck, George, Duke of Albermarle 107
- Mortimer, Edmund, Earl of March 67
- Mountbatten, Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, consort of Elizabeth II 175, 176
- Neale, J.E. 16–17, 21, 22
- Newton, Isaac 108, 135
- Noialles, Antoine 80
- Normandy 39, 44, 46, 47, 52
- Osborne, Thomas, Earl of Danby 118
- Paget, Lord William 81, 82, 85, 86, 93
- Parliament 21, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73, 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 93, 94, 96, 105, 118, 127, 128, 131, 133, 134, 142, 147, 148, 156, 158, 161
- Paulet, William, Marquis of Winchester 81, 97
- Peel, Sir Robert 142, 148; attitude toward formation of government 158; disagreement with Victoria 164, 165, 166; first meeting with Victoria 162; negotiations for government 163; political philosophy 159, 160, 161; resigns commission 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172
- Philip “the Handsome,” King of Castile 90
- Philip II, King of Spain and England 10, 16, 17, 64, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87; marriage treaty to Mary I 88–90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 115, 124, 132, 179
- Philippa of Clarence 67
- Plantagenet, Geoffrey: Count of Anjou 10, 26, 28, 29, 30, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46–47, 48, 50, 52, 54, 60; efforts to secure Normandy 46–47; marriage to Matilda 37

- Pole, Reginald, Archbishop of
Canterbury 76
- Privy Council 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88;
role in Mary I's marriage
negotiations 89, 114, 115, 121
- Protestant Reformation 70, 72, 73,
75, 79
- Ranulf, Earl of Chester 49
- Reform Act (1832) 149, 152
- Renard, Simon 80, 81, 83, 84, 86,
91, 93, 94, 98
- Richard II, duke of Normandy 32,
33
- Richard, Duke of York 67
- Richard II, King of England 9, 67
- Robert, Earl of Gloucester 26, 35,
36, 39, 42; captured at rout of
Winchester 59, 60; declares
allegiance to empress 47, 56
- Robert of Torigny 29, 34, 37,
40, 44
- Roger, Bishop of Salisbury 37, 43,
47
- Rubin, Gayle 8
- Russell, lord John 142, 158, 167–168
- Seymour, Jane, consort to Henry
VIII 71
- Smith, Sir Thomas 14
- Soranzo, Giacomo 95
- Spencer, Robert, Earl of Sunderland
110
- Stephen (of Blois), King of England
26, 28, 29, 36, 38, 39; capture and
imprisonment 48–50, 52, 53,
54, 56, 58; claims English throne
45–46; opposition to 47; set
free following siege of
Winchester 59, 60, 61
- Stockmar, baron, 156
- Strachey, Lytton 143
- Strickland, Agnes 15, 16
- Swift, Jonathan 109
- Temple, Henry John, Lord
Palmerston 150
- Theobald, Archbishop of
Canterbury 46
- Theobald, Count of Flanders 34
- Tory (political party) 120, 136,
142–143, 146, 148, 152, 155, 156,
160, 163
- Tower of London 20, 75
- Treaty of Westminster (1153) 60
- Uracca, Queen of Leon-Castile 41
- Victoria, Queen of Great Britain 3,
5, 11, 23, 137, 141, 142, 143, 144,
147; accession 149; early
relationship to Leopold
151–152; education 150; first
meeting with Peel 162;
identification with English
queens 153; negotiations with
Peel 163–164, 165, 166, 167,
168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175,
177, 178; perception of gender
differences 154–155;
relationship to Melbourne
157–158, 159, 160, 161
- Victoria, Duchess of Kent
150, 160
- Vitales, Orderic 26, 44, 45,
48, 52
- Vives, Juan Luis 87
- Wars of the Roses 9, 68
- Wellesley, Arthur, Duke of
Wellington 157; first interview
with Victoria 158, 161, 163, 165,
171
- Westminster Abbey 20, 44
- Whig (political party) 5, 119, 120,
136, 138, 142, 144, 146, 147,
148, 150, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159,
160, 163
- William, the *Aetheling* 35, 38

- William I (the Conqueror), King of England 8, 33, 35, 36, 42, 45, 85, 95, 173
- William II (Rufus), King of England 34, 44
- William III, Prince of Orange and King of England 11, 102, 103, 104, 105; death of 128, 129, 131, 134, 145, 146, 153, 179; expedition to Ireland 122; marriage 109, 110, 111, 113; opinion of George of Denmark 122; perception as foreign king 127; reaction to birth of prince of Wales 115; reconciliation with Anne 125; role in Glorious Revolution settlement 117–120, 121; treatment of George of Denmark 124
- William IV, King of Great Britain 141, 142, 148, 149, 150, 152, 159
- William Henry, Duke of Gloucester; death of 127; son of queen Anne 121, 125, 126
- William of Malmesbury 28, 37, 39, 40, 42, 56, 57
- William of Ypres 59
- Witenagemot* 31
- Wolsey, Thomas Cardinal 69
- Wyatt, Thomas 91–92
- Wyndham, William, Lord Grenville 147, 148, 167, 168

CHARLES BEEM is currently an assistant professor of History at the University of North Carolina, offering courses in world civilizations, early modern Europe, the history of gender, and all aspects of British history: medieval, early modern, modern, as well as the history of the British Empire. His most recent publication is an article on the career of Prince George of Denmark, published in *Canadian Journal of History*. His current project is an edited volume on the history of England's medieval and early modern royal minorities.