

Married Regnant Queenship in Early Modern England: Gender, Blood and  
Authority, 1553-1714

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of  
Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy by Anne Louise Mearns.

May 2015

## Abstract

### **Anne Mearns - Married Regnant Queenship in Early Modern England: Gender, Blood and Authority, 1553-1714.**

Regnant queenship is one of the defining features of the early modern era. During this period England witnessed the reigns of four regnant queens, three of whom were married: Mary I, Mary II and Anne. The reigns of Mary I and Mary II in particular were marked by considerable religious and political tensions, which made their queenships even more remarkable. Using a wide range of contemporary sources, the thesis considers the early modern period as a coherent whole. Despite distinct differences between the mid Tudor and later Stuart political climates, continuing fears of and antipathy to female rule meant that precedents set by Tudor regnant queens in the sixteenth century remained highly relevant to the reigns of the Stuart queens in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and parallels can be easily drawn. In an era when marriage was deemed necessary for women, and particularly queens, who were required to secure the future succession of their dynasty, marriage was and remained an important, yet problematic, element of queenship. Focusing on married regnant queens and analysing the ensuing tensions between conjugal and political power over the period gives us a fuller understanding of these reigns, and, more generally, of early modern monarchy. This diachronic approach allows us to consider whether the concept of female rule evolved across the period, and, from there to assess whether and how that evolution changed the office of regnant queen and altered contemporary perceptions of regnant queenship.

The anxieties provoked by female rule are explored through an initial focus on the contested accessions of Mary I and Mary II. The thesis reveals the centrality of blood legitimacy to their claims to be queen, showing how, in a polarised religious climate, this combined with prevailing conceptions of gender in terms that enabled both women to gain, and then maintain, monarchical authority. In both periods, regnant queenship inaugurated unprecedented monarchical arrangements that presented significant challenges to the political nation. Drawing Anne into the analysis for purposes of comparison, confirms that the mechanisms and rituals that defined and confirmed monarchical power were by necessity re-interpreted in each queen's reign, as contemporaries sought to negotiate the ambiguities surrounding female rule. Crucially, married regnant queenship introduced the phenomenon of the male consort, an inversion of traditional gendered roles at the level of the crown. Analysis of all three queens reveals that this raised significant questions about gender and authority that neither legislative nor symbolic measures were able to successfully resolve. Representations of queenship demonstrate that queenly identities were readily manipulated by opponents of individual queens and their regimes using broadly similar themes across the period. And queens and their supporters appropriated existing portrayals of consort queens as suitable models to represent regnant queenship. Overall, the thesis demonstrates that although by Anne's accession in 1702, there was less apprehension regarding female rule, regnant queenship continued to be problematical. Some evolution had occurred, but this was greatly outweighed by continuities.

# Contents

---

	Page no.
Acknowledgments	iii
List of illustrations	iv
List of abbreviations	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 - Accession	19
Part 1 - A Gendered Ideal: Contemporary Beliefs about Women	21
Part 2 – The Accession of a Woman: The Significance of Gender	25
Part 3 – Hereditary Blood Right: Legitimate and Illegitimate Blood	42
Chapter 2 - The Confirmation of Power	62
Part 1 – Proclaiming Regnant Queenship	65
Part 2 – Without Precedent: The Coronation of Three Regnant Queens	80
Chapter 3 – Conjugal versus Political Power	103
Part 1 – Gender and Legal Constructs of Authority: In Theory and in Practice	105
Part 2 – Perceptions of Conjugal and Political Power: Representation and Iconography	135
Part 3 – A Crown for the Queen’s Husband?	151
Part 4 – Failed Maternity: The Quest for an Heir	159
Chapter 4 – Representation and the Manipulation of Identity	169
Part 1 – Unnatural, Unlawful, Ungodly and Monstrous: The Manipulation of Queenly Identities	172

Part 2 – Restorers of Order, Virtuous Femininity, Maternal and Godly Archetypes: Positive Representations of Queenly Identities	195
Conclusion	226
Bibliography	232

# Acknowledgements

---

I wish to acknowledge the help and support I have received from both my supervisors at University of Liverpool, Dr Anne McLaren and Dr Harald Braun, for the duration of this research project. I particularly wish to thank my primary supervisor, Dr Anne McLaren for her advice and support over the last seven years, and for her ongoing enthusiasm, encouragement, and interest in my research. This has been especially pertinent when certain life and career events presented challenges that had the potential to jeopardise my studies.

I would also like to thank Dr Paul Booth, Hon. Senior Research Fellow in History, Keele University, for his interest in my research, and his help with regard to my queries concerning Latin. I wish to thank Jack Heery of the Ranulf Higden Society for coming to my aid and very kindly translating some of my primary sources, and also to Anne Montgomery from St Hildeburgh's Church Choir, Hoylake who also helped with translation in the early stages of my research.

Encouragement and support from my family has been highly significant to the completion of this thesis, especially my husband, who has endured the seven year PhD process and all it entails with great fortitude, and my sister who kindly offered to proof read the final draft.

Finally, I would like to thank the Department of History for awarding me a fee bursary which made my research possible.

# Illustrations

---

	Page no:
<b>Fig. 1</b> Philip and Mary sixpence, 1554, photo © British Museum	140
<b>Fig. 2</b> Great seal of Philip and Mary, illustration to John Speed's <i>History of Great Britain</i> (1632), photo © British Museum	142
<b>Fig. 3</b> Mary II, Regency medal, 1690, image from <a href="http://www.coinpeople.com">http://www.coinpeople.com</a> retrieved 06/03/2015	146
<b>Fig. 4</b> Official coronation medal of William and Mary, 1689 image from <a href="http://www.coinarchives.com">http://www.coinarchives.com</a> retrieved January 2014	182
<b>Fig. 5</b> Anne, Coronation medal, 1702, photo © British Museum	221

# Abbreviations

---

- CSPD* *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Mary I, James II, William and Mary*, eds., C.S. Knighton, E.K. Timings & W.J. Hardy (London, 1898-1998)
- CSP Spanish* *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives at Vienna, Simancas, Besancon, Brussels, Madrid and Lisle*, ed. Royall Tyler (London, 1916-1954)
- CSP Venetian* *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London, 1864-1898)
- PoAS* *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, Vols. 5,6 & 7*, eds., W.J. Cameron & F.H. Ellis (London, 1970-1975)

# Introduction

---

Regnant queenship is one of the defining features of the early modern era. During this period England witnessed the reigns of four regnant queens: Mary I, Elizabeth I, Mary II and Anne. Three of these queens were married; only Elizabeth failed to conform to contemporary expectations and remained unwed. Against a backdrop of political and religious upheaval, Mary Tudor ascended the throne as England's first regnant queen in July 1553. Her accession was remarkable and not solely because of her gender. Declared illegitimate following the annulment of her mother's marriage to Henry VIII, her position further diminished at the birth of her half-brother in 1537, the future Edward VI. Although eventually restored to the line of succession in 1544, and considered by many as the rightful heir to the throne, upon Edward's death the prospect of Mary's queenship appeared unlikely. A coup led by the duke of Northumberland excluded Mary, and her younger sister, Elizabeth, from the succession, and placed her Protestant cousin, Jane Grey, on the throne instead. Overcoming this significant challenge to her queenship and successfully obtaining her throne was a considerable achievement. Mary was to be faced with further significant challenges throughout the course of her five year reign, as the political nation attempted to negotiate the unprecedented nature of regnant queenship. On her death in November 1558 Mary was succeeded by Elizabeth. Elizabeth's death in 1603 ended a fifty year period of female rule as the accession of James I (James VI of Scotland) reinstated male monarchy in England.

The end of the early modern period saw the accessions of England's third and fourth regnant queens: Mary II in 1689 and Anne in 1702. Like Mary Tudor, the accession of Mary II was problematical, marked by religious tensions and political change. As the elder daughter of James II, Mary was heiress presumptive to the English crown until the birth of her half-brother, James Francis Edward Stuart, in 1688. She was a staunch Protestant and her devotion to the English Church and the prospect of her future queenship made the Catholicism of her father bearable for English Protestants. The arrival of her half-brother was undoubtedly a



contributory factor in the Glorious Revolution. Supported by Protestant political elites, Mary's husband, William of Orange, arrived in England in November 1688 to defend his wife's hereditary blood right. James fled to France in exile, and a Convention Parliament deemed that the English crown was vacant and advocated the dual monarchy of William III and Mary II. But the notion of duality was purely fictional as the administrative authority was vested solely in William, leaving Mary in the anomalous position of a regnant queen but without the authority of her predecessors. Mary died unexpectedly of smallpox in December 1694 and William continued to rule alone until his death in 1702. As there were no children from the marriage, Mary's younger sister Anne succeeded to the throne, as the last Stuart monarch and final regnant queen of the early modern era. Unlike those of Mary I and Mary II, Anne's accession was uneventful but her reign is noteworthy for a number of reasons. Firstly, although married, her consort, George of Denmark, had no formal, regal title or role. Also, she successfully presided over a period marked by considerable English military victories in Europe. Finally, despite dying childless in 1714, her reign secured the future of the Protestant monarchy in England via the Hanoverian accession.

The early modern era was also characterised by significant religious and political changes. At Henry VIII's death in 1547, religion in England was schismatic. Henry had broken with Rome, placed himself as head of the Church in England, and overseen the dissolution of the monasteries, but he died adhering to the Catholic mass. Heralded by Protestant reformers as a new Josiah, Edward VI oversaw a brief period of rapid religious reform, marked by the destruction of Catholic service books and images from parish churches, the introduction of the Book of Common Prayer, and the imprisonment of the Catholic bishops, Bonner and Gardiner, who were later to serve under Mary. The duke of Northumberland had been a key advocate of evangelical reform and it cannot be doubted that anxieties over Mary's devout Catholicism played a role in the 1553 succession crisis. It is also not entirely surprising that the reforming Edwardian legislation was repealed by Mary's first Parliament in October 1553.<sup>1</sup> Mary's death in 1558 signalled the failure of her attempt to re-Catholicize the realm, and Elizabeth's reign heralded the beginning of a Protestant ascendancy in England. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Useful overviews of the religious situation in England in the sixteenth century are provided by: John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford, 1988), pp.212-249; Susan Brigden, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors 1485-1603* (London, 2001), pp.179-212; A more thorough study is found in: Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional religion in England 1400-1580* (London, 1992)

seventeenth century was characterised by marked a wave of anti-Catholicism that was present at all levels of society. To a great extent underpinned by events in Europe, particularly France where Louis XIV openly persecuted Protestants, contemporaries feared Catholic plots and linked Catholicism to tyranny and absolutism. In this climate, and following significant expressions of religious anxieties manifested in the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, the accession of the Catholic James II in 1685 proved a considerable challenge to the Protestant political nation. James' attempts to improve the rights of the minority English Catholic population were fiercely resisted and English Protestants had looked to the succession of his daughter Mary to secure the future of Protestant England.<sup>2</sup>

Significant political changes across the period include the transition from the personal monarchy of the Tudors to the parliamentary monarchy of the later Stuarts. Following the Glorious Revolution, the 1689 Bill of Rights introduced significant constitutional change in the form of contractual Protestant monarchy and the transformation of Parliament from an ad hoc arrangement to a permanent institution. The reigns of William and Mary, and Anne were characterised by the rise of party politics. Whigs and Tories evolved from ideologies into formal political parties that came to symbolise the political nation. Whigs were committed to the defence of liberties and the notion of the Protestant succession whilst Tories upheld the principals of hereditary succession, passive obedience and the Anglican church.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the period saw the extension and development of the political nation as the public sphere expanded due to heightened popular political consciousness. To fully appreciate the complex issues raised by regnant queenship, the reigns of Mary I, Mary II and Anne should be considered within the context of these religious and political developments.

Recent historiography is indicative of the increased interest in early modern queenship. Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz have acknowledged the popularity of queens and queenship, not merely for academic study, but also for novelists, dramatists and film makers,

---

<sup>2</sup> Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England 1603-14* (Harlow, 2003), pp. 314-332; Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1997), pp.263-286; Robert Beddard, 'The Protestant Succession' in Robert Beddard, ed. *The Revolutions of 1688: The Andrew Browning Lectures 1988* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 1-10

<sup>3</sup> Coward, *The Stuart Age*, pp. 347-356; Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed*, pp.317-318

asserting that “Queens are much in fashion these days.”<sup>4</sup> They attribute this phenomenon to the “anomalous” nature of queenship, citing queens’ reigns as a deviation from the normal: “extended moments of suspension in the normal working of political, social, cultural and gender history.”<sup>5</sup> The increased academic interest in queenship arose from the considerable body of work on women and gender in the 1980’s and 1990’s. Since then a number of valuable journal articles, edited collections and monographs on queenship have been published. Articles by Constance Jordan, Patricia-Anne Lee, and later, Judith Richards, considered the question of female rule within the context of sixteenth century political thought, and in particular, the debate on queenship engendered by Protestant reformers during Mary Tudor’s reign and continuing through Elizabeth’s.<sup>6</sup> Levin and Bucholz argue that the anomalous nature of queenship has meant that too often individual queens have been studied in isolation.<sup>7</sup> More recent edited collections, including that of Levin and Bucholz, have sought to address that issue, drawing together common themes about queenship across the period. Also attempting to draw together common themes is Charles Beem’s *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History*. Beem examines the dilemma presented by a queen’s gender from a distinctly English perspective, considering the twelfth century Empress Matilda, whose attempts to claim the crown ultimately failed, Mary I, Elizabeth I, Anne and Victoria. Acknowledging the paradox of female rule he constructs regnant queens as ‘female kings.’<sup>8</sup> These works, along with others published between 1989 and 2009, have effectively redefined medieval and early modern queenship and have contributed significantly to our understanding of the exercise of female authority. But the focus of some volumes is quite broad, either considering queenship within a wider, European context, or including both consort and regnant queens, as opposed to specialising solely in regnant queenship.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Carole Levin and Robert Bucholz, eds., *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England* (London, 2009), p. xiii

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. xiii-xiv

<sup>6</sup> Constance Jordan, ‘Woman’s Rule in Sixteenth Century British Political Thought’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40, 3 (1987), pp. 421-451; Patricia-Ann Lee, ‘A Bodye Politique to Governe: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship’, *The Historian*, 52 (1990), pp.242-261; Judith M. Richards, ‘“To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule”: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 28, 1 (1997), pp.101-12

<sup>7</sup> Levin and Bucholz, *Queens and Power*, p.xiv

<sup>8</sup> Charles Beem, *The Lioness Roared: the Problems of Female Rule in English History* (New York, 2006)

<sup>9</sup> John Carmi Parsons ed. *Medieval Queenship* (Stroud, 1994); Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed. *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester, 2002); J.L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445-1503* (Oxford, 2004); Anne J. Cruz and Mihoko Suzuki, *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe* (Urbana, 2009); L.O. Fradenburg ed. *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh, 1992); Olga S. Opfell, *Queens, Empresses, Grand Duchesses and Regents: Women Rulers of Europe A.D. 1328-1989* (London, 1989); Carole Levin, Jo Eldridge Carney, and Debra Barret-Graves eds.,

Turning specifically to individual early modern English regnant queens, the main focus of this body of work has been on sixteenth century queens, particularly Elizabeth I. Until recently Mary Tudor was to a great extent overshadowed by her younger sister. Furthermore, early work on Mary was influenced by Protestant histories. Continuing into the twentieth century, historians such as G.R. Elton asserted that Mary was “the wrong kind of queen”, a woman preoccupied by religion and her Spanish heritage who contributed to the decline of “good government.”<sup>10</sup> The later 1980s saw the beginning of a shift however, with the publication of David Loades’ comprehensive biography, *Mary Tudor: a Life*, and Jennifer Loach’s work examining Mary’s relationship with Parliament.<sup>11</sup> Since the end of the twentieth century there has been a significant resurgence of interest in Mary, with a range of work published that not only recognises her significance as England’s first regnant queen, but also offers a revisionist interpretation of her reign. For example, Judith Richards has effectively argued for the importance of Mary’s reign as a crucial “introduction” for the study of English female rule, and cited the reign as an example for Elizabeth.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, placing Mary’s reign as a benchmark for that of her sister has been crucial to our improved understanding of the nature of female authority in the sixteenth century. This is further recognised by the recent publication of two further edited collections. *Tudor Queenship: the Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* provides a thematic study of the reigns of both Tudor queens that refreshingly redresses the traditional disproportionate attention on Elizabeth, whilst *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* presents an up to date consideration of the traditional views of Mary along with an openly revisionist perspective of key issues of her reign.<sup>13</sup>

---

“*High and Mighty Queens*” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations (New York, 2003); Regina Schulte ed., *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World 1500-2000* (New York, 2006)

<sup>10</sup> G.R.Elton, *England Under the Tudors* (London, 1955), p. 214

<sup>11</sup> David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford, 1989); Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford, 1986)

<sup>12</sup> Judith M. Richards, ‘Mary Tudor as ‘Sole Quene’? Gendering Tudor Monarchy, *Historical Journal*, 40,4 (1997), p. 895; ‘Gender Difference and Tudor Monarchy: the Significance of Queen Mary I’, *Parergon*, 21, 2 (July, 2004), pp. 28-29, 38; ‘Mary Tudor: Renaissance Queen of England’ in Levin, Eldridge Carney and Barrett-Graves eds., “*High and mighty Queens*” of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations, pp.28,36-39; ‘Examples and Admonitions: What Mary Demonstrated for Elizabeth’, in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

<sup>13</sup> Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock eds., *Tudor Queenship: the Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010); Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman eds., *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2011)

A number of recent monographs also testify to the growing interest in Mary. Anna Whitelock's *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen* provides a sympathetic analysis of the conflict between Mary's gender and her exercise of authority. Acknowledging the importance of Mary's reign as a precedent for Elizabeth, Whitelock asserts that as a queen, Mary "triumphed" but finds that the tensions between gender and authority effectively prevented her from succeeding as both a woman and monarch.<sup>14</sup> And in *Mary Tudor: the Tragical History of the First Queen of England*, David Loades has reconsidered some of his original arguments and seeks to re-appraise certain aspects of Mary's reign, recognising the example set by Mary for future queens.<sup>15</sup> John Edwards' *Mary I: England's First Catholic Queen* provides a comprehensive study of Mary's life and reign with particular focus on the areas Edwards points out have contributed to her "bad reputation", namely her marriage and the drive to restore the Catholic Church in England.<sup>16</sup> The most recent monograph is Sarah Duncan's *Mary I: Gender, Power and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen*, offering a further revisionist interpretation of Mary's reign that seeks to demonstrate that Mary operated as both king and queen, which ties in to Beem's notion of regnant queens as female kings.<sup>17</sup>

A number of noteworthy journal articles have also recognised the tension between Mary's gender and her exercise of authority. Anna Whitelock has considered how Mary's exercise of power challenged the established rules of political governance, placing the queen as central to the formulation of the key policies of the reign.<sup>18</sup> And Alice Hunt explores these inherent tensions by examining the proposal made by some of Mary's councillors to delay her coronation until after Parliament had met, raising significant questions about the nature of her authority.<sup>19</sup> Mary's marriage created further problems, and Glynn Redworth considers the contradiction between Mary's exercise of authority and her marital status as he explores the extent to which Philip was able to enjoy political influence. Linking his argument to Mary's poor health and contemporary notions of hysterical women, he asserts that Philip was able to

---

<sup>14</sup> Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen* (London, 2009), pp.309-310

<sup>15</sup> David Loades, *Mary Tudor: The Tragical History of the First Queen of England* (Richmond, 2006), pp.8-13, 216

<sup>16</sup> John Edwards, *Mary I: England's First Catholic Queen* (London, 2011), p. xiii

<sup>17</sup> Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen* (Basingstoke, 2012)

<sup>18</sup> Anna Whitelock, 'A Woman in a Man's World: Mary I and Political Intimacy', *Women's History Review*, 16, 3 (2007), pp. 323-334

<sup>19</sup> Alice Hunt, 'The Monarchical Republic of Mary I', *Historical Journal*, 52,3 (2009), pp. 557-572

exercise considerable influence, concluding that it was Philip, and not Mary, who was politically dominant.<sup>20</sup> Alexander Samson also focuses on the problematic issue of defining authority within marriage by examining how the wedding ceremonial of Philip and Mary responded to the anxieties caused by Mary's marriage to a foreign prince.<sup>21</sup> And, considering the extent of Philip's influence, he acknowledges that this is a matter of debate amongst historians concluding that this is a question still awaiting a definitive answer.<sup>22</sup>

Compared to the range of published works on Mary Tudor, the secondary literature on Mary II and Anne is limited, particularly so for Mary II. Despite a brief resurgence of interest in Mary II following the three hundredth anniversary of the Glorious Revolution in 1989 there has been little academic work on her since. She has featured in two recent biographies: Maureen Waller's *Ungrateful daughter's: The Stuart Princesses Who Stole Their Father's Crown*, and John Van der Kiste's *William and Mary*, but neither of these volumes pays considered attention to Mary's queenship, and she is not included in recent edited collections on early modern queenship.<sup>23</sup> A major contributory factor is that traditionally Mary has always been viewed alongside William. The concept of the dual monarchy has resulted in a dual identity that is effectively dominated by William, as alluded to in the title of Elizabeth Hamilton's 1972 biography, *William's Mary*, and W. A. Speck's essay, 'William – and Mary?', in which Speck points to a chapter in the popular history, *1066 and All That*, entitled 'Williamanmary: England Ruled by an Orange.'<sup>24</sup>

Considering Mary's queenship, Melinda Zook outlines Marian historiography showing how histories of the queen have been influenced by the political divisions of the period. Mary is portrayed either as an obedient wife or a betraying daughter, with the former view becoming the dominant image over the eighteenth century as the Revolutionary settlement took hold.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Glyn Redworth, '“Matters Impertinent to Women”: Male and Female Monarchy Under Philip and Mary', *English Historical Review*, 112, 447 (June, 1997), pp.597, 603-605, 611-612

<sup>21</sup> Alexander Samsom, 'Changing Places: the Marriage of and Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria, and Mary Tudor, July-August 1554', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 36, 3 (2005), pp.761-784

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p.768

<sup>23</sup> Maureen Waller, *Ungrateful Daughters: The Stuart Princesses Who Stole Their Father's Crown* (London, 2002); John Van der Kiste, *William and Mary* (Stroud, 2003)

<sup>24</sup> Elizabeth Hamilton, *William's Mary* (London, 1972); W.A. Speck, 'William – and Mary?', in Lois G. Schworer ed. *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 131

<sup>25</sup> Melinda Zook, 'History's Mary: The Propagation of Queen Mary II, 1689-1694', in L. O. Fradenburg ed. *Women and Sovereignty*, pp. 177-178

Lois Schwoerer has sought to reconsider the evidence and reconstruct Mary as a regnant queen. She considers the creation of the dual monarchy within the context of attitudes towards female rule, before examining some features of ‘Maryite imagery’ to establish Mary’s position throughout her reign and at her death in 1694.<sup>26</sup> Building on Schwoerer’s work, Zook also attempted to reconstruct Mary’s image by examining Jacobite portrayals of the queen, and Mary’s self-presentation in her memoirs and letters, arguing that the portrayal of the queen as a dutiful wife was used to counteract Jacobite allegations that she was a betraying daughter.<sup>27</sup> This argument is taken up by Rachel Weil who asserts that Mary’s image was an essential tool for Williamite propagandists who sought to legitimise the Glorious Revolution and ensure acceptance of the dual monarchy. Weil demonstrates how Mary’s gender was actively exploited for propagandist purposes. She suggests that defining the queen in sexual terms effectively removed Mary from the political arena and transformed subjects’ love for her into political allegiance to William.<sup>28</sup> With the exception of Angela McShane Jones’ 2004 article examining depictions of Mary in the illustrations of broadside ballads, there is a considerable gap in work on the queen until 2008. Melinda Zook, reflecting once again on what she terms the ‘bipolar’ perceptions of Mary, seeks to demonstrate the political significance of Mary’s brief reign by considering the impact of her death on the political nation, comparing the national outpouring of grief to that that marked the death of Diana, Princess of Wales in 1997.<sup>29</sup> Pointing to Mary’s Englishness, her devotion to the English church, and her overall popularity compared to her husband, Zook stresses the vital role played by Mary within the dual monarchy. But many questions remain unanswered about Mary’s queenship and a thorough re-appraisal of her is long overdue.

In 1991 Robert Bucholz highlighted the scholarly work of the twentieth century that sought to “rehabilitate” Anne’s reputation as dull, weak and pliable, culminating in Edward’s Gregg’s comprehensive biography of the queen.<sup>30</sup> Initially published in 1980, with a new edition released in 2001, Gregg’s work sought to bring together both private and public aspects of

---

<sup>26</sup> Lois G. Schwoerer, “Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95”, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 42,4 (Winter, 1989), p.718

<sup>27</sup> Zook, “History’s Mary”, p.174

<sup>28</sup> Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender the Family and Political Argument in England 1680-1714* (Manchester, 1999), pp.110-113

<sup>29</sup> Melinda Zook, ‘The Shocking Death of Mary II: Gender and Political Crisis in Late Stuart England’, *British Scholar*, 1,1 (September 2006), pp.21-22, 24

<sup>30</sup> Robert Bucholz, ‘“Nothing but Ceremony”: Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual’, *Journal of British Studies*, 30,3 (July 1991), p.288

Anne's life, presenting Anne as both woman and queen. Assessing Anne's role as monarch, he finds her a hard working and popular queen, regularly attending cabinet meetings, effectively managing political infighting and reviving the practice of 'touching for the king's evil.'<sup>31</sup> Crucially however, he considers her gender a disadvantage for a reign that was dominated by war.<sup>32</sup> Bucholz further develops this point, remarking on the paradox that an apparently unremarkable woman presided over an era of exceptional military, economic and cultural success.<sup>33</sup> For Bucholz however, when it came to military matters, Anne's gender may have been problematic, but was a factor she successfully negotiated. Recognising the limits of her gender Anne delegated matters to one of the most capable military leaders of the age, John Churchill, Earl of Marlborough.<sup>34</sup> Bucholz's work is central to Anne's historiography. Throughout the 1990s and first decade of this century, his work has furthered our understanding of Anne's queenship, particularly with regard to her contemporary image, her insistence on ceremonial ritual, and her position within Augustan court culture.<sup>35</sup> His most recent work considers the relationship between Anne's gender and notions of her queenly body, linking Anne's obesity to contemporary constructions of her body that viewed her weight, and that of Mary II's, as a result of gluttony, implying that the sisters were greedy, grasping for both food and power.<sup>36</sup> Acknowledging that there has been little work on bodies and "corpulence" in this period he also speculates that Anne's plentiful figure may have also been viewed as a sign of stability and as evidence of her maternal instincts.<sup>37</sup> More recently Anne Somerset's comprehensive biography of Anne's life and reign also considers the queen as both monarch and woman, and corroborates Gregg's portrayal of her as a capable governor. Liberating Anne from the outdated stereotype of a weak woman manipulated by bedchamber favourites, Somerset concludes that Anne "acquitted herself well" in her role as the last Stuart monarch.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven, 2001), pp. 141-150

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p.137

<sup>33</sup> R.O. Bucholz, "Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues?", in Campbell Orr ed. *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837*, p.94

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102, Robert Bucholz, 'The "Stomach of a Queen" or Size Matters: Gender, Body Image and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne', in Levin and Bucholz eds., *Queens and Power*, p. 246

<sup>35</sup> Bucholz, "'Nothing but Ceremony'"; R. O. Bucholz, *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture* (Stanford, 1993); Bucholz, ' "Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues?"', in Campbell Orr, ed. *Queenship in Britain*

<sup>36</sup> Bucholz, "Stomach of the Queen", pp. 250-252

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 261

<sup>38</sup> Anne Somerset, *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion* (London, 2012), p. 546



A noteworthy development from the work on queenship is the newly emerging focus on male consorts. With the exception of David Loades' 1988 essay much of the work on Philip focuses on his position as king of Spain, but recent consideration has been given to his role as king of England by Harry Kelsey, who, in addition to previously used materials makes use of Spanish sources to re-appraise Philip's role in England.<sup>39</sup> Charles Beem and Miles Taylor's 2014 edited collection *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* seeks to bring the role of male consorts under necessary scrutiny.<sup>40</sup> Adopting a distinctly international perspective the volume considers male consorts from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century, and includes Sarah Duncan's exploration of Philip's role as consort, whilst Beem revisits his earlier work on George of Denmark.<sup>41</sup> Unlike William III, whose reign as regnant king has been well documented, this new focus on male consorts contributes to our understanding of the dilemmas faced by Philip and George.

Using a wide range of contemporary sources, this thesis aims to address four key areas. Firstly, it will consider the period as a whole. Instead of constraining queenship within the confines of the sixteenth century, and in contrast to Beem's inclusion of post modern queens in *The Lioness Roared*, my analysis focuses on a coherent period. The influences and precedents set by Tudor regnant queens were highly relevant to the reigns of the Stuart queens. Parallels can be drawn between the reigns of Mary I and Mary II. Both their accessions were marked by considerable political and religious turmoil, but, as Joan Scott points out, the throwing out of old orders and bringing in of new ones did not necessarily revise the terms of gender as "old notions of gender have also served to validate new regimes."<sup>42</sup> Thus considering regnant queenship across the period allows us to consider to what extent there was either continuity or change concerning female rule, particularly given the significant religious and political developments that occurred. Secondly, the thesis seeks

---

<sup>39</sup> Harry Kelsey, *Philip of Spain, King of England: The Forgotten Sovereign* (London, 2012); David Loades, 'Philip II and the Government of England', in C. Cross, D. Loades and J.J. Scarisbrick eds., *Law and Government Under the Tudors: Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton Regis Professor of Modern History in the university of Cambridge on the occasion of his Retirement* (Cambridge, 1988), pp.177-194

<sup>40</sup> Charles Beem and Miles Taylor, eds., *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (Basingstoke, 2014)

<sup>41</sup> "'He to Be Intituled King'": King Philip of England and the Anglo-Spanish Court', in Charles Beem and Miles Taylor eds., *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (Basingstoke, 2014), pp. 55-80; Charles Beem, 'Why Prince George of Denmark did not Become a King of England', in Beem and Taylor eds., *The Man Behind the Queen*, pp. 82-91; Beem, Charles, "'I am her Majesty's Subject': Prince George of Denmark and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', *Canadian Journal of History*, 38, 3 (2004), pp.458-487

<sup>42</sup> Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1999) , p. 49

to build upon the work of Schwoerer and Zook to rehabilitate Mary II as a regnant queen, as opposed to the accepted notion of her as merely half of the dual monarchy. Thirdly, it specifically focuses on married regnant queenship. In an era when marriage was deemed necessary for women, and particularly queens, who were required to secure the future succession of their dynasty, marriage was an intrinsic element of queenship. A considered analysis of the tension between conjugal and political power enables a fuller understanding of early modern perceptions of monarchical authority within a gendered framework. In his decidedly interesting work on Anne and her husband, George of Denmark, Charles Beem argues that by 1702 female rule had evolved to such an extent that Anne could effectively do without a formal male consort.<sup>43</sup> Focussing on married regnant queenship allows us to test this theory, thus ascertaining to what extent female rule evolved across the period. Finally, the thesis seeks to draw together common notions of blood, gender and authority in this era, demonstrating their crucial role underpinning early modern regnant queenship.

Chapter one considers the impact of the accession of a woman to the English throne. When Mary Tudor ascended the throne in 1553 regnant queenship was an unprecedented and disquieting phenomenon. In 1689, when Mary II succeeded to the throne, regnant queenship was no longer unprecedented, but crucially, Mary II's anomalous position as half of England's first dual monarchy was. Furthermore, given the dominant patriarchal model of later seventeenth century society, the rule of a woman still had the capacity to be distinctly unsettling. The accessions of both queens were underpinned by significant political, religious and dynastic upheaval, with the usurpation of Lady Jane Grey in 1553, and the Glorious Revolution and consequent deposition of James II in 1689. This is in marked contrast to Anne's peaceful and anticipated accession as England's fourth regnant queen in 1702. Chapter one focuses on Mary I and Mary II, examining the challenges their queenships presented to the political nation against the backdrop of considerable religious tensions, and within the context of contemporary beliefs about gender, blood and authority.

Anxieties about female rule were underpinned by gendered ideologies. Theories of traditional gender polarity based upon significant differences between the sexes placed women as

---

<sup>43</sup> Beem, *The Lioness Roared*, p.101

inferior to men. Informed by biblical teachings, and the work of Aristotle and Galen, a dominant gendered model emerged that defined women as physically weaker, emotionally unstable, and subject to men. Hence the government of a woman posed a direct contradiction to established and natural order, and was considered by many as ungodly and unnatural. Such a model of gendered beliefs continued across the period and was still prominent at the end of the seventeenth century, by which time, as both Gordon Schochet and Laura Gowing have demonstrated, patriarchy had also become firmly entrenched within society.<sup>44</sup>

Consideration of this gendered model in the first chapter enables a more focussed analysis of the significance of gender to the accessions of Mary I and Mary II. For instance, my analysis demonstrates that despite there being no overt expressions of anxieties about female rule in the celebrations that greeted Mary I's accession, a closer reading of the poems, ballads and plays that marked the occasion reveals distinct themes of reassurance, as contemporaries attempted to negotiate the unsettling nature of regnant queenship. And in relation to the debates that aimed to solve the constitutional dilemma over who should succeed James II in 1689, appreciation of the dominant gendered model reveals a continued apprehension regarding female government, supporting Lois Schwoerer's conclusion that patriarchy played a significant role in negating suggestions that Mary be made sole queen and William her consort.<sup>45</sup> Within this context the chapter will also consider to what extent these queens either transcended their gender or actively conformed to gendered expectations at their accessions.

Along with religion, gender was a contributory factor enabling the dynastic manipulation that marked the accessions of Mary I and Mary II. Citing Mary Tudor's illegitimacy, and marked by a foreboding that her devout Catholicism would most certainly halt the rapid reforms of the Edwardian Reformation, in 1553 the duke of Northumberland attempted to divert the succession through the Suffolk line to Lady Jane Grey. Illegitimacy was a decisive bar to monarchical authority and a re-appraisal of the sources reveals the intrinsic links between gender and notions of legitimate and illegitimate blood. Such notions were at the forefront of English politics once again in 1688 with the birth of a son to the Catholic James II and his

---

<sup>44</sup> Gordon J. Schochet, *Patriarchy in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford, 1975), pp.1,57; Laura Gowing, *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in Seventeenth Century England* (London, 2003), pp.7-9

<sup>45</sup> Lois Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 42, 4 (Winter, 1989), pp. 729-730

queen, Mary of Modena. Against a backdrop of considerable anti-Catholicism in England, the legitimacy of this child was questioned, as Protestants alleged he was suppositious; and his birth became the catalyst for the Glorious Revolution and consequent accession of William and Mary. Chapter one will demonstrate that notions of gender, blood and authority remained contestable across the period, and combined with religious doctrine, underpinned attitudes towards regnant queens.

Given the unsettling nature of regnant queenship, it was crucial for the successful establishment of the new regime that the queen's authority was formally confirmed as soon as possible following her accession. This was particularly imperative given the problematical accessions of Mary I and Mary II. Chapter two considers how monarchical power was confirmed for regnant queens by analysing the significance of the proclamation, royal entry and coronation at this critical juncture of a new queen's reign. Individually these events performed their own specific purpose by defining the queen's claim to the throne and providing a visual affirmation of queenship. For power to be formally and successfully confirmed a combination of these key events was required. The proclamations of Mary I and Mary II are considered within the particular context of their accessions. The analysis reveals the centrality of notions of blood and hereditary blood right to Mary's claim in 1553. In 1689, in contrast, because James II was still alive, such notions were problematical and necessitated a significant reworking of the language and format of the proclamation. Royal entry provided an important visual affirmation of Mary Tudor's queenship, as the queen symbolically took control of the capital city, but its significance dwindled during the seventeenth century, and neither William and Mary, nor Anne, took part in a formal royal entry. Instead, other opportunities were sought for visual demonstration of authority, and this was particularly evident at coronations, where the ritual of ceremonial was enhanced by formal processions and celebrations, and marked by the issue of commemorative medals, all of which, by the later seventeenth century, provided for a growing public interest in the coronation itself. Analysis of the coronations of Mary I, Mary II, and Anne reveals a surprising flexibility in such a well established ritual as contemporaries reinterpreted existing guidance to meet the challenges presented by regnant queenship. Alice Hunt has highlighted how the Tudor coronations negotiated and offered new definitions of monarchical authority.<sup>46</sup> This was

---

<sup>46</sup> Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2008), p.9

certainly evident at Mary Tudor's coronation which was problematic because there was no precedent for the coronation of a regnant queen. The existing coronation ceremonial formally prescribed in texts such as the medieval *Liber Regalis* and the fifteenth century *Little Device*, only considered kings and queen consorts, not regnant queens. The negotiation and search for new definitions of monarchical authority was not solely the preserve of the Tudor monarchy, as it continued into the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, as the coronations of the two Stuart queens were also unprecedented. That of Mary II presented challenges because there was no precedent for crowning dual monarchs. Furthermore, crowning Mary as William's equal had the capacity to obscure William's kingship, both symbolically and in contradiction to the revolutionary settlement. Finally, in 1702, Anne's coronation was remarkable because she was crowned as sole queen despite being a married woman: her consort, George of Denmark, was excluded from any monarchical authority. The need for reinterpretations of the existing ceremonial for each of these coronations clearly testifies to the challenges presented by regnant queenship, whilst revealing the centrality of the coronation to the confirmatory process.

Central to a study of married regnant queenship is the obvious tension between conjugal and political power that existed when a regnant queen married. Queens were not expected to rule alone. Marriage was considered necessary, as a husband would help the queen with her task of government, and crucially, provide an heir. But marriage for a regnant queen was inherently problematic because of the belief that women should be subject to their husbands. This apparent contradiction between the exercise of power by a woman and the authority of her husband raised important questions about the extent of a male consort's authority and influence. This was particularly pertinent if a queen were to marry a foreign prince, as Mary Tudor did the year following her accession. Sixteenth century dynastic politics were marked by fears of England's domination by a foreign power. Paradoxically by 1689, England welcomed a foreign king. With his English wife, Mary, the Dutch and Protestant, William of Orange, was deemed by the English Parliament an eminently more suitable monarch than the Catholic James II.<sup>47</sup> But the tension between conjugal and political power still remained, enhanced by the patriarchal doctrine of late seventeenth century society.

---

<sup>47</sup> Widely recognised as a defender of Protestantism in Europe, and considered a Protestant king, William was a Calvinist.

Chapter three examines how contemporaries responded to the inherent tension between conjugal and political power by analysing the relationship between gender and legal constructs of authority. Set within a gendered framework, the act for the Queen's Regal Power and the Marriage Treaty of Philip and Mary sought to define Mary's regal authority and address the problems raised by the unprecedented position of a male consort: specifically to ensure that Philip's authority in England did not extend beyond conjugal limits. Despite attempts to differentiate between conjugal and political authority, boundaries were easily blurred, and a closer consideration of the wording of the terms of the Marriage Treaty reveals ambiguities that enabled Philip to exercise a certain amount of political influence. Such ambiguities were amplified by contemporary perceptions of Philip's capability as a governor, compared to that of his wife. The 1689 Bill of Rights placed monarchical authority solely in William, effectively defining the balance of power within the dual monarchy. Such a rigid definition became problematic in 1690, as William prepared to leave England for the military campaign in Ireland. It raised the question of how to invest monarchical authority in Mary II without negating or reducing William's power. A considered analysis of the Parliamentary debates surrounding the Regency Bill demonstrates that the issue was far from a straightforward matter of taking power from one and investing it in the other, as contemporaries struggled to achieve a suitable legislative conclusion. Similar to the 1554 legislation, the 1690 Regency Act also proved problematic in practice. Mary's handling of her regencies was both praised and criticised, as the political nation sought to reconcile her gender to her monarchical authority in William's absence. By 1701 legal constructs of married queenship were more successful. Anne's place in the succession, and her future monarchical authority, were clearly defined in the Act of Settlement, which, significantly, made no attempt to provide her consort with a formal regal role whatsoever.

Chapter three also considers how the tensions between conjugal and political power were perceived by contemporaries as they struggled to adapt to the inversion of traditional gendered roles presented by a regnant queen and her male consort. For instance, an analysis of the iconography employed following Mary's marriage to Philip in 1554 reveals a series of mixed messages that testify to limitations of legislative manoeuvres. Gendered identities are often blurred as Philip is portrayed both as a king and in the manner of a female consort, and

Mary as both monarch and wife. Consideration of perceptions of the balance between conjugal and political power within the dual monarchy of William and Mary focus upon her regencies, as this was the only time she was able to exercise monarchical authority. Analysis of panegyric, newspaper articles and medals commemorating her regencies serve to communicate a certain level of gendered anxieties, as portrayals of Mary II at this time sought to constrain the queen within gendered boundaries rather than risk emasculating William's authority. Legislative definitions of Anne's monarchical authority presented no such ambiguities, but despite this, perceptions of George's role in her queenship are also marked by similar mixed messages. Although George had no formal regal role, occupying instead, the informal role of prince consort, an examination of panegyric celebrating military achievements of the reign, and the funeral sermons following his death in 1708, reveal George's centrality to his wife's sovereignty.

Directly linked to perceptions of conjugal and political power is the question of whether a queen's husband should be crowned. Neither Philip of Spain nor George of Denmark was crowned and Chapter three explores the reasons why. The concept of a male consort without a crown was something that contemporaries struggled with, especially with regard to Philip, but for some, to a degree, for George also. A crown would have significantly altered the balance of power so carefully defined in legislation. Certainly for Mary Tudor, suggestions that Philip be crowned caused considerable anxieties about the extent of Philip's power. Establishing the rationale behind expectations that Philip and George should be crowned, and defining why this did not happen for either man, contributes to our understanding of exactly how fragile the balance between conjugal and political power was for married regnant queens, their consorts, and the political nation. Furthermore, that this was an issue with regard to George is indicative of the clear continuities across the period.

Providing an heir was one of the main reasons for marriage, and chapter three also considers the failed maternity of Mary Tudor, Mary II and Anne. All three queens died childless, but the consequences of the failure of their maternal bodies for their reigns differed. Although of crucial significance to the queenship of Mary Tudor, the altered political and religious climate, plus the establishment of a Protestant succession, at the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, can be seen to considerably reduce the impact of maternal failure.

Finally, Chapter four examines representations of regnant queenship by both opponents and supporters of the queens and their regimes. Greatly enabled by contemporary beliefs about gender, queenly identities were readily manipulated by critics across the period. Considered analysis of the tracts written by radical Protestant reformers in the mid sixteenth century, and the satirical ballads and poems of Jacobites in the later seventeenth century, uncovers a number of distinct similarities. Frequently underpinned by religious doctrine, the attacks on both Mary Tudor and Mary II drew upon anxieties about female rule to portray these queens and their governments as unnatural and ungodly. Their arguments were further reinforced by notions of tainted and illegitimate blood as they sought to challenge the queenships of both women.

Moving away from negative constructions of queenship, the second part of the chapter considers the positive representations employed by the queens themselves and their supporters. Using traditional gendered models to present their authority and to respond to opponents' polemic, portrayals of regnant queenship are characterised by ideals of femininity, piety, maternal imagery, and Godly queenship. Reinforcing these portrayals, contemporaries also sought suitable classical, biblical and historical archetypes with whom to draw relevant comparisons. Considering the celebrations marking Mary Tudor's accession Chapter one identifies three key themes: the queen as a restorer of order; the divine nature of her queenship; and her piety and chastity. In addition to maternal imagery, each of these themes will be explored in further detail in Chapter four, as they evolved during Mary's reign in response to the changing political and religious situation, and particularly, following her marriage to Philip in July 1554. Similarly, and not unsurprisingly, given the nature of their respective accessions, Mary II is also presented as having restored order to the realm. But this portrayal will be shown to be overshadowed to a great extent by representations of Mary that placed her queenship firmly within gendered boundaries, celebrating her traditional feminine virtues and conjugal duty to her husband. Maternal imagery will be shown to be a crucial element of the representations of Mary I and Mary II, as both queens negotiated the concept of their failed fecundity. The main emphasis of this chapter is on Mary I and Mary II, but concludes by considering how many of the key elements used to portray these queens resurfaced in Anne's reign. Anne too proved incapable of providing an heir. Despite



numerous pregnancies, she produced only one child that survived infancy, although he died shortly before her accession. Continuities in the use and significance of maternal imagery also demonstrate that despite significant political and religious changes across the period, including the evolution of monarchical office, attitudes towards women in the role of king had not evolved in parallel.

# 1

## Accession

---

“And in this consideration also we do reject women, as those whom nature hath made to keape home and to nourish their familie and children, and not to meddle with matters abroade, nor to beare office in a citie or common wealth no more than children or infants: except it be in such cases as the authoritie is annexed to the blood and progenie, as the crowne, a dutchie, or an erldome for there the blood is respected, not the age nor the sexe. Whereby an absolute Dutches or Countess, those I call absolute, which have that name, not by being married to a king, duke, or erle, but by being the true, right and next successors in that dignitie, and upon whom the right of the blood that title is descended: These I say have the same authoritie although they be women or children in that kingdome, dutchie or earledome as they should have had if they had bin men of full age. For the right and honour of the blod, and the quietness and suertie of the realme, is more to be considered, than either the base age as yet impotent to rule, or the sexe .....”<sup>48</sup>

For the political theorist, Sir Thomas Smith, writing during the first half of the 1560s, matters of gender, blood and authority were of key significance. That these issues were central in Smith’s political thought should not be surprising given that, as ambassador in France, he was serving England’s second only regnant queen, Elizabeth I; and that regnant queenship in England was still a relatively recent phenomenon, having commenced with the accession of Mary I in 1553. But it was not only in the second half of the sixteenth century that these issues were particularly relevant, as they were to become prominent again in the latter part of the seventeenth century, with the accession of William III and Mary II as England’s first dual monarchs in 1689. That these issues were still of such crucial significance in 1689 is one of the key parallels that can be drawn between the reigns of Mary I and Mary II, the most obvious of which being that their accessions were grounded in considerable political and

---

<sup>48</sup> Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (1583), ed. Mary Dewar, (Cambridge, 1982), pp.64-65

religious upheaval: Mary I was faced with the usurpation of Lady Jane Grey in 1553, whilst Mary II ascended the English throne as a consequence of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689. Furthermore, neither queen's accession was guaranteed as both faced considerable opposition to their queenship; Mary I against established government and the machinations of the duke of Northumberland, whilst Mary II was challenged by the kingship of both her husband and her father, as James II, having fled to France in 1688 was still alive. Such a backdrop of upheaval was in stark contrast to Anne's accession as England's fourth regnant queen, and last Stuart monarch, in 1702, which was predominantly peaceful, and welcomed by many following the death of William, who was after all foreign and not especially popular. And although issues of gender, blood and authority were very much a significant feature of Anne's reign, at her accession they were not of the same level of critical significance that was exhibited during those of Mary I and Mary II. Hence this chapter will focus on the two queen Marys and consider the significance of blood, gender and authority to their accessions to the throne.

The accession of a woman to the crown of England in 1553, was without precedent, and combined with contemporary notions of women's unstable nature and unsuitability for office, was deeply unsettling to the early modern political nation. The resulting anxieties about female rule were though manifested in very different ways, from the obvious polemic of the Protestant exiles such as John Knox, to the more subtle themes of reassurance found in poetry and literature at the beginning of Mary Tudor's reign that portrayed Mary's regime as sanctioned by God, and focussed on the queen's traditional feminine attributes of piety, virtue and chastity. Beliefs in women's inferiority, unsuitability for government, and subjection to their husbands continued across the period, and whilst in 1689 the accession of a woman in itself was no longer unprecedented, the accession of a dual monarchy was. Indeed, underpinned by contemporary ideologies, the concept of the dual monarchy raised numerous questions concerning the tensions between gender and authority which were highly visible in the parliamentary debates to resolve the constitutional crisis, and in numerous popular pamphlets of the period. Such interplay between gender and authority is also evident in the roles played by both queens in their respective accessions; from the highly participative actions of Mary Tudor which to a great extent effectively blurred her gender, to the almost entirely passive role of Mary Stuart whose behaviour conformed to contemporary gendered ideals.

Gender can also be seen as a contributory factor that enabled the manipulation of blood right. Notions of hereditary blood right and legitimate queenship combined with religious doctrine were highly prominent at the accessions of Mary I and Mary II, and informed attitudes to both queens. For Mary Tudor this was manifested in Edward VI's *Device for the Succession* and *Letters Patent* that excluded her from the succession on grounds of illegitimacy, in favour of her Protestant, and legitimate, cousin, Lady Jane Grey. And in 1689, once the birth of Mary Stuart's half-brother had been effectively discredited, executive authority within the dual monarchy was placed solely with William, despite Mary's stronger blood claim to the throne. The blood of both queens was problematic. Mary Tudor's blood posed significant problems for the duke of Northumberland's attempted coup during the succession crisis of 1553, as despite his efforts she was still regarded by the majority of the populace as the rightful heir to the throne. The problems associated with Mary Stuart's blood were twofold. Although being one of the key reasons why William of Orange, arrived in England in November 1688, to defend his wife's hereditary rights, Mary's stronger blood claim had the potential to eclipse William's kingship. Furthermore her blood relationship to her father and her half brother, the Prince of Wales was problematic to the political nation because it left her vulnerable to allegations of usurpation and violating patriarchal ideals. In addition, her relationship to her father raised concerns that torn loyalties between duty to her father and duty to her husband could jeopardise the Revolutionary settlement and consequently the security of the realm. Hence as Smith asserted blood was crucial to the "quietness and suertie" of the realm.

## **Part 1 – A Gendered Ideal: Contemporary Beliefs about Women**

The accession of Mary Tudor as England's first regnant queen brought issues of gender and authority to the forefront of early modern political thought. Contemporary beliefs defined women as inferior to men, both physically and emotionally, thus rendering them incapable of public office, and crucially, of government. Early modern notions about women were firmly grounded in classical and biblical thought, and numerous arguments were given for women's inferiority. Theories of traditional gender polarity based upon the significant differences between men and women were advocated by Aristotle who based his argument around four

main principles: metaphysical, natural, epistemological and ethical.<sup>49</sup> Under his metaphysical principle Aristotle held that women were contrarily opposite to men; men were hotter whilst women were colder; men were active whilst women were passive. His natural principle found that women were imperfect or deformed men, a deformity occurring in nature, whilst epistemologically women were less rational than men. Ethically women had less virtue than men and therefore men were naturally superior, rulers by nature, capable of engaging in public speech and more suited to command. In contrast women were deemed naturally inferior, and by nature more suited to obedience and silence in public.<sup>50</sup> Such ideas were reinforced by contemporary medical knowledge, and in particular the belief in the body's four humours and the qualities associated with them. The male body was considered to be hot and dry whilst the female body was thought to be cold and wet. Physical and emotional characteristics that marked gender difference were assigned to these humours. Men's heat imbued them with both physical and moral strength, courage, reason and honesty; whilst women were physically weaker, irrational, intellectually unstable and lacking in courage.<sup>51</sup> Women's physical weakness also made them more susceptible to illness, especially hysterical conditions which were attributed to the uterus, such as melancholia, listlessness and violent passions.<sup>52</sup> That Mary Tudor suffered from repeated bouts of illness throughout her life, and in particular exhibited 'hysterical' symptoms, would have reinforced these beliefs amongst contemporaries.<sup>53</sup>

Biblical teachings further reinforced contemporary beliefs of women's inferiority. Most influential of these was the book of Genesis and its account of the creation. After all, Eve was created after Adam, and from part of his body, which clearly demonstrated women's inferiority to men. Genesis also made clear that women were created for the benefit of men, as Eve was created as a companion or "help meet" for Adam. Furthermore it was women's sinful and unstable nature that was responsible for 'the Fall' and the consequent expulsion of

---

<sup>49</sup> Sister Prudence Allen, *The Concept of Woman. Volume II. The Early Reformation, 1250-1500* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 17, 107-108

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108, and Merry Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 13

<sup>51</sup> Wiesner, *Women and Gender*, pp. 26-27, Jacqueline Eales, *Women in Early Modern England 1500- 1700* (London, 1998), p.3

<sup>52</sup> Ian Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 41-42

<sup>53</sup> H.F.M. Prescott, *Mary Tudor* (London, 1952), p. 204; Glyn Redworth, '“Matters Impertinent to Women”: Male and Female Monarchy under Philip and Mary', *English Historical Review*, 112, 447 (1997), p.603; V.C. Medvei, 'The Illness and Death of Mary Tudor', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 80 (1987), pp. 766-770

both Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. It was Eve who committed the first sin and her resulting punishment of subjection to man and pain in childbirth would have been considered justified by contemporaries.<sup>54</sup> The notion that Eve had sinned as a direct implication of her gender was one that was perpetuated in popular literature. For instance, in his *Concerning Famous Women*, the Italian writer and poet, Giovanni Boccaccio, writing in the fourteenth century, although acknowledging Adam's involvement in the expulsion from Eden, clearly saw Eve as the major perpetrator. She had, he maintained, "a woman's fickleness" which led her to disobey the word of God, and furthermore, she was a temptress who led her husband into her disobedience "with enticing suggestions."<sup>55</sup> In addition, the belief that women were in subjection to men, and in particular to their husbands, was further reinforced in the New Testament and the teachings of St Paul, who forbade women to speak in public, highlighting their subjection to men as one of the main reasons for this. The Spanish scholar, Juan Luis Vives, in his instruction manual, *The Education of a Christian Woman*, highlighted both Paul's teachings and Eve's creation after Adam when considering the issue of women's subjection. Consequently Vives saw women as essentially weak and lacking in judgement, to the point that their female nature rendered them almost unstable as he argued:

"A woman's thoughts are swift and generally unsettled, roving without direction, and I know not where her instability will lead her."<sup>56</sup>

Vives' *Education of a Christian Woman*, although originally written for Mary Tudor as *De Institutione Faeminae Christianae* in 1523, was however intended for a wider audience, and was republished in an English translation in 1540.<sup>57</sup> Beliefs about women were not restricted to educated elites, hence Smith's comments in *De Republica Anglorum* highlight the widespread belief that women, were by nature, more suited to life in the domestic sphere nurturing their children, not involving themselves in "matters abroad" and certainly not holding office. The Bible conveyed powerful messages that were understood at all levels of society. Furthermore the variety of popular media used to perpetuate the notion of women's

---

<sup>54</sup> M.R. Sommerville, *Sex and Subjection: Attitudes to Women in Early Modern Society* (London, 1995), pp.25-31; S. Mendelson and P. Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 32-33

<sup>55</sup> Giovanni Boccaccio, *Concerning Famous Women*, trans. and ed. G.A. Guarino (1964), p. 2

<sup>56</sup> Juan Luis Vives, *The Education of a Christian Woman*, trans. and ed. Charles Fontazzi (Chicago, 2000), p. 59

<sup>57</sup> Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca, 1990), pp. 117-119 for further analysis of Vives' work

nature and inferiority, including folklore, ballads, pamphlets and broadsheets, testify that these beliefs were indeed widespread across early modern England.<sup>58</sup>

Such a model of gendered beliefs continued across the period, and despite a period of female rule lasting from 1553 to 1603 with the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth, was still prominent around the time of Mary II's accession at the end of the seventeenth century. For instance, in 1687, George Saville, first Marquis of Halifax, in his popular pamphlet, *The Lady's New Year's Gift*, sought to define gender roles along traditionally held lines:

“You must first lay it down for a foundation in general, that there is inequality in the sexes, and that for the better economy of the world, the men, who were to be the law givers, had the larger share of the reason bestowed upon them, by which means your sex is better prepared for the compliance that is necessary for the better performance of those duties which seem to be most properly assigned to it.”<sup>59</sup>

Saville viewed such a clearly differentiated model as essential for the good order of society, with the differing characteristics of both genders effectively complementing each other to achieve a balanced harmony, and echoing the beliefs of earlier writers concerning women's lack of strength and reason he continued:

“We are made of very different tempers, that our defects might be mutually supplied. Your sex wanteth our reason for your conduct, and our strength for your protection: ours wanteth your gentleness to soften and to entertain us.”<sup>60</sup>

Saville had originally written *The Lady's New Year's Gift* for his daughter, but proving popular it was republished many times into the eighteenth century, thus a clear indication that these ideas about gender difference continued to be widespread into Anne's reign.

---

<sup>58</sup> Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, pp. 58-60

<sup>59</sup> George Saville, *The Lady's New Year's Gift*, in H.C. Foxcroft ed. *The Life and Letters of Sir George Saville, Bart. First Marquis of Halifax*, Volume II. (London, 1898), p. 394

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 394

## Part 2 – The Accession of a Woman: The Significance of Gender

In 1553, with the exception of the contested rule of the uncrowned Matilda in the twelfth century, there was no precedent for regnant queenship in England.<sup>61</sup> Prior to 1553 women had only governed unofficially; as consorts, mothers of kings, and temporarily as regents. For instance, the widowed Eleanor of Aquitaine wielded significant power during the reign of her son Richard I at the end of the twelfth century, as Margaret of Anjou, queen consort of Henry VI was also able to do in the mid fifteenth century, and Katherine of Aragon, first queen of Henry VIII, had acted as regent whilst the king was in France in 1513. But crucially, women had not inherited and governed in their own right. To this extent, a regnant queen was, as Judith Richards has asserted, something of a ‘novelty.’<sup>62</sup> However, the significance of Mary Tudor’s gender had far deeper reaching and serious implications than mere novelty value. To some, the accession of a woman to the throne of England was so against both divine and natural law, it was deemed to be a punishment from God. For example, in 1554, the Protestant preacher, Thomas Becon, lamenting the death of Edward VI, and with direct reference to the teachings of St Paul, saw Mary’s accession in this light, as he wrote:

“For in the stead of that virtuous prince thou hast set to rule over us a woman, whom nature hath formed to be in subjection unto man, and whom thou by thine holy apostle commandest to keep silence, and not to speak in the congregation. Ah, Lord! To take away the empire from a man, and give it unto a woman, seemeth to be an evident token of thine anger towards us Englishmen.”<sup>63</sup>

Similarly, the reformer, John Calvin, considered the rule of a woman to be “a deviation from the original and proper order of nature,” and ranked it akin to “slavery” as one of the

---

<sup>61</sup> The daughter of Henry I, Matilda (1102-1167) was made heir to the throne of England by her father following the death of his son in 1120, and was formerly recognised as such by Henry’s magnates on two occasions. On Henry’s death in 1135 however, his nephew, Stephen of Blois, who had been brought up at the English court, and who had a claim in his own right through his mother, the daughter of William I, claimed the throne and was crowned in Winchester. A protracted civil war ensued as Matilda returned from Anjou to England to fight for her throne. Although obtaining the advantage following Stephen’s capture in 1141, and in the same year being recognised by a legatine council as ‘lady of England and Normandy’, support for her waivered, and with pope Innocent II upholding Stephen’s claim, she was eventually unsuccessful in her cause. The focus of her efforts later shifted to secure her son’s inheritance rather than her own claim. Matilda returned to Normandy in 1148.

<sup>62</sup> Judith Richards, ‘ “To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule”: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 28, 1 (1997), p. 103

<sup>63</sup> Thomas Becon, *An Humble Supplication Unto God for the Restoring of his Holy Word Unto the Church of England*, in John Ayre, ed. *Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon* (Cambridge, 1844), p.227



punishments related to the fall of mankind.<sup>64</sup> And the radical Protestant, John Knox, one of Mary's most vociferous critics, drew upon contemporary beliefs about gender and used both the Bible and the writings of Aristotle to reinforce his argument that the rule of a woman was unnatural and monstrous, "a thing repugnant to nature."<sup>65</sup> Knox's argument against female rule essentially had three main strands. Firstly, he asserted that female rule was contrary to the laws of nature, pointing out that women were "weake, fraile, impacient, feble and foolish" and that they had also been proved to be "vnconstant, variable, cruell and lacking the spirit of counsel and regiment."<sup>66</sup> Referring to Aristotle's *Politics*, he pointed out that such characteristics not only rendered women unsuitable for government, but warned that female rule would result in "iniustice, confusion and disorder."<sup>67</sup> Secondly, he argued that female rule contravened divine order because God had effectively denied authority to women. Drawing on the account of the Creation and Eve's responsibility for the expulsion from Eden, he referred to:

"..... the reueled will and perfect ordinance of God, and against this parte of nature, I say, that it doth manifestlie repugne that any woman shal reigne or beare dominion ouer man. For God by the order of his creation, and after by the curses and malediction pronounced against the woman, by the reason of her rebellion, hath pronounced the contrarie."<sup>68</sup>

Reflecting popular beliefs about gender, Knox asserted that women were created to serve men, not to command them, and similar to Becon, referred to the teachings of St Paul, and the subjection of women as he continued:

"First, I say, that woman in her greatest perfection, was made to serue and obey man, not to rule and command him: As saint Paule doth reason in these words. Man is not of the woman but the woman of the man. And man was not created for the cause of the woman, but the woman for the cause of the man, and therefore

---

<sup>64</sup> John Calvin to Sir William Cecil dated Geneva 1559, in H. Robinson, ed. *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge, 1845), pp. 34-35; Although written early in Elizabeth's reign, Calvin is referring to his responses to John Knox two years earlier. Not wishing to offend the Protestant Elizabeth he is anxious to stress his belief in exceptional women.

<sup>65</sup> John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (1558), ed. Edward Arber (London, 1895), p.11

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15

ought the woman to haue a power vpon her head (that is a couerture in signe of subiection).”<sup>69</sup>

The question of women’s subjection was crucial to Knox’s opinion of female rule and he drew upon the teachings of St Paul to illustrate his point further, utilising Paul’s words: “I suffer not a woman to teache, nether yet to vsurpe authoritie aboue man.”<sup>70</sup> Therefore for Knox, female rule was a direct contradiction of divine order as it effectively contravened the teachings of the Bible and the word of God. Knox used this point to underpin the third strand of his argument, namely that women were not able to inherit office. Whilst not denying the inheritance rights of women in general, he argued however that they could not inherit a position that carried the responsibility of authority over men as God had denied such authority to women, and consequently it would be against God’s will that they inherit such authority.<sup>71</sup> Such strongly held convictions were to set Knox on a collision with the regime of Mary, and later that of her sister Elizabeth, as both women acceded to the throne of England as a direct consequence of their hereditary right, a point of difference with which Knox was unable to reconcile himself.

The arguments of Becon, Calvin and Knox, although underpinned by their religious convictions and predisposition against a Catholic queen, also evidence contemporary anxieties that formed part of a substantial and significant debate around the issue of gynecocracy, which was to be voiced most vociferously amongst the Protestant exiles during Mary’s reign, and in particular, following her marriage. Indeed, as will be considered in a later chapter, Mary’s marriage to Philip of Spain was to prove the catalyst that triggered the critics of gynecocracy to transpose their arguments into direct vilifications of Mary and her regime. However in 1553, such ideology appears almost in direct contradiction to the vast outpouring of popular support for Mary in her campaign to claim her throne and in the celebrations of her accession. Indeed, initially, there appears to be little evidence reflecting anxieties about Mary’s gender in contemporary accounts of the events surrounding her accession. Despite her position as heiress presumptive during the reign of her brother, Edward VI, Mary’s accession as queen of England was far from straightforward. Indeed, following Edward’s death on 6<sup>th</sup> July 1553, Mary was faced with an attempted coup

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45

organised by the duke of Northumberland and the subsequent usurpation of Lady Jane Grey as queen of England.<sup>72</sup> Mary however, was considered by many as the rightful heir, and the proclamation of Jane in London on 10<sup>th</sup> July received a distinctly muted response marked by a lack of celebration amongst the people. Contemporary accounts report a young man, Gilbert Potter, a drawer at a local tavern, being placed in the pillory and having his ears cut off as punishment for speaking up in support of Mary, declaring that “she had the right tittle”.<sup>73</sup> Potter’s relatively humble position as a worker at a local tavern is indicative of the type of popular support for Mary as large numbers of ordinary people expressed their loyalties to her by committing themselves to her cause. The groundswell of popular support was particularly evident in the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk, where Mary had retreated to her estates upon being advised of Northumberland’s conspiracy against her. In his *Vita Mariae Reginae*, Robert Wingfield, a staunch adherent of Mary, records this support:

“it is remarkable to relate how much excitement there was among the countryfolk of the two counties; every day they flocked to their rightful queen ready to lay out for her in this worthy cause their wealth, their effort and life itself, more dear by far than wealth and effort.”<sup>74</sup>

Indeed, the numbers of “men from all ranks of life” who joined Mary’s troops on a daily basis so increased the size of her forces that it necessitated her move from her residence at Kenninghall to the larger castle of Framlingham in Suffolk.<sup>75</sup> In his record of events, the Spaniard, Antonio de Guaras, confirms Wingfield’s account of support for Mary, but significantly, neither accounts exhibit anxieties over Mary’s gender. Likewise, the scenes of great joy witnessed in London following the proclamation of Mary as queen after the collapse of Jane Grey’s usurpation, do not exhibit expressions of gendered anxiety. Instead it is as though the proclamation triggered a cathartic reaction following the uncertain political situation after Edward’s death, as Mary’s accession represented the restoration of order, in stark contrast to the disorder associated with Northumberland’s coup. The proclamation of

---

<sup>72</sup> Northumberland’s coup and Mary’s campaign to claim her throne are considered by David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, pp. 171-183; Anna Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: England’s First Queen*, pp. 161-174; Judith Richards, *Mary Tudor*, (Abingdon, 2008), pp.114-120; John Edwards, *Mary I: England’s Catholic Queen*, pp. 87-104

<sup>73</sup> J.G. Nichols ed. *The Diary of Henry Machyn Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563* (London, 1848), pp.35- 36; J.G. Nichols ed. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary* (London, 1850), pp. 115-116

<sup>74</sup> *The Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae of Robert Wingfield of Brantham*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Camden Miscellany*, 28, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 29 (London, 1984), p.253. Wingfield’s tract was written in celebration of Mary’s accession. Despite its partisan nature, the tract provides a detailed account of events in East Anglia.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p.255

Mary as queen, in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July was received by a jubilant populace throwing their caps in the air and shouting “God save Quene Mary.” As the news spread across the city, church bells were rung, bonfires lit and crowds gathered in the streets to celebrate.<sup>76</sup> De Guaras, elaborated on the celebrations as he recalled;

“... so great were the cries and acclamations when they drank for the love of the queen, as is the custom here, that it seemed as if all had escaped from this evil world, and alighted in Heaven.”<sup>77</sup>

Using the analogy of Heaven, de Guaras also invited comparison between the Godly nature of Mary’s queenship and the tyranny of Northumberland’s government. In this context, the popular support for Mary, the joyful reactions to her accession and the associated celebrations, can be viewed as recognition of her status as the rightful heir to the throne, and her accession as a restoration of good order, indicating that in this instance, and in opposition to the arguments of Knox and Becon, her blood was of greater significance than her gender, a point that was reflected in Smith’s comments that “the right and honour of the blod” were more important than the “sexe” of the monarch.

It would be erroneous to discount the significance of Mary’s gender on the grounds of such celebrations alone. Indeed, the queen’s gender was of crucial significance at her accession, and caused anxieties that crossed the religious divide. The poems, ballads and plays of the early part of her reign are embedded with subtle themes of reassurance, as contemporaries sought to negotiate the deviation from the normality of the monarchical model that female rule represented. Three key themes are identified within such works: firstly, that Mary had restored order to the realm; secondly, the divine nature of her queenship; and finally, within the context of contemporary standards of acceptable behaviour for women, that she was virtuous, pious and chaste. Richard Taverner’s *An Oration gratulatory made upon the joyful proclaiming of the moste noble Princes Quene Mary Quene of Englande* is one work that embodies these themes. Taverner was a Protestant reformer who would have had significant concerns about the affect of Mary’s accession upon religious practice in England, but

---

<sup>76</sup> C. Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from AD 1485 to 1559*, Vol. 2, ed. W. D. Hamilton (London, 1877), pp. 88-89; See also Machyn, *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p.37, Antonio De Guaras, *The Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. Richard Garnett (London, 1892), pp. 96-97; *Chronicle of Queen Jane* pp. 11-14, and *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp. 96,108

<sup>77</sup> De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p.96

upholding principles of hereditary succession, his *Oration* attempts to address gendered anxieties. Pointing to Mary's delivery of England from the clutches of tyranny, he invites comparison between Northumberland's wickedness and the joy that Mary's accession has brought to the nation:

“Lo out of what trouble and mysery wherinto we were brought by ye most deuelishe deuce of one man into what felicity and ioye we be reduced by ye most gracious benefite of one mayden Quene.”<sup>78</sup>

He highlighted her unmarried status and hence her virginity. Mary's “mayden” status was important to Taverner as it demonstrated her chastity and the purity of her nature, lending her an almost divine quality. But the divine nature of her queenship is also because her rule has been sanctioned by God, a view directly opposing that of Becon, Calvin and Knox, as Taverner, referring to her precarious position during the succession crisis continued:

“Now God hath sent us contrary to all humane expectation our most naturall and mooste rightful Soueraigne Lady to rule and raign ouer us, and such a Lady of whose integritie, Princely clemencye, benignitie, and wysdom no man douteth .....”<sup>79</sup>

Although the language used refers directly to Mary as “mayden” and “Soueraigne Lady”, Taverner also blurred the queen's gender by attempting to masculinise her, asserting her “Princely” qualities and describing her as the “gouvernoure of England” as opposed to a governess; seeking to reassure, that although she was a woman, she was capable of government.<sup>80</sup>

William Forrest's *A New Ballad of the Marigolde* embodies similar messages of reassurance. Written shortly after her accession, Forrest compared Mary to a garden flower, a marigold. Whilst other flowers such as roses and lilies were beautiful, their purpose was merely to satisfy men's senses, a purely transient satisfaction, as their blooms quickly fade leaving only bare stalks, whilst the hardy marigold withstands the elements and continues to bloom.

---

<sup>78</sup> Richard Taverner, *An Oration gratulatory made upon the joyfull proclaiming of the moste noble Princes Quene Mary Quene of Englande* (London, 1553) p.8

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9

“Though these which here are mencioned  
Bee delectable to the iye,  
By whom sweete smelles are ministred,  
The sense of man to satisfye,  
Yet each as serueth his fatasye;  
Wherefore to say I wyll be bolde,  
And to aduoide all flaterye,  
I doo commende the Marigolde.

All these but for a time doth serue,  
Soone come, soone gone, so doth they fare,  
At feruent heates and stormes thei sterue,  
Fadyng away, their staulkes left bare.  
Of that I praise, thus say I dare,  
Shee sheweth glad cheare in heate and colde,  
Moche profityng to hertes in care,-  
Such is this floure, the Marigolde.<sup>81</sup>

Mary had certainly withstood the “feruent heates and stormes” during the reigns of her father and brother, and more recently Jane Gray’s usurpation of her crown. But Forrest’s comparison goes beyond mere reference to Mary’s stoicism during periods of political and religious upheaval as he effectively set her apart from other women. As the exception to the dominant gendered model understood by contemporaries Forrest’s Mary was reliable and dependable; certainly reassuring qualities in any ruler, but particularly so a female ruler, given contemporary ideas of women’s instability. Such characteristics also demonstrate Mary’s suitability for the office of monarch, a theme which Forrest elaborates upon by reminding his readers that she is also well educated, virtuous and pious.<sup>82</sup> Similar to Tavener he also sought to present Mary’s rule as divinely sanctioned by God, particularly in his description of the marigold opening its petals in response to the sun’s rays, which serves as a

---

<sup>81</sup> William Forrest, *A New Ballade of the Marigolde* (1553), in Hyder E Rollins ed. *Old English Ballads 1553 – 1625* (Cambridge, 1920), p.9

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.10-11

metaphor for Mary's God given authority and also the Virgin Mary.<sup>83</sup> Forrest's enthusiastic praise of Mary is hardly surprising given that he was an ordained Catholic priest, but like Taverner, he also sought to calm anxieties about the queen's gender. That there was a perceived need for such reassurance on Mary's accession is significant as it provides a clear indication of the existence of underlying anxieties and the tensions that existed between her gender and contemporary understanding of monarchical authority.

The significance of Mary's gender is further apparent in the role she played during the events of her accession, and particularly in her campaign to claim her throne. Having been informed of Northumberland's plot against her, she had already judged the seriousness of the situation and, using the excuse that some of her servants were ill, moved from Hunsdon to her residence at Kenninghall, thus placing herself further away from court, and the threat to her person. Mary's position at Edward's death was precarious. She was greatly outnumbered by Northumberland's well equipped forces, a point noted by the Imperial ambassadors, who recognising the danger she was in considered the likelihood of her obtaining the crown to be "well-nigh impossible" without extra forces.<sup>84</sup> Not only was Mary outnumbered and ill prepared, she was also a woman, who contrary to the accepted model of gender roles was faced with the prospect of having to lead armed men into combat in order to obtain her throne.

According to the political theorist Machiavelli, writing earlier in the sixteenth century, a prince should be adept at warfare in order to maintain his realms and his position.<sup>85</sup> But Mary posed a gendered contradiction to Machiavelli's theory as given contemporary beliefs about women, being weaker; she would lack the courage, judgement and physical strength required for that undertaking. Also early modern women were expected to behave in a certain manner; namely they should be modest, pious and chaste, so a woman entering the arena of warfare posed a direct contradiction to the expected codes of behaviour. However, the sixteenth century Italian poet Torquato Tasso, recognising a clash between a princess's moral and political duties, argued that the duty of a princess was first and foremost to her royal blood

---

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, p10. The representation of Mary as the Virgin Mary is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, pp. 201-204

<sup>84</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp.72-78

<sup>85</sup> Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince* (Oxford, 2005), p. 50

and position, even if this meant that she had to neglect her moral virtues in pursuit of the qualities required to govern.<sup>86</sup> In this context Mary can be seen as transcending her own gender and embodying masculine virtues when the political situation and her position required her to do so, without necessarily jeopardising her reputation, a strategy that was to be used so adeptly by Elizabeth at crisis points such as the threat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. Hence the Mary that emerges during the succession crisis of 1553 is politically astute, exercising her own judgement and inspiring others by her leadership. For instance she recognised the significance of the proclamation in announcing her intention to claim her throne, and had herself proclaimed queen in her own household, inspiring her servants and those about her.<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, although not actually taking to the battlefield, she took it upon herself to muster and review her troops. Setting out amongst her soldiers on horseback, Mary had to dismount after her horse became nervous at being surrounded by such large numbers of men, but appearing undaunted she carried out the review on foot, spending several hours amongst the men, talking to them and inspiring them with her relaxed manner.<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, she effectively behaved as a king, as one account of her accession refers to the manner in which she greeted the Earl of Arundel and Lord Paget following her proclamation in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July, thanking them “in ways which are due by a King to his subjects.”<sup>89</sup> Thus Mary took control over her own accession, and in this instance successfully negotiated the barriers presented by her gender. Her ability to embody masculine virtues when the situation required, in addition to her being considered by the majority as England’s rightful queen, effectively enabled her to command respect and loyalty, and crucially, it would appear that in some circumstances she could be viewed as a prince or king rather than a woman.

Further implications associated with her gender were unique to the religious situation in England. On one hand the papal legate to England, Cardinal Reginald Pole, saw Mary’s gender as a noteworthy factor in England’s restoration to the Catholic church, as writing to Pope Julius III following her accession he asserted that the question of religion in England will be answered “by means of a woman”, who will restore “justice, piety, and the true

---

<sup>86</sup> Maclean, *Renaissance Notion of Woman*, pp. 61-62

<sup>87</sup> Wingfield, *Vita Mariae Reginae*, p. 252

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.264-265; De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p.92

<sup>89</sup> C.V. Malfatti, *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as Related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial* (Barcelona, 1956), p. 21



religion.”<sup>90</sup> Such hopes overlooked the tension between monarchical and ecclesiastical office that had existed since the reign of Henry VIII, a tension that Pole would certainly have been aware of. As a consequence of the 1534 Act of Supremacy, on her accession as regnant queen Mary also became Supreme Head of the Church of England. Such a position was deemed to be problematic for a man as it conflicted with the Catholic belief that Christ was the supreme head of the church through his earthly successor the pope, so for a woman, who should after all be in subjection to men, this created a paradox that Mary was unable to reconcile herself with. In her letters to Pole, she expressed her anxieties over this issue and reflecting Catholic doctrine she asserted that the office of supreme Head of the Church in England did “not become a king” as the two offices were distinct; one political, the other ecclesiastical, but more significantly, as Pole recorded she argued that:

“... the title of Supreme Head of the Church in her kingdom misbecame her sex, this is taught by both divine law and by the law of nature, as shown by St Paul, who, when he forbids a woman to teach in church shows sufficiently how absurd and iniquitous it is for her to personify the supreme head in church.....”<sup>91</sup>

Under statute the title was hers by right, but as a woman and a Catholic, it was in all terms a significant contradiction and one to which a suitable compromise was not to be found during her reign. Significantly the issue of the supreme headship of the church in England was also problematic for the Protestant Elizabeth, who following her accession negotiated the issue by becoming supreme governor of the English church as opposed to supreme head.

By the time of the Glorious Revolution and the accession of William and Mary in 1689 it can be argued that the significance of gender had to some extent become diluted, since the death of Elizabeth in 1603 had restored the presence of male monarchs to the English throne. Certainly female rule was no longer the unprecedented phenomenon that it had been in 1553. And in significant contrast to Mary Tudor, Mary II was already married at the time of her accession, to a Protestant prince, which given the political and religious climate at the time, and the concerns around tyranny and fear of Catholicism, in many respects lessened the impact of her gender. But crucially, it did not discount its significance altogether, and gender

---

<sup>90</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. V, p. 383

<sup>91</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. V, pp. 447-448

can be seen to have played a key role in the creation of England's first dual monarchy. Popular notions about gender still persisted, and despite the reigns of both Mary I and Elizabeth in the sixteenth century, women were still considered to be more suitable as wives and companions to men rather than governors, a view expressed by the writer Daniel Defoe in an essay about the education of women in 1692:

“Not that I am for exalting the female government in the least: but, in short, I would have men take women for companions, and educate them to be fit for it.”<sup>92</sup>

Women were still considered as weaker than men, and the comments of Sir Thomas Smith over a hundred years earlier about the incapacity of age and gender still held resonance. For example, in the preface to a pamphlet published to celebrate the coronation of William and Mary in April 1689, the author cited the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth I to refer to the “Weakness of a Child and of a Woman”, although unlike Smith he emphasised God's strength in overcoming such incapacity as opposed to hereditary blood right.<sup>93</sup> Although not as vociferously expressed as the gynaecocracy debate of the sixteenth century, political commentators and theorists still questioned a woman's suitability for government. That this was once again a topic for debate was most likely prompted by the lack of a legitimate male heir in the early 1680s, which for the first time since the reign of Elizabeth had resulted in the prospect of another regnant queen.<sup>94</sup> Indeed, writing at this time, the political theorist, Algernon Sidney, echoed views expressed in the previous century when he questioned whether women were “as fit as men to perform the office of a king,” as they did not have the qualities required to “judge us, and to fight our battles.” And, underpinned by the dominant patriarchal beliefs of the period, he also asserted that it was unnatural for a woman, who could not be head of a family, to be head of a nation.<sup>95</sup> Hence female rule, although no longer unprecedented, was still considered an unnatural phenomenon, and thus had the potential to be considerably unsettling.

---

<sup>92</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Education of Women* (1697), in George A. Aitken ed. *Later Stuart Tracts* (New York, 1964), p. 284. Although first printed in 1697, Aitken points out Defoe's essay was written in 1692

<sup>93</sup> Anon., *Lux Occidentalis: or Providence Display'd in the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary; and their Happy Accession to the Crown of England* (London, 1698)

<sup>94</sup> Charles II and his queen, Catherine of Braganza, had no legitimate children. Charles' heir, his younger brother James who succeeded him as king in 1685 had two surviving daughters from his first marriage, Mary and Anne, and despite remarrying in 1673, to the much younger Mary of Modena no children from this marriage had survived beyond 1682, effectively leaving Mary as heiress presumptive to the English crown.

<sup>95</sup> Algernon Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, ed. Thomas G. West (Indianapolis, 1996), pp. 59-60; Sidney's *Discourses* was first published in 1698, only four years before the accession of the last Stuart regnant queen, Anne, in 1702.

Such deeply held views were to become highly significant during the Glorious Revolution, and were articulated in both the parliamentary debate over who should ascend the throne following James II's flight from England, and in the extensive pamphlet literature of the period. After James II had fled England for France in December 1688, the Convention Parliament was summoned to find a solution to the constitutional crisis that ensued. Two key decisions needed to be made; crucially to establish whether the English throne was indeed vacant, and if so, who should fill this vacancy. There was an overwhelming consensus that the government of the realm should be invested in one individual alone as the concept of a dual monarchy was unprecedented and presented a variety of potential problems, not least the concern that having two reigning monarchs would result in "confusion in the Government" which raised the question; who was to be obeyed if William issued one command, and Mary issued another.<sup>96</sup> Such an idea of 'confusion' was instructed by political ideologies as much as practical concerns. In his *Two Treatises of Government*, the political theorist, John Locke, writing about conjugal society within marriage recognised that whilst a husband and wife shared a "common concern", there would inevitably be differences of opinion, and therefore deemed it necessary that "the last Determination" was placed in one person, which, adhering to contemporary beliefs about gender, was naturally the man as the "abler and stronger."<sup>97</sup> Similarly, Sir Robert Filmer, using the analogy of the father as the head of the family, asserted that the government of one was the most natural.<sup>98</sup> In addition to the influence of such political ideologies the debates over the crown were also underpinned by a number of key issues including the perceived need for strong male government, contemporary notions about gender, and particularly the belief that a woman should be subject to her husband. So despite Mary having a stronger claim to the English throne than William, arguments for making him king, or placing the administrative authority solely in him, dominated the debates.<sup>99</sup> For instance, the pamphlet *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly, and for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone*, asserted that the exercise of authority should be vested in one, and considering who was the

---

<sup>96</sup> Anchitell Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons From the year 1667 to the Year 1694*, Vol. IX (London, 1763), p. 75

<sup>97</sup> John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge, 1988), p. 321

<sup>98</sup> Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha. The Naturall Power of Kinges Defended against the Unnatural Liberty of the People*, in J.P. Somerville, ed. *Patriarcha and Other Writings* (Cambridge, 1991), p.23 Although written much earlier, *Patriarcha* was first published in 1680, 27 years after Filmer's death in 1653

<sup>99</sup> William had a claim to the throne in his own right as the son of James II's sister, Mary, the Princess Royal, and as a grandson of Charles I

most suitable reflected upon the political and religious situation in Europe to conclude that “a Vigorous and Masculine Administration” was what was required, as only a prince would be capable of effective government in both peace and war.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, given contemporary understanding of gender, the pamphlet reinforced the point by reminding readers that:

“... a Man, by Nature, Education and Experience, is generally rendered more capable to Govern than the Woman.”<sup>101</sup>

Also bearing in mind the volatile European situation, the author of another pamphlet, *Four Questions Debated*, used the Biblical analogy of Israel’s choice of king to effectively echo Sidney’s comments that women did not have the necessary qualities to participate in warfare, asserted that:

“A Princess not able to make War, the great end of Israels choosing a King was to fight their Battles, which a Woman can’t do.”<sup>102</sup>

Continuing on this theme the pamphlet further emphasised the importance of military capability to the role of the monarch by pointing to the considerable number of allies already engaged with William in the defence of the Protestant religion, which if William’s power were to be dependent upon that of his wife would have ‘dangerous’ consequences for the realm should she die.<sup>103</sup> Hence the prospect of England’s involvement in armed conflict in Europe made Mary’s queenship problematic and a far less suitable option than the rule of William, who was not only male, but was also an established military and political leader. Another key issue was that as a married woman Mary was subject to her husband, which if she was to be made regnant queen with William as merely her consort would create a direct contradiction between conjugal and political authority. Such a crucial point of difference was raised in the Commons as one member asked the House:

“And does any think that the Prince of Orange will come in to be a subject to his own wife in England? This is not possible, nor ought to be in nature.”<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> Anon., *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly, And for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone* (Edinburgh, 1689)

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>102</sup> *Four Questions Debated* (1689)

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, ; Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, pp.75-76; One of the problems identified in the debates of the Convention parliament of making Mary queen with William as her consort, was that if she died, any power he may have in England would effectively come to an end.

<sup>104</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p. 64

Such a contradiction was also highlighted by the pamphlet literature including *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen joyntly* which picked up on this issue when arguing that the administration be vested in William rather than Mary as “the Husband ought rather to Rule the Wife, than the Wife the Husband.”<sup>105</sup> Clearly such an inversion of expected gendered roles was held to be against natural order and as such highly problematic to negotiate. Indeed this was an issue that touched Mary directly, as chief amongst those who wished to make her queen, the Tory, Lord Danby, had written to her with assurances that if she were to support him he would ensure that she became queen with monarchical power invested in her alone. But Mary, having always dutifully deferred to William angrily resisted any attempt to “divide her interest” from that of her husband, and advised William of Danby’s overtures.<sup>106</sup> William’s response to this episode and to the protracted parliamentary debates predictably adhered to the dominant gendered model as he advised the Convention Parliament “that he would hold no power dependent upon the will of a woman.”<sup>107</sup>

Having been married to William since 1677 Mary’s position as a consort was of key significance as it can be argued to have lessened the impact of her gender upon her accession. In this manner her gender was less of a concern for contemporaries, as they were able to view her as a consort rather than a governor; the reins of government remaining in a ‘safe’ pair of male hands, with Mary reassuringly constrained within the confines of marriage. Continuing to view Mary as a consort after her accession conformed to Defoe’s view that women were suitable companions for their husbands, rather than governors and her depiction as such was a feature of many of the poems and ballads of the period. An example of this is found in *An Ode on her Highness the Princess of Orange*, which celebrates Mary’s position as a consort, comparing her to one of the nine muses, Urania, and praising her traditional feminine qualities of beauty, piety and virtue.<sup>108</sup> Although this work was composed prior to the Glorious Revolution and performed before William and Mary in Holland in May 1688, it was later published in London following their accession. At its composition it therefore correctly identified Mary as merely William’s consort, but the fact that the work was later published in

---

<sup>105</sup> *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly*

<sup>106</sup> John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland from the Dissolution of the Last Parliament of Charles II Until the Sea Battle off La Hogue*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII (London, 1771) pp. 197-203

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, p.204

<sup>108</sup> Anon., *An Ode on her Royal Highness the Princess of Orange* (London, 1689)

England once Mary became queen indicates that the view of her as a consort rather than regnant queen was extant in England following her accession. A similar vision of Mary is expressed in Thomas Rymer's *A Poem on the Arrival of Queen Mary*. Although portraying Mary as a queen, crucially Rymer constructed her along traditionally gendered lines, supporting her husband in his role as governor:

“The Active Part Her Mighty Consort takes;  
And, for the Weal of Humane Kind He Wakes.  
Beneath Her Eyes His Generous Heart inspir'd,  
His Arm is strengthened, and His Prowess fir'd:  
Cheer'd by Her Rays His Care saultes the Morn,”<sup>109</sup>

Thus Rymer made clear that the reins of power were held by William whilst Mary occupied the role of consort, supporting and inspiring her husband. Furthermore Rymer reinforced this point concluding that Mary had no political ambition of her own.<sup>110</sup> Thus constructing Mary as a consort offered some sense of reassurance as by conforming to the accepted gendered model her presence on the throne could not be seen as threatening the prevailing patriarchal order of society.

But if these representations of Mary show her in a traditionally gendered and supportive role as dutiful wife and consort, the comments relating to her behaviour on her arrival in England in February 1689 were in sharp contrast; placing Mary in a considerably negative light they drew direct attention to notions of women's unstable and sinful nature. Her accession with her husband, to the throne of her father whilst he still lived, albeit in exile in France, was unprecedented and highly controversial and one that contemporaries were clearly sensitive to. Given this, the diarist John Evelyn recorded that many expected her to show some reluctance or regret at the situation when she arrived in London. He notes instead that her manner was very different from what had been expected as:

“She came into W-hall as to a Wedding, raint & jolly, so as seeming to be quite Transported: rose early on the next morning of her arrival, and in her undresse (as reported) before her women were up; went about from

---

<sup>109</sup> Thomas Rymer, *A Poem on the Arrival of Queen Mary. February the 12<sup>th</sup> 1689* (London, 1689)

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*,

roome to roome, to see the Convenience of White-hall: Lay in the same bed & apartment where the late Queene lay: & within a night or two, sate downe to play at Basset, as the Q. Her predecessor us'd to do.”<sup>111</sup>

Although excuses were made, her behaviour was “censured by many” and attention was drawn to her potential unsuitability for office.<sup>112</sup> She had as Sir John Dalrymple pointed out “betrayed a womanish levity” and the incident gave political capital to the opponents of the Glorious Revolution, and to those who had advocated that the administrative power of the dual monarchy be invested in William alone.<sup>113</sup>

In sharp contrast to Mary Tudor’s active role in her accession in 1553, Mary Stuart’s role in her own accession can only be described as limited. There are a number of key differences that account for this; the most obvious being that Mary II was already married at the time of her accession, and, conforming to accepted behaviour norms of the period, was already deferring to a husband who acted on her behalf. Secondly, unlike Mary Tudor, she was not resident in England, having been in Holland, as Princess of Orange since her marriage in 1677, which becomes problematic when comparing the roles played by the two queens in their accessions, as due to Mary II’s marital status, it is William who actively participated in both his and his wife’s accession. That Mary stayed in Holland until February 1689 suited William’s political agenda, and according to Dalrymple, he kept her in Holland deliberately to “prevent intrigues for her interest.”<sup>114</sup> There are two potential reasons why William wished to prevent such intrigues. Either it was to further his own political ambitions to pursue kingship, as recognising the strength of her hereditary claim he was anxious to ensure it did not eclipse his own, or, recognising the highly sensitive familial situation in which his wife was placed, between her husband and her father, an attempt to protect Mary from Jacobite allegations of usurpation and parricide.<sup>115</sup> That William was already in England however, was certainly to his advantage, and his behaviour in the months between James’ departure and the meeting of the Convention Parliament is significant. Not only did he ensure that Mary remained absent from the political arena, but during this time William behaved as though he

---

<sup>111</sup> E.S. de Beer ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. IV (Oxford, 1955), pp. 624-625

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 625

<sup>113</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII, p.209

<sup>114</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII, p. 203

<sup>115</sup> The notion of protecting Mary from Jacobite allegations of usurping her father’s throne is expressed in a pamphlet discussed on pp. 56-57

was already king, although crucially making no direct attempt to claim the throne. But also significant was the positive response to this behaviour from the political nation. For instance, following assurances from chief army officers that they would preserve the peace in the city of London, William issued a proclamation commanding that the regiments were to be assembled in the appropriate places and that discipline was to be maintained, to which, Dalrymple records “he was instantly obeyed, as if he had been already King of England.” And furthermore, on his arrival in London he immediately took control of the government, summoning the Convention Parliament, managing financial issues, and making changes in the army.<sup>116</sup> To a great extent William’s behaviour can be viewed as a response to the need for a ‘vigorous male administration’ as in James’ absence the nation lacked a governor, but it was also sanctioned by an underlying belief that William was the nation’s saviour as he had rescued England from Catholicism and tyranny. To this extent the Lords and Commons ordered a day of public thanksgiving in London, Westminster and the surrounding area, and a further day throughout the whole kingdom:

“for haveing made the prince the glorious instrument of the great deliverance of this kingdom from popery and arbitrary government”<sup>117</sup>

Feelings of gratitude towards William were also expressed less officially, in pamphlets. The author of *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly, And for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone* portrayed William in the guise of England’s saviour and argued that his coming to England’s aid made him deserving of no less than the crown.

“Who is it therefore, that has so highly Merited, the Love and good Opinion of the People? The Honour of Wearing the Crown, and Swaying the Scepter of this Land? As His illustrious Highness the Prince of Orange, who with so great Expence, Hazard, Conduct, Courage, and Generosity, has happily Rescued Us from Popery and Slavery; and with so much Gallantry Restored Us to our ancient Rights, Religion. Laws, Liberties, and Properties: for which Heroick Action, we can do no less, in

---

<sup>116</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VI, pp.178-188

<sup>117</sup> Narcicus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* (Oxford, 1857), Vol. I, pp. 497-498



Prudence, Honour, and Gratitude, than pray Him to Accept Our Crown.”<sup>118</sup>

Similarly the author of *Four Questions Debated* also saw William’s actions as worthy of reward, arguing that it would be

“... ungrateful to make him a subject in that Kingdom for which he has done more, than all the Kings of England ever did.”<sup>119</sup>

Unlike William, Mary was unable to participate in events to the same extent, and consequently it was not possible for her to be viewed in this light. Her gender, her position as William’s consort, and her lack of physical presence in England at this time, all contributed to exclude her to a great extent from actively participating in her own accession. This is not to say however, that she played no role whatsoever in her accession. As will be discussed below, through her correspondence with her younger sister, Anne, princess of Denmark, she became actively involved in the rumours surrounding the birth of her half-brother in 1688. But beyond this, her role was essentially a passive one, and any opportunity that was presented for her to become actively involved, such as the overtures of Lord Danby, was dutifully deferred to her husband as Mary conformed to patriarchal expectations.

### **Part 3 - Hereditary Blood Right: Legitimate and Illegitimate Blood**

On 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1553 the Bishop of Bedford omitted to pray for the princesses Mary and Elizabeth, and the following Sunday the Bishop of London, much to the aggravation of those present, preached that both Mary and Elizabeth were “bastarddes.”<sup>120</sup> These incidents were a precursor for the proclamation of Lady Jane Grey as queen on 10<sup>th</sup> July, and the effective disinheritance of Mary and Elizabeth, removing them from the line of succession through the instrument of Edward VI’s *Device for the Succession* and the associated *Letters Patent*. Traditionally this episode, led by the duke of Northumberland, has been viewed as a result of fears surrounding the anticipated re-Catholicization of England should Mary succeed to the

---

<sup>118</sup> *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess jointly*

<sup>119</sup> *Four Questions Debated*, p.7

<sup>120</sup> J.G. Nichols ed. *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, p. 78

throne. This was certainly a key contributory element but it was not the only factor, as had this been the case, there would have been no need to exclude the Protestant Elizabeth. In addition, the fact that there was some Protestant support for Mary at her accession, would appear to contradict the view that religion was the only reason for this attempt at dynastic manipulation. Instead Edward's *Device* can be seen as a consequence of a number of factors, including considerable anxieties over female rule. Two key factors can be used to evidence this. Firstly, the gendered language of the *Device* and *Letters Patent*, and secondly the reasons given for excluding Mary and Elizabeth from the succession. One of the most striking aspects of Edward's *Device* is that despite the proclamation of Jane as queen on 10<sup>th</sup> July, the crown was not initially bequeathed to her. It was instead to follow the Suffolk line, namely the descendents of Henry VIII's younger sister Mary, through to an eventual male heir, as following their mother, Lady Frances, each of the Grey sisters, Jane, Katherine and Mary, are named as the dying Edward VI specified that:

“For the lake of issu (*masle*) of my body (*to the issu (masle) cumming of thissu femal, as i have after declared*). To the L. Franceses heires masles, *For lakke of* (if she have any) such issu (befor my death) to the L' Janes (and her) heires masles, To the L Katerins heires masles, To the L Maries heires masles, To the heires masles of the daughters wich she shal haue hereafter. Then to the L Margets heires masles. For the lake of such issu, To th'eires masles of the L Janes daughters. To th'eires masles of the L Ksterins daughters, and so forth til yow come to the L Margets (daughters) heires masles.”<sup>121</sup>

It was therefore never the intention that the crown should pass to a woman, only that a woman should continue the blood line until a legitimate male heir was produced. As the Lady Jane was young, and unlike Mary and Elizabeth already married, to Northumberland's youngest son Guildford Dudley, there was every expectation of her producing children. But at Edward's death however, there was no child of the marriage and consequently the wording of the finalised *Letters Patent* differed from the *Device* in that the crown was bequeathed directly to Jane. Thus the *Letters Patent* state that the crown:

---

<sup>121</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 89

“shall remayne, come, and be, (2) TO THE LADIE JANE, eldest daughter of the said ladie Francis, and to the heires males of the said body of the said ladie Jane, lawfully begotten.”<sup>122</sup>

In this respect the crown not only remained free from the taint of Catholicism, Jane Grey being an adherent of the Protestant religion, but would also eventually revert to the male line once Jane and Guildford produced a son. The emphasis on “heires males” effectively ensured that Jane’s female body was circumscribed to its reproductive role. In this context the *Device* enabled a convenient circumnavigation around the problem posed by female rule. The ideology behind this was not new. Lois Huneycutt has convincingly demonstrated how attitudes about female rule in the twelfth century effectively ensured that the claims of Matilda in England and the rule of Melisende in Jerusalem were weakened in favour of the hereditary right of their sons.<sup>123</sup> Indeed, Huneycutt argues that contemporaries regarded both women as regents for their sons and points to Matilda’s change of focus in her campaign for securing the throne of England for her son instead of for herself.<sup>124</sup> Unlike in France there was no Salic Law in England barring the succession of women or the descent of the crown through the female line, so such a circumnavigation would have been perfectly understandable and acceptable to contemporaries.

The reasons stated in the *Letters Patent* for excluding Mary and Elizabeth from the succession reflect two crucial concerns of the period, namely legitimate blood and gender. The grounds for exclusion were simple; both women were illegitimate and therefore could not succeed to the throne. Their tainted illegitimate blood ensured that “to all intents and purposes” both Mary and Elizabeth were “clearly disabled to aske, claime, or challenge the said imperiall crowne.”<sup>125</sup> Such notions about illegitimacy were highly significant, and Anne McLaren has recently highlighted that strong prejudice existed in this period over the prospect of an illegitimate individual exercising monarchical power, and most interestingly, speculating that such prejudice was possibly even stronger than the prejudice against female

---

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94

<sup>123</sup> Lois L Huneycutt, ‘Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth Century Churchmen’, in John Carmi Parsons ed. *Medieval Queenship* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 192-197

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 198

<sup>125</sup> *Letters Patent*, p93

rule in this period.<sup>126</sup> The crucial issue of Mary's legitimacy was recognised by Pole when he stressed in a letter to the Emperor shortly after her accession that "the principal foundation" of her right to the crown rested on the legitimacy of her mother's marriage to Henry VIII.<sup>127</sup> Furthermore, it was also a point which was later seized upon by critics of Mary and her regime, and particularly the radical Protestant reformers, John Knox and Christopher Goodman, to claim that her queenship was unlawful, unnatural and ungodly.<sup>128</sup> Hence blood had the capacity to be highly problematic. Further evidence of this can be found in the rumours that circulated at court in the months immediately before Edward's death. The imperial ambassador, Jehan Scheyfve, aware of the possibility that the succession was likely to be manipulated, reported that it was believed that the duke of Northumberland, in response to fears that excluding Mary and Elizabeth from the succession could result in the intervention of the King of France who could lay claim to the throne through Scotland, would seize Elizabeth and either marry her to his son, the Earl of Warwick, or even discard his own wife and marry Elizabeth himself in his attempts to gain power.<sup>129</sup> Clearly, as daughters of Henry VIII, even if they were declared illegitimate their blood remained problematic for Northumberland and his dynastic machinations. Furthermore, despite his plans with regard to the succession, the majority of people firmly regarded Mary as the rightful heir. There was therefore evidently a need to further reinforce the unsuitability of the princesses' blood in relation to their claim to the throne, and to this end the *Letters Patent* cited their relationship to Edward as his half-sisters. The consequences of their being only "of the halfe blood" relationship to the king effectively barred them from inheriting from him, whether they were illegitimate or not.<sup>130</sup> And to reinforce this legal point, the issue was repeated in Jane's proclamation on 10<sup>th</sup> July that declared Mary and Elizabeth firstly to be illegitimate before continuing that they were:

"but of half blood to our late cousin and therefore by ancient laws and customs unable to inherit even if they had been born in lawful matrimony."<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Anne McLaren, 'Memorializing Regnant Queens in Tudor and Jacobean England', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (2010), p.17

<sup>127</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. V, p.439

<sup>128</sup> This issue is discussed in further detail in Chapter 4, pp. 171-179

<sup>129</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 55

<sup>130</sup> *Letters Patent*, p.93

<sup>131</sup> C.S. Knighton, ed., *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reign of Mary I, 1553-1558* (London, 1998), p. 1

The second reason for excluding Mary and Elizabeth provides direct evidence of anxieties over the potential problems that female rule could bring. The unmarried status of Mary and Elizabeth induced a genuine fear that if they were to succeed to the throne and marry a foreign prince this could leave England vulnerable to domination by a foreign power. Indeed the *Letters Patent* drew upon such anxieties stating that:

“.....yf the said lady Mary or ladie Elizabeth should herafter have and enjoy the said imperiall crowne of this realme, and should then happen to marry any stranger borne out this realme, that then the same stranger, having the governmente and imperiall crowne in his hands, would rather adhere and practice to have the laws and customes of his or their owne native country or countreys to be practised or put in ure within this our realme, then the laws, statutes, and customes here of longe time used, whereupon the title of inheritance of all and singular our loving subjects doe depend, which would then tende to the utter subversion of the common-welth of this our realme, which God defend.”<sup>132</sup>

Once again, Jane’s proclamation reinforced this point, citing the same concerns of foreign domination, and also touching on the fears that Catholicism would be reinstated under Mary, that England would be brought “into the tyranny of the bishop of Rome.”<sup>133</sup> Hence the unmarried status of Mary and Elizabeth had the capability to cause considerable anxiety. In contrast however, Jane Grey was already married, and more significantly, to an English Protestant, Guildford Dudley, therefore there was no prospect of subversion to a foreign power if she was queen, and no prospect of re-Catholicization either. Her marriage also provided the hope of a male child. But even before that child had been produced, Jane’s queenship can be argued to have already provided England with a king. The English ambassadors to the Emperor at Brussels, Philip Hoby and Richard Morrison, were informed by one of the imperial servants, Don Diego, that he rejoiced that the late Edward VI had provided them with a king, which the clergyman and historian, John Strype, asserted to be a reference to Guildford Dudley.<sup>134</sup> It would appear that Don Diego, considering that Jane as a married woman would be subject to her husband, believed that power would effectively be

---

<sup>132</sup> *Letters Patent*, p. 93

<sup>133</sup> *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, p1

<sup>134</sup> John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials relating chiefly to religion and the reformation of it and the emergencies of the Church of England under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary* (Oxford, 1822), pp. 10-11

held by Guildford and not his wife. Such a view provides a clear indication that for contemporaries, a queen's husband was considered to be a king; an issue that was to become prominent during the negotiations for, and subsequent marriage of Mary Tudor and Philip of Spain.<sup>135</sup>

Informed by religious tensions, the *Device for the Succession* was a clear manipulation of Mary and Elizabeth's hereditary rights that was made possible to a great extent by their gender, as it drew on contemporary anxieties about female rule, and particularly the potential consequences of the accession of an unmarried woman. That Mary in particular was vulnerable to such manipulation can be seen in the account of the imperial ambassador, Scheyfve, who as noted above had been alerted to a possible violation of Mary's hereditary rights almost a month before Edward's death. Anticipating such a manoeuvre, he cited several reasons that could be given for excluding Mary from the succession, namely her disobedience to the King and his council, fears about re-Catholicization, concerns that she would free certain powerful prisoners, and, he continued:

“other points which they may raise, as for example the inferiority of the female sex, which at this juncture serves their purpose.....”<sup>136</sup>

Hence it was clear to Scheyfve that whilst Mary's gender could be used to justify any dynastic manipulation, other contributory factors were also evident. Clearly gender, legitimacy and religion combined together to form a powerful argument that could be used by Mary's opponents against her queenship, and essentially it was the interplay between these key elements that allowed for the manipulation of the succession.

Mary and her supporters negotiated the issues raised in the *Device* and *Letters Patent* through a variety of different mechanisms. Following Edward's death Mary took the initiative by immediately asserting her rights in a letter to the Council demanding that they proclaim her queen. In this letter she defined her right to the crown through both legal and hereditary means, and with reference to the 1544 *Act of Succession* she stated:

---

<sup>135</sup> The issue of a male consort and a regnant queen, and the problems that this raised is discussed in chapter 3.

<sup>136</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p.50

“what hath bene provided by Act of Parliament and the Testament and last will of our dearest Father, besides other circumstaunces advancing our right, you know, the Realme, and the whole world knoweth...”<sup>137</sup>

Secure in her unwavering conviction of her hereditary and legal right, Mary also made perfectly clear that she was not alone in this opinion, as the majority of the populace acknowledged her as the true heir. Furthermore she demonstrated political astuteness as she revealed that she was fully aware of the covert dynastic machinations and of the forces assembled against her, continuing to assert her authority by confirming that she was willing to pardon the Council if they would demonstrate their allegiance to her, and to God, by proclaiming her queen.<sup>138</sup> The Council’s response though merely upheld Jane’s proclamation and rebuked Mary’s claim, referring to her “supposed title,” and reinforcing the issue of her illegitimacy.<sup>139</sup> But following the collapse of Northumberland’s coup, on her accession, Mary took crucial steps to counteract the allegations of illegitimacy. Firstly, the marriage of her parents was declared valid by her first parliament in October 1553, thus formally legitimising the queen. Secondly, no opportunity was lost early in the reign to emphasise Mary’s royal lineage, either formally, in proclamations and the reinstatement of hereditary celebrations, or informally, in poems and ballads. For example, in the *Proclamation for Order and Conformity in Religion* of August 1553, Mary’s descent from the kings of the realm is the initial focus before moving on to matters of religion as it states that: “She, her father, grandfather and all (ancestors) progenitors kings of this realm...”<sup>140</sup>. And in May 1554 Mary reintroduced the long abandoned celebrations at Westminster marking the anniversary of her grandfather, Henry VII, thus further emphasising her direct descent from kings of the realm.<sup>141</sup> The same emphasis on her genealogy is found in the *Vita Mariae Reginae* where Wingfield, traced Mary’s lineage back to the Plantagenet line asserting that she was a “child of both Houses, and queen by the best right on the death of Edward VI.”<sup>142</sup> Likewise the verses written by the lawyer, Walter Haddon, to celebrate Mary’s accession also emphasise her rightful hereditary title as he describes the queen as being a “virgin lady” “descended from a line of kings,” and asserted that God had placed the queen on the throne of her

---

<sup>137</sup> John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* [...] (1583 edition), [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield). Available from <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>. [Accessed:01.09.2009]

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>140</sup> *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, p5

<sup>141</sup> *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, p. 116; the timing of this reinstatement is significant given that it came in the aftermath of Wyatt’s rebellion and the first celebration came a mere month after Wyatt’s execution.

<sup>142</sup> *Vita Mariae Reginae*, pp. 250-251

ancestors.<sup>143</sup> Such emphasis on Mary's royal blood and her hereditary title effectively underpinned her queenship with a sense of dynastic legitimacy.

Such notions of dynastic legitimacy were a vital element of the vast amount of popular support for Mary at her accession. Indeed, so deeply held were such convictions that they crossed the religious divide between Catholics and Protestants. Contemporaries drew comparison between Mary's rightful, legitimate claim and Northumberland's wrongful attempt to overturn it, and many of those who did so were Protestants. Richard Taverner, whose verses celebrating Mary's accession as having delivered England from Northumberland's machinations was a Protestant reformer. Walter Haddon was also a Protestant, and his congratulatory verses highlighted the contrast between the illegitimacy of the duke's attempted deviation of the succession and Mary's position as the rightful heir to the throne as "Madness fought with reason, unbridled desire with right."<sup>144</sup> Similarly, the Protestant, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, echoed these sentiments, viewing the attempt to exclude Mary as a deviation from good order. In his poetical autobiography describing the events immediately after Edward's death, and expressing his concern about Mary's Catholicism, he asserted:

"And, though I liked not the religion  
Which all her life queene Marye had profest,  
Yett in my mind that wicked motion  
Right heires for to displace I did detest."<sup>145</sup>

Likewise in Devon, on hearing of Jane Grey's proclamation, yet another Protestant, Peter Carew, fully aware of the potential implications for his own faith under a Catholic queen, "yet respecting his faythe, dewte, and allegaunce to his naturall prince" caused Mary to be proclaimed queen in the market towns of Dartmouth and Newton Abbot.<sup>146</sup> Clearly, these men believed Mary's hereditary blood right held greater weight than her religion, as despite their concerns about the prospect of re-Catholicization of England and its potential implications, they upheld the principles of legitimacy over religious doctrine. This does not

---

<sup>143</sup> A copy of verses congratulatory, made by Dr. Walter Haddon, to Queen Mary, upon her access to the crown, in Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, pp. 176-177, trans. Anne Montgomery 5/11/09

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>145</sup> Sir Nicholas Throckmorton's poetical autobiography in *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p.2

<sup>146</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p.114



necessarily mean that Protestants accepted a Catholic queen without voicing reservations or even attempting to counsel the new queen. The protestant clergyman, Richard Beard, viewed Mary as Edward's rightful successor, marking her accession in a psalm that pointed to the "collusion" of Jane Grey's usurpation, but he expressed the singularly unrealistic hope that Mary would continue the work that Edward had started.<sup>147</sup> Likewise, Haddon subtly expressed hopes of continuity in religious policy, citing Mary as heir to the realm and heir to the 'virtue' that Edward had created.<sup>148</sup> And Alice Hunt has recently shown that Taverner's *Oration Gratulatory* was also an attempt to counsel Mary by presenting her as bound by Parliament's in the interest of the commonwealth.<sup>149</sup>

The attempt to exclude Mary was seen as a deviation from the natural order of the succession by both Catholics and Protestants, and it was concerns over this deviation and its potential consequences that eventually persuaded the Council, in Northumberland's absence, to proclaim Mary queen. In his speech to the Council, the earl of Arundel argued that depriving Mary of her rights as the true heir equated to the taking away of the liberty that England had enjoyed under legitimate kings, thus not only defending her rights, but essentially, her legitimacy. He continued, stating that the crown was Mary's by "direct succession" as she was the "lawful and natural daughter" of Henry VIII, arguing that if the Council continued to support Northumberland they were allowing themselves to be "corrupted" and drawn into the duke's tyranny.<sup>150</sup> Thoroughly aware of the possibility of divided loyalties, given that the Council had only declared Jane Grey queen several days earlier, he equated the change in allegiance, not only with godliness, in the repenting of sin, but also as being necessary for the "welfare and freedom" of the realm, warning that those who did not transfer allegiance to Mary would be responsible for the ensuing unrest. Thus the only way to restore liberty and ensure peace and justice was to restore the crown to the rightful heir.<sup>151</sup> Arundel's arguments about corruption and tyranny were reflected by the author of *An inuetyue against Treason*, who warned about the dangers of supporting a deviation from the rightful order of succession, and cited historical examples to support his point including the Wars of the Roses

---

<sup>147</sup> Beard, Richard, *A godly psalme of Marye Queene which brought vs comfort al, through God, whom wee of dewtye prayse, that giues her foes a fal* (London, 1553)

<sup>148</sup> A copy of verses congratulatory, made by Dr. Walter Haddon, to Queen Mary, upon her access to the crown, in Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, pp. 176-177, trans. Anne Montgomery 5/11/09

<sup>149</sup> Alice Hunt, 'The Monarchical Republic of Mary I', *Historical Journal*, 52, 3 (2009), pp. 566-567

<sup>150</sup> Malfatti, *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor*, p16

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17

and usurpation of Richard III. Hence those engaging in tyranny and attempting to manipulate the succession, such as Richard III and the duke of Northumberland, were seen to meet their just desserts, whether killed in battle or arraigned as traitors. But order had been restored as God had ensured the succession of Mary as the rightful queen.<sup>152</sup> Thus on 19<sup>th</sup> July 1553, Mary, whose title to the throne was underpinned by hereditary blood right, her father's will, act of Parliament, and finally by God, was proclaimed queen in London amongst much celebration.

The belief in hereditary blood right once again became a crucial issue for the political nation during the latter part of the seventeenth century. Following the accession of the Catholic James II in February 1685, his elder daughter Mary, Princess of Orange, became the heiress presumptive to the English crown. Mary and her sister Anne were the only surviving children from James' first marriage to Anne Hyde and although James had remarried in 1673, to the much younger, Mary of Modena, no children from the marriage had survived beyond 1682. James' Catholicism, which was at odds with the Protestant commonwealth, had to some extent been managed, as the devout Protestantism of his daughter Mary, and her position as heiress apparent, had ensured a future Protestant monarch for England. In this respect, as Howard Nenner has pointed out, Englishmen could live with the "threat" posed by James' Catholicism whilst they had the hope of "salvation" offered through the prospect of his daughter's queenship.<sup>153</sup> But the birth of a son to James and his queen in June 1688 removed the hope of that salvation, and English Protestants were faced with the potential religious and political consequences of a Catholic heir. As such the birth of James Francis Edward Stuart, Prince of Wales, was a key contributory factor of the Glorious Revolution, an event that brought about not only constitutional change, but also the anomaly of the dual monarchy of William and Mary; when instead of a king and his consort, or a queen and her consort in the case of Mary Tudor and her husband Philip of Spain, England had two regnant monarchs.

Anxieties about the prospect of a Catholic heir were evident shortly after the announcement of the queen's pregnancy and rumours began to circulate that questioned whether the

---

<sup>152</sup> *An inuectyue against Treason*, (London, 1553)

<sup>153</sup> Howard Nenner, 'Pretense and Pragmatism: The Response to Uncertainty in the Succession Crisis of 1689', in Lois G. Schworer ed. *The Revolution of 1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1992), p85

pregnancy was potentially fraudulent. Indeed, Rachel Weil has shown how the “crisis” triggered by the announcement that Mary of Modena was pregnant culminated in what has become known as the ‘warming pan myth’ or ‘warming pan scandal’; a strategy adopted by many prominent Protestants, including James’ own daughters amongst others, that effectively discredited the Prince’s birth by enabling the suggestion that the child was suppositious, having supposedly been smuggled in to the Queen’s lying in chamber in a warming pan.<sup>154</sup> Although Mary has been portrayed as not being actively involved in politics, a view she purported herself in her memoirs stating “that women should not meddle in government”, she did however become actively involved in this particular strand of dynastic politics.<sup>155</sup> After receiving letters from Anne that directly questioned the legitimacy of the queen’s pregnancy, and once the child was born, whether or not he was indeed their brother, Mary, seeking to defend her own blood right, and clearly anxious to establish the truth, wrote to her sister on 21<sup>st</sup> July 1688 with a comprehensive list of questions concerning the queen’s pregnancy and events around the birth.<sup>156</sup> That she chose to do this despite William having already written to James congratulating him on the birth of a prince, effectively gave credence to the rumours already in circulation. The foisting of a suppositious child upon the kingdom, as the heir to the throne was a corruption of the hereditary order of succession and a direct violation of Mary’s hereditary blood right, an issue which was seized upon in the pamphlet literature of the period.<sup>157</sup> One pamphlet of 1688, *An Account of the Reasons of the Nobility and Gentry’s Invitation of his Highness the Prince of Orange into England*, which included a substantial account of the events around the birth of the Prince of Wales, provides a clear illustration of the sense of outrage and anxiety felt by English Protestants as they felt forced to accept the child as heir to the throne:

“All the people are forced by fear of Punishments, to suffer a *Child* to be declared *Heir apparent* of the *Crown*, which ought not by the known Laws of the *Kingdom* to have been acknowledged until lawful Witnesses of his Birth of the *Queen* had been duely published to the *Kingdom* as

---

<sup>154</sup> Rachel Weil, ‘The Politics of legitimacy: Women and the Warming Pan Scandal’, in Lois G. Schwoerer ed. *The Revolution of 1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1992), pp.65-70; Weil points to the prominent role played by Protestant politicians who, if not starting rumours about the Prince’s birth, certainly established an environment in which such rumours were readily believed.

<sup>155</sup> R. Doebner, ed. *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England (1689-1693) Together with her Letters and Those of Kings James II and William III to the Electress, Sophia of Hanover* (Leipzig, 1886), p. 23

<sup>156</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II, Part II (Edinburgh, 1773), pp. 305-306

<sup>157</sup> Weil states that over fifty works making “significant reference” to the prince’s birth appeared between 1688 and 1745, many being republished during fears of Jacobite invasion in 1715 and 1745, Weil, ‘The Politics of Legitimacy’, p.72

was necessary in this case, wherin publick fame makes him a  
*Counterfit.*”<sup>158</sup>

In this context, the Protestant political nation saw the child as suppositious not only because of Mary’s position but also that of the nation under the threat of tyranny and Catholicism. That Catholics were perceived by Protestants to be capable of such deception in order to achieve their objectives is evident by the publication of *Idem Iterum, or The History of Q. Mary’s Big Belly* in 1688 which referred not to Mary of Modena, but Mary Tudor. Using extracts from Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, the pamphlet reminded readers of a previous deception by a Catholic queen; Mary Tudor’s supposed pregnancy in 1555. Distinct parallels could be drawn as it was alleged that there had been plans to impose a suppositious child upon the realm in Mary’s Tudor’s reign, as a woman who had given birth to a son at around the time the queen’s child had been expected, reported she had been approached to give him up and that he would be well provided for.<sup>159</sup> Although such an imposition remained firmly within the boundaries of rumour and speculation, against a backdrop of heightened religious tensions, it provided political capital to anxious Protestants, and set a precedent for the notion of a Catholic queen’s capacity for deception in order to secure a Catholic succession.

Such open expression of anxieties and questioning of the circumstances surrounding the prince’s birth became a mechanism that enabled a Protestant succession to still be a possibility if William would defend his wife’s hereditary rights. Citing the violation of hereditary right and intrinsically linking Mary’s blood and the body of the realm to support their argument, the earls of Devonshire and Shrewsbury, Lord Lumley, the Bishop of London, Admiral Russell and Henry Sidney wrote to the Prince of Orange on June 30<sup>th</sup> 1688 requesting his assistance in the restoration of England’s liberties and religion:

“The false imposing of that upon the Princess and nation, being not only an infinite exasperation of people’s minds here, but being certainly one of the chief causes upon which the declaration of your entering the

---

<sup>158</sup> Anon., *An Account of the Reasons of the Nobility and Gentry’s Invitation of his Highness the Prince of Orange into England Being a Memorial from the English Protestants Concerning their Grievances* (London, 1688), p. 1

<sup>159</sup> *Idem Iterum or The History of Q. Mary’s Big Belly* (1688)

Kingdom in a hostile manner must be founded on your part, although many other reasons are to be given on ours.”<sup>160</sup>

In this manner Mary’s blood was used as the justification for William’s arrival in England, as a restorer of her hereditary rights and the nation’s liberties. Such intervention on behalf of his wife was clearly considered to be a perfectly reasonable course of action, and according to the Tory MP, Sir Joseph Tredenham, William’s “matrimonial right was the argument that brought him over.”<sup>161</sup> Indeed William’s own declaration directly cited the violation of Mary’s position as heiress presumptive as one of the reasons for his coming to England. Significantly though, and in a not so subtle reminder of his own blood claim, the declaration also sought to justify his actions through his own position in the succession, in addition to that of his wife’s:

“And since our Dearest and most Entirely Beloved Consort, the Princesse, and likewise wee Our Selves, have so great an Interest in this Matter, and such a Right, as all the world knows, to the Succession to the Crown...”<sup>162</sup>

Hence William, whilst supporting Mary’s hereditary rights, also emphasised the status of his own blood right. Using language markedly similar to that of Mary Tudor in her letter to the Council in July 1553 demanding they proclaim her queen, he emphasised that both his and Mary’s rights were widely acknowledged amongst the political world. As the son of James II’s sister Mary, the Princess Royal, William was a grandson of Charles I, so had a place in the English succession in his own right. Significantly, once the birth of the Prince of Wales had been effectively discredited, William was the next male heir, a point highlighted in *Four Questions Debated*, although this was through the female line rather than the male line.<sup>163</sup> Others also considered William’s blood to be of key significance. For example, in February 1689 Elector Frederick of Brandenburg wrote to William congratulating him on his accession to the English throne, and without any reference to Mary acknowledged the crucial significance of William’s blood as he stated:

“I am unable to express the greatness of my joy at the accomplishment of the desire I have had for several years, particularly during the six months

---

<sup>160</sup> *CSP Domestic, James II, Vol. III June 1687-February 1689* (London, 1972), p225

<sup>161</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p. 56

<sup>162</sup> *The Declaration of his Highnes William Henry, by the grace of God Prince of Orange, &c of the reasons inducing him, to Appear in Armes in the Kingdome of England, for Preserving of the Protestant Religion, and for Restoring the Lawes and Liberties of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1688), p.3

<sup>163</sup> *Four Questions Debated*, p.7

since Minden, for your elevation to the throne of England, which is equally due to you, by blood, and by the benefits which England and all Protestants, indeed all Europe, have received by your means.”<sup>164</sup>

Certainly the Elector’s comments are a reflection of the political balance of power within Europe at the time, and in particular fears of Catholic, French expansion under Louis XIV, but it is interesting to note his emphasis on William’s blood rather than Mary’s as it provides an indication of how their individual hereditary blood claims were viewed in parts of Europe. Indeed, according to Baxter, in the first half of the 1670s, some foreign observers had difficulty reconciling Mary’s position as heiress apparent with her status as the daughter of a commoner, her mother being the daughter of one of Charles II’s ministers, Edward Hyde. And given this belief, it appears that at this time William had also considered his claim to the throne to be superior to that of both Mary and Anne for the same reason.<sup>165</sup> This notion of superior and inferior blood was still extant in the latter 1680’s. The pamphlet *An Account of the Reasons of the Nobility and Gentry’s Invitation* reported the Catholic triumph following the announcement of Mary of Modena’s pregnancy, as they proposed that even if the child was a girl it would still replace Mary as heir presumptive:

“Tho it were a Daughter; and ignorantly and impudently Affirme that if the *Queen* had a Daughter Born after the King came to the Crown, it ought to Succeed before a Daughter born when he was but a Duke.”<sup>166</sup>

Not referring to Mary’s Hyde ancestry, Catholics implied that her blood was inferior to any child of James’ conceived since he became king, as she was merely the daughter of a duke. The assertion is tenuous at best, but it provides an insight into Catholic attitudes towards Mary. Furthermore, considered alongside the Williamite regime’s justification for the Glorious Revolution that centred upon discrediting of the birth of the Prince of Wales, this would indicate that for both Catholics and Protestants, the crucial combination of blood and religion held greater weight than gender, and could be used as a mechanism to enable the achievement of both political and religious objectives; in this instance, the manipulation of the succession.

---

<sup>164</sup> William John Hardy, ed. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, 13<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1689- April 1690* (London, 1895), p10

<sup>165</sup> Stephen Baxter, *William III* (London, 1966), pp. 129; 223-224;

<sup>166</sup> *Account of the Reasons*, p. 9

The matter of hereditary blood right continued to be of crucial significance during the debates of the Convention Parliament. Initially there was much support, in particular from the Tories and leading church figures, for making Mary regent in James' absence, thus adhering to the dominant Tory belief that the office of the crown was never vacant. Such a course of action would have ensured the preservation of the Stuart dynasty, and as James' elder daughter it was believed that her blood entitled her to claim this office. Indeed, Lord Nottingham, heading those advocating Mary as regent asserted that:

“... if a regent was appointed, old forms would be followed, the monarchy preserved unviolated, and the Princess of Orange, because she was the nearest relation to the crown capable of acting as regent, would have the legal title to the office.”<sup>167</sup>

Others in the Convention however, considered that the throne was already vacant, and also grounding their argument through Mary's blood right, advocated making her queen rather than regent. For instance Sir Thomas Clarges asserted two key points; firstly that the crown was a hereditary and not an elective office, and secondly as James had left England, taking the Prince of Wales with him to France, he had in effect abdicated, thus the throne was indeed vacant and the next Protestant heir in the line of succession was Mary.<sup>168</sup> This argument was echoed by Lord Danby who led those advocating Mary's queenship. Danby highlighted the potential problems associated with a regency as making Mary regent would have effectively reinforced James' title to the throne, which in consequence defined those who supported this measure as being in direct opposition to James' right as king. Recognising the danger of such a position Danby also argued that James had abdicated, so that “the throne was not vacant, but filled with the lineal heir, the Princess of Orange.”<sup>169</sup> Significantly, both Clarges and Danby also reinforced their arguments by referring to the doubted legitimacy of the Prince of Wales; Clarges questioning whether the boy was indeed James' son, whilst Danby was more direct, stating that the child was indeed illegitimate.<sup>170</sup> Similarly, Sir Joseph Tredenham, also focussed on the supposed illegitimacy of the Prince of Wales, and echoing the reasons given to exclude Mary and Elizabeth Tudor from the succession in 1553, asserted that Mary was the next rightful heir because the illegitimacy of the Prince of Wales resulted in a legal and natural incapacity that effectively barred him from the succession. And

---

<sup>167</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII, p. 196

<sup>168</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p. 55

<sup>169</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII, pp. 197-198

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 197-198; Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p.55

touching on anxieties over female rule by making a direct reference to Mary's gender he asserted that:

“in the Princess of Orange there is no incapacity; she is a Protestant; and as for her being a woman, Queen Elizabeth was so, and reigned gloriously.”<sup>171</sup>

According to Tredenham, Mary's gender was evidently a negotiable factor. Mary was not only the “lineal heir”, she was also the polar opposite of her half-brother as she was both legitimate and Protestant. Tredenham may have cited the Prince of Wales' incapacity as illegitimacy, but his comments also reveal that for the Protestant political nation the child's Catholicism presented a further crucial incapacity that was not negotiable. Advocating Mary's queenship therefore reconciled the dominant religious doctrine with the principal of hereditary succession.

Those who argued that Mary should be queen all cited her position as “lineal heir” as the main factor that qualified her for monarchical office, but her blood relationship to James also proved to be paradoxical, as although it could be used to justify arguments around hereditary principles, it was also highly problematical because James II was still alive. To negotiate this uncomfortable paradox Mary's blood was also put forward as a reason for advocating either William's sole kingship or a dual monarchy with the administrative power invested in William alone. The pamphlet *Reasons humbly offer'd for placing his Highness the Prince of Orange, singly, in the Throne, during Life* considered that restricting Mary to a queen consort's role would serve to protect her from Catholic allegations of usurpation:

“The Princess of Orange will share in all the glory of a crown without the trouble of it: easy from Popish reflection that she sits in her father's throne while he lives. And it concerns the Kingdom, as well as the Princess, to take care that she be at rest from those solicitations on behalf of Papists which under the countenance of her father will perpetually assault her tender breast.”<sup>172</sup>

It was clear that if Mary became queen her perceived violation of patriarchal expectations would make her the focus of Catholic propaganda. Recognising this and correctly

---

<sup>171</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, pp.55-56

<sup>172</sup> *Reasons humbly offer'd for placing his Highness the Prince of Orange singly, in the Throne, during Life*, in *CSP Domestic Series, James II, Vol. III*, p. 391



anticipating that Jacobites would make political capital from the situation, the author viewed Mary's blood as entitling her to share in the 'glory' of monarchy, whilst not placing her, and consequently the nation, in a vulnerable position. This also built upon concerns that if Mary was queen, she may, out of a sense of obligation and duty to her father, weaken in her resolve and consequently risk the security of the realm. In this respect, her position as "lineal heir" would not offer the security against the Catholic threat that the Protestant nation required, as instead it could be exploited by Jacobites to place the realm in jeopardy. Other publications voiced similar concerns. The author of *Four Questions Debated* asked outright whether it was "best to settle the Exercise of the Government in the Person, who would be next by Lineal Descent" and found to the contrary. The reasons given to justify the negative answer to the succession of the next 'lineal' heir, included the future "inconveniences" that were likely to occur in relation to "the dispute of the pretended Prince of Wales" and the concern that if both Mary and Anne died without surviving issue, the crown could fall into the hands of "papists."<sup>173</sup> Thus if Mary acceded to the throne there would always be an opportunity for her brother, as a male heir, to claim the English throne, as the crown still remained within the Stuart line. Underpinned by religious tensions, the only way to protect England against the threat of the claims of the Prince of Wales, whose illegitimacy remained unproven, was to settle the administration on someone other than Mary. This was a view propounded by the anonymous author of *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange jointly, And for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone*, who argued that:

"It is better to settle the Exercise of the Government in One who is not immediat in the Line, than in One that is, (I,) Because it is a clear Asserting of a Fundamental Right that manifests the Constitution of the English Government, and covers the Subjects from Tyranny and Slavery. (2.) It cuts off the Dispute of the pretended Prince of Wales. (3.) The old Succession being legally Dissolved, and a new one made, the Government is secured from falling into the hands of a Papist."<sup>174</sup>

Notions of blood and religion combined to form a powerful argument for those who advocated either William's kingship, or a dual monarchy with monarchical authority vested solely in him. Both these options would ensure that the liberties of English government

---

<sup>173</sup> *Four Questions Debated* (1689), pp. 6-8

<sup>174</sup> Anon., *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly, And for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone*, (1689)

would be upheld and that the realm would be protected from the threat of tyranny and Catholicism.

Political activists and commentators, who highlighted the problems associated with Mary's blood if she became queen, also recognised its significance for the prospect of the continuation of the Protestant royal line. Both Mary and Anne's 'value' to the nation was therefore bound up in their fecundity and the production of Protestant heirs.<sup>175</sup> Not only would this secure the future of Protestant England, but it also served to constrain both Mary and Anne within the accepted gendered ideals of motherhood, thus ensuring neither sister presented any threat to the existing patriarchal order. The notion of Mary and Anne providing for the continuation of the Protestant royal line illustrates that the concept of dynastic and religious continuity through the female line as expressed in Edward VI's *Device for the Succession* was still extant. And although, initially, it would appear that the Lords and Commons agreeing on 13<sup>th</sup> February 1689, to the concept of the dual monarchy with the administrative power vested solely in William, was a relegation of Mary's blood right in favour of male authority, the order of the succession acknowledged Mary and Anne's stronger hereditary right, as following the deaths of William and Mary the crown was to pass initially to the heirs of Mary's body, and on failure of this, to Anne and the heirs of her body. Only if both these options failed was the crown to pass to the heirs of William's body.<sup>176</sup> In this context, continuation of the Protestant blood line combined with long term political and religious objectives played a key role in the creation of William's kingship as opposed to the queenship of his wife.

In both the mid sixteenth and the later seventeenth centuries the accession of two regnant queens brought matters of gender, blood and authority to the forefront of contemporary political thought. Underpinned by Biblical and classical ideologies, and reinforced by contemporary medical knowledge, the notion that female rule was unnatural and contrary to both nature and divine law flourished, and continued to be prevalent throughout the period.

---

<sup>175</sup> The authors of both *Reasons humbly offer'd for placing his Highness the Prince of orange singly, in the Throne, during Life* and *Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly, And for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone*, saw Mary and Anne in this way.

<sup>176</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p.83; Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII, p. 207

Unsurprisingly, given such beliefs, the accession of a regnant queen had the potential to be deeply unsettling to the political nation, and gendered anxieties were expressed accordingly. With the exception of the conspicuous diatribes of Protestant reformers, in 1553 it initially appeared that such anxieties were limited, overshadowed by the celebrations of Mary Tudor's accession as rightful queen. But further consideration of the poetry and ballads that marked Mary's accession reveals an underlying message of reassurance that is highly significant. Emphasising the divine nature of Mary's queenship, and constructing her as having restored order to her realm whilst maintaining her traditional feminine characteristics of virtue and piety, such messages sought to calm anxieties about female rule. Indeed, the very existence of such messages of reassurance clearly demonstrates the prevalence of gendered anxieties at Mary's accession. Similarly, in 1689, works that portrayed Mary II as a consort rather than regnant queen, offered reassurance that she was no threat to the dominant patriarchal order, and that the reins of government were held by a predictably 'safe' pair of male hands. Such depiction was a convenient semi-fiction that to a great extent was enabled by Mary's anomalous position as a regnant queen without monarchical power; as half of a dual monarchy with administrative authority vested solely in her husband, William III. Gender was highly significant to the creation of the dual monarchy, as both the debates of the Convention Parliament and the pamphlet literature of the period expressed concerns about a woman's capability for government. The impact of gender was of considerable significance when considering the marital status of both Mary I and Mary II. To a great extent Mary Tudor's unmarried status enabled her to transcend her gender when the political situation required, playing an active role in her accession and being viewed by many as a prince rather than a woman, whilst Mary II, having been married since 1677, was regarded as being subject to her husband and thus conforming to the dominant gendered model. The significance of marital status can be seen when considering the position of Jane Grey during her brief usurpation, when contemporaries believed that her queenship offered the prospect of a Protestant king, in the form of her husband, Guildford Dudley, in stark opposition to the uncertainty of the unmarried, and Catholic, Mary Tudor.

In the first half of the 1560s Sir Thomas Smith stressed the significance of blood right in relation to monarchical office and the "quietness and suertie of the realme."<sup>177</sup> By annexing hereditary blood right to the exercise of monarchical authority Smith's comments

---

<sup>177</sup> Smith, *De Republica Anglorum*, p. 65

demonstrate the cruciality of beliefs about blood in this period; beliefs that were to continue to underpin political thought into the later seventeenth century. Underpinned by considerable religious tensions, for Mary Tudor such beliefs were manifested in the attempt by the duke of Northumberland to exclude her and Elizabeth from the succession on grounds of illegitimacy. But the importance of Mary's blood right was upheld by the majority of the population and Northumberland's dynastic machinations subsequently failed. Significantly, Mary's right to the crown was upheld by many Protestants, who, despite concerns about the prospect of re-Catholicisation, recognised Mary as the rightful heir to the crown, both through her blood and her father's will. Although religious doctrine informed individual attitudes to Mary's queenship, notions of legitimacy and rightful succession according to the law crossed the religious divide. In 1688 and 1689 the question of religion, legitimate blood, and the defence of hereditary blood right underpinned the Glorious Revolution. The birth of the Catholic Prince of Wales was brought into question and William justified his arrival in England with armed forces as defending his wife's position as heiress presumptive. In this manner the accessions of Mary I and Mary II reflect Smith's annexation of blood and the peace of the commonwealth, as the accession of both queens was considered to have overturned tyranny and disorder. But blood could also prove problematic for regnant queens, particularly for Mary II given her position as "lineal heir" whilst her father, James II, still lived, to the extent that the political nation considered her blood to pose a significant risk to the security of the realm as it could jeopardise the Revolutionary settlement. Hence in this case the annexation of Mary's blood to her crown proved something of a paradox. Despite this notions of blood were crucial to the succession of both queens and it can be argued that to a great extent, blood, particularly when combined with religion, was of more crucial significance to contemporaries than gender as individual regimes sought to achieve their political and religious objectives. But it would be erroneous to discount the significance of gender and the considerable interplay that existed between gender, blood and authority in this period.

## 2

# The Confirmation of Power

---

“Sire, the Queen accomplished two regal acts: she was proclaimed and took possession; the third, remaining, is the coronation, which will take place as soon as the necessary preparations can be made.”<sup>178</sup>

In August 1553 in a dispatch to the Emperor, Charles V, the Imperial ambassadors in England referred to three ‘regal acts’; two of which Mary Tudor had already completed, the third yet to be accomplished. His emphasis on these three key events illustrates the belief that the acts of proclamation, royal entry to the city of London, and coronation, combined to formally confirm Mary’s monarchical power and were therefore crucial to the establishment of her queenship. Likewise in 1689 with the accession of William and Mary, although there was no formal, ceremonial royal entry into the capital, the proclamation and coronation of England’s first dual monarchs formally confirmed their authority and were vital to the successful establishment of the new regime. The transition from one monarch to another was recognised by contemporaries as a time of possible confusion and turmoil.<sup>179</sup> This was certainly the case at the accessions of both Mary I and Mary II when the transitory phase was underpinned by significant political and religious tensions. Hence the proclamation of a new monarch presented the opportunity to promulgate an important message, announcing to the political nation and the realm as a whole, the start of a new regime; defining the new monarch’s claim to the throne and offering reassurance through a sense of dynastic continuity. In this respect, and in particular when the transition from one monarch to another was far from definitive, the importance of the proclamation was paramount. Such was the case in 1553 when Mary I negotiated the attempted usurpation of Lady Jane Grey, and in 1689 following the Glorious Revolution when Parliament debated whether the throne was

---

<sup>178</sup> The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 6<sup>th</sup> August 1553, in *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 151

<sup>179</sup> Claude De Seyssel, *The Monarchy of France*, trans. J. H. Hexter, ed. Donald R Kelley (London, 1981), p.50; A more recent analysis of anxieties over the transition of monarchs is given in Richard McCoy, *Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation* (New York, 2002), pp. xi-xiii

indeed vacant as Mary Stuart's father, James II, was still alive.<sup>180</sup> As highlighted in the previous chapter, the opposition to the queenships of both Mary I and Mary II was in stark contrast to the peaceful accession of Anne in 1702. Whilst Anne's proclamation played a vital role in confirming her queenship it lacked the political urgency that fuelled those of both her elder sister and Mary Tudor.<sup>181</sup> This chapter will thus consider the proclamations of Mary I and Mary II and their contributory and crucial role in confirming the authority of these queens' regimes in the context of their individual accessions. It will highlight the centrality of claims of blood and hereditary blood right to the proclamations. This was a particularly crucial element for Mary Tudor given the attempt to exclude her from the throne on grounds of illegitimacy, whilst Mary II's status as James's elder daughter was problematic and necessitated a reworking of the format and language of the proclamation to ensure that the Revolutionary settlement was not jeopardised. The effectiveness of the proclamation in achieving its objectives can be measured in part by examining the response to its delivery, and both formal and informal reactions by the political nation and the general populace will be considered, with the emergence of common themes across the period including public celebrations, bonfires, bell ringing and artillery fire. Such expressions of joyful celebration went beyond mere acceptance of the new regime however, and this chapter will argue that they were an integral part of the proclamation itself, playing a vital role in the establishment of authority for the new monarch. This was reinforced through the monarch's formal entry into London, as the act of taking possession of the capital symbolised the monarch taking possession of the realm and provided a significant opportunity for a visual affirmation of the new monarch's authority. Neither William and Mary, nor Anne, took part in a formal royal entry, but it was of key significance for sixteenth century monarchs and this chapter will consider the role played by Mary Tudor's royal entry in reinforcing the message of the proclamation.

The proclamation by itself did not, as Alice Hunt has pointed out, "constitute a definitive legal act."<sup>182</sup> Hence for a new monarch's power to be formally and symbolically established

---

<sup>180</sup> For the debate over whether the throne was actually vacant see Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, pp. 10-32

<sup>181</sup> The political landscape had changed since 1689. James II died in exile in September 1701. Anne's accession had been legally provided for and at William's death in March 1702, was generally welcomed, particularly given her support for the Church of England and her continuation of William's policies towards France.

<sup>182</sup> Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2008), p.119

further regal ceremonial was required. Coronation was an established ritual that formally confirmed monarchical power through ceremonial anointing whilst also providing the opportunity for the visual affirmation of authority through ceremonial display and celebration. The first account of an English coronation was that of Edgar in 973, and by 1553 twenty three kings of England had been crowned according to established ceremonial.<sup>183</sup> But the only queens to have been crowned were queens consort. Thus Mary Tudor's accession as England's first regnant queen presented a particular set of challenges to the established ritual. Perplexed by questions over the nature of female authority and how Mary could be symbolically transformed by the ceremonial, some of Mary's councillors sought to delay her coronation ceremony until after Parliament had been called. At the least the tension between Mary's gender and the established ritual of crowning kings necessitated a significant reinterpretation of the existing ceremonial. Conflicting contemporary accounts of Mary's coronation have proved problematic when interpreting the ceremonial, but by comparing these sources to the established guidance that was used for coronation ceremonies this chapter will offer an alternative explanation for the differences noted in the contemporary records.

The coronation of William and Mary in 1689 also presented challenges to the established ceremonial. The concept of dual monarchs was unprecedented and no guidance existed to fit such an exceptional monarchical arrangement. A committee set up to determine the coronation had intended that Mary II be crowned as her husband's equal, but subsequent alterations were made to ensure that this did not eclipse William's kingship, indicating that Mary's anomalous status was indeed problematic. The situation was further complicated as James II was still alive, in exile in France, and despite the bloodless nature of the Glorious Revolution there was a great deal of uncertainty and marked political tensions, hence the coronation was a necessary vehicle to secure the new Protestant regime and legitimise the Revolution and its principles. This chapter will consider how the coronations of Mary I and Mary II contributed to the confirmation of their monarchical power and secured the position of the new regime. It will also examine how the established ceremonial was reinterpreted by contemporaries to negotiate the challenges presented by the unprecedented nature of each coronation. Finally, the chapter will conclude by considering how the coronation of regnant

---

<sup>183</sup> Roy Strong, *Coronation: From the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (London, 2006) pp. xxx – 5

queens had evolved by Anne's coronation in 1702. The principles of the Glorious Revolution were still prominent at Anne's coronation, particularly in its definition of English, Protestant monarchy. But most striking, is that despite being married to Prince George of Denmark since 1683, Anne was crowned as sole monarch in a ceremony that effectively excluded George from any formal monarchical position. This chapter will not explore the reasons why George was not crowned as a full consideration of this is included in Chapter 3. It will however argue that crowning Anne as sole monarch at the exclusion of her husband ensured that, like the coronations of Mary I and Mary II, Anne's coronation was also to some extent unprecedented.

## Part 1- Proclaiming Regnant Queenship

In 1553 Mary Tudor, along with her sister, Elizabeth, was effectively barred from the succession on grounds of illegitimacy and the crown diverted through the Suffolk line to Lady Jane Grey, who was proclaimed queen in London on 10<sup>th</sup> July. Having been proclaimed and been formally received at the Tower of London Jane had undertaken the first two 'regal acts' referred to above and was formally in possession of royal authority.<sup>184</sup> The significance of Jane's position compared to Mary's at this critical juncture is made clear by the Imperial ambassadors who noted that "the actual possession of power was a matter of great importance, especially amongst barbarians like the English."<sup>185</sup> This is a key point considering the historical precedent of the fifteenth century, which, as Howard Nenner has argued, strongly suggested that the right to be king lay with whoever was actually king at the time; the kingships of Henry IV, Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII reinforced a right of conquest as opposed to hereditary blood right of the immediate male heir.<sup>186</sup> Although Jane had undertaken the first two 'regal acts', she had not yet been crowned, and until that third ceremonial event was carried out her queenship was open to challenge.<sup>187</sup> Hence for Mary to claim her throne and assert her position as the rightful queen, it was crucial that she was proclaimed queen as soon as possible. This was also the view of the

---

<sup>184</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p.80; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, p.85; *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p.35

<sup>185</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 74

<sup>186</sup> Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King* (London, 1995), pp.2-3

<sup>187</sup> Alice Hunt cites the significance of Jane's epithet of the 'nine days Queen' as even though she had been proclaimed she had not yet been anointed through coronation; Hunt, *Drama of Coronation*, p.119



Imperial ambassadors who pointed to what they considered to be the established custom in England of the new monarch being proclaimed king, or in this case queen, immediately upon the death of the previous incumbent. They also pointed to the crucial role this proclamation would play in allowing Mary to rally her supporters.<sup>188</sup> On the 9<sup>th</sup> July, Mary wrote to the council demanding that they proclaim her as queen in the city of London and elsewhere in the kingdom. Defining her right to the crown she reminded them that she was the rightful queen by both act of Parliament, through the 1544 Act of Succession, and her father's will. Expressing her concern that the Council had not informed her of Edward's death, and informing them that she was fully aware of the plan to bar her from the succession, she continued:

“Wherefore my Lordes we require you and charge you, and euery of you, that euery of you, of your allegiance whyche you owe to God and vs, and to none other, for our honour and the surety of our parson, onely employ your selues, & forth with vpon receipt hereof, cause our right and title to the Crowne and gouernment of this Realme to be proclaimed in our City of London, and other places as to your wisdoms shall seeme good, .....”<sup>189</sup>

Mary's awareness of the need for her to be proclaimed queen as soon as possible, is evident both from her letter to the Council and her decision to declare her intention to claim her throne and implement her own proclamations. Initially this process commenced informally and privately at her residence of Kenninghall, where she was proclaimed within her own household. Having gathered the entire household together and advised them of Edward's death, Mary proceeded to define her right to the crown by both “divine and human law.” This proclamation was both private and informal in the sense that it was her servants and members of her household who in reaction to her announcement proclaimed her in a spontaneous manner, away from the public sphere and without the relevant ceremonial.<sup>190</sup> This did not however lessen its impact, as in making clear her intention to claim her throne, it served to inspire Mary's supporters to proclaim her across the region. Further proclamations were required to consolidate support for Mary and it was essential that these were formal proclamations made in the public domain. For example, on 11<sup>th</sup> July, and on her orders, one

---

<sup>188</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p.73

<sup>189</sup> John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments [...]* (1583 edition), [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield). Available from: <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>. [Accessed 01.09.2009]

<sup>190</sup> *Vita Mariae Angliae*, pp. 251-252; De Guaras, *The Accession of Queen Mary*, p. 90

of her servants proclaimed her in the market place at Ipswich, despite Jane Grey having already been proclaimed queen in the city earlier that day.<sup>191</sup> This was a public refutation of Jane's proclamation, and constituted a direct challenge on the legitimacy of Jane's claim to the throne. Crucially it also triggered further proclamations. According to Robert Wingfield's loyal account, the counter proclamation of Mary influenced the sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk, Thomas Cornwallis, to such an extent that after consideration of the political situation, he had Mary formally proclaimed in the city the next day.<sup>192</sup> Ipswich was however merely part of the process that had begun in Mary's household, and on the 11<sup>th</sup> July the Imperial ambassadors reported to the Emperor that Mary had "caused herself to be proclaimed Queen in Norfolk, and is continuing to do so in the neighbouring districts."<sup>193</sup> Mary's successful campaign to claim her throne culminated in her proclamation in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July but the earlier proclamations had been vital to her success.

The crucial nature of the proclamation in contributing to confirming the new monarch's power was clearly evident in 1689 at the accession of William and Mary. Following the Glorious Revolution, the length of time taken by the Convention Parliament to decide firstly, whether or not the throne was indeed vacant; and secondly to put forward the concept of the dual monarchy as a 'solution' to the constitutional crisis, combined with the public nature of the debate, had caused an atmosphere of suspense and uncertainty, as the populace became increasingly impatient for a decision.<sup>194</sup> In addition to this there were still pockets of support for James II amongst some sections of the nobility and clergy, which contributed to the general sense of unrest. Thus the sooner William and Mary were formally proclaimed king and queen the sooner the supposed vacancy of the throne would be filled, and the potential for further unrest curtailed. But William and Mary's accession had been determined by Parliament, and in acknowledgment of this and also to legitimise the events and outcome of the Revolution, it was deemed necessary for the Declaration of Rights to be ceremoniously read, and the crown formally offered and accepted, before the new monarchs could be proclaimed. Hence William and Mary were formally proclaimed in London on 13<sup>th</sup> February,

---

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 255-256

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256

<sup>193</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p82

<sup>194</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII p.201

immediately after having been presented with “the instrument agreed on for declaring them king and queen”, and having been offered and accepted the crown.<sup>195</sup>

Although not unique to Mary I and Mary II, clearly the need for them to be proclaimed as soon as possible was especially pertinent to both these queens given the circumstances surrounding their individual accessions and the challenges to their queenship. Other early modern queens were also proclaimed at the earliest opportunity. For instance, Elizabeth I was proclaimed in London on the same day Mary died on the 17<sup>th</sup> November 1558, and in 1702 Anne was also formally proclaimed on the same day as the death of her predecessor, William. At her accession Elizabeth was still held by many to be illegitimate which presented potential problems for her authority, hence her proclamation on 17<sup>th</sup> November was certainly politically expedient, but Anne faced no such challenges to her legitimacy on William’s death.<sup>196</sup> Political expediency and the need to ensure dynastic continuity were evidently equally important factors with regard to proclaiming the new monarch.

The role of the proclamation in defining a monarch’s claim to the throne can be determined by an analysis of the format and of the language used in the proclamation itself. The wording of the proclamation was particularly important as by definition it effectively reflected the dynastic, and from 1689, the constitutional position of the new regime. Hence the language and format of William and Mary’s proclamation is very different to that of the proclamation of Mary Tudor. Careful thought and consideration was given to how a proclamation was to be set out, for example, in July 1553 Richard Troughton, bailiff of South Witham, responded to a request from the mayor and aldermen of Grantham for advice over how they should phrase Mary Tudor’s proclamation.<sup>197</sup> This may have been because of the unprecedented nature of regnant queenship or possibly a result of the confusion that had ensued from the rival proclamations of Jane Grey. An initial examination of Mary’s proclamation finds that the wording and format was based on that of Edward VI, six years earlier. Both proclamations comprise three parts; the initial statement announcing the new monarch and their title to the

---

<sup>195</sup> Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. I, p. 501; Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part I, Book VII, pp. 209-210; H.C. Foxcroft ed, *A Supplement to Burnet’s History of my own tome derived from his original memoirs, his autobiography, his letters to Admiral Herbert and his private meditations, all hitherto unpublished* (Oxford, 1902), p.312 Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p.84

<sup>196</sup> Hunt, *Drama of Coronation*, pp.146-147

<sup>197</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p.113

nation; the definition of their right to the throne; and finally, an exhortation reminding subjects of allegiance owed by them to the sovereign. Hence, Mary's title and position was announced as:

“MARY BY THE GRACE OF GOD Queen of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, and in the earth supreme head of the Church of England and Ireland: to all our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, greeting”<sup>198</sup>

The definition of her right to the throne used the same language found in Edward's proclamation; namely accession by hereditary blood right, thus emphasising dynastic continuity. Acknowledging Edward's death the proclamation asserted Mary's hereditary right to the crown in one sentence:

“Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to call unto his mercy the most excellent Prince, King Edward VI, our late brother of most worthy memory, whereby the crown imperial of the realms of England and Ireland, with the title of France and all other things appertaining to the same, do most rightfully and lawfully belong to us.”<sup>199</sup>

Mary's proclamation was underpinned by the principles of hereditary succession.<sup>200</sup> Further consideration of the significance of this and the importance of blood and legitimacy is clear when comparing Mary's proclamation to that of Jane Grey. Rather than being based on Edward's proclamation, in both format and wording, as Mary's was, Jane's proclamation was instead a reinforcement of Edward's *Device for the Succession*. With its main emphasis on the unsuitability of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor for the throne through illegitimacy and as unmarried females, Jane's proclamation is problematic as it defines her claim to the throne by effectively denying that of Mary and Elizabeth and places her own right to govern as a secondary concern. In an attempt to provide a sense of dynastic continuity Jane's blood

---

<sup>198</sup> P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations, Vol. 2, The Later Tudors 1553-1587* (London, 1969), p. 3; for Edward's proclamation see *Tudor Royal Proclamations, Vol. 1, The Early Tudors 1485-1553* (London, 1964), p. 381

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

<sup>200</sup> Aside from Jane Grey's usurpation, Howard Nenner credits the succession of the Tudor monarchs from Henry VIII in order of lineal descent as bolstering the principle of hereditary monarchy which by 1603 and the accession of the Stuarts to the English crown ensured that this principle was “indefeasible”; Nenner, *Right to be King*, p.3

relationship to Edward is highlighted by defining the proximity of the Suffolk line to Henry VIII:

“Whereupon our late cousin, recalling that we and Lady Catherine and lady Mary our sisters, daughters of Lady Frances and Henry, duke of Suffolk, and Lady Margaret (Clifford), daughter of Lady Eleanor, sister of Lady Frances and late wife of Henry, earl of Cumberland, were very near his blood on his father’s side and born within the realm .....”<sup>201</sup>

But this format essentially weakened her proclamation which was consequently less effective towards confirming her power and establishing her regime. In contrast, Mary’s proclamation, underpinned by its emphasis on hereditary blood right was far stronger, particularly with its adoption of the same format and wording of that of Edward, whose legitimacy and title were not questioned. By setting Mary’s proclamation within the same framework it essentially sent out the same message; that Mary was the legitimate and rightful monarch.

In 1689 the proclamation of William and Mary also presented challenges. The proclamation of the dual monarchs was problematic as their right to the throne could not be defined in hereditary terms; firstly because James II was still alive, and secondly, because their title was effectively parliamentary. Therefore, whilst the proclamations of Edward, Mary I and Elizabeth had the common theme of expressing remorse for a deceased monarch, whether father, brother, or sister, and consequently defining their hereditary blood right, it was necessary for William and Mary’s proclamation to advance a new definition of their claim to power in order for their rule to be effectively established. A radical reworking of the format of the proclamation was required which reflected the Revolutionary settlement. Hence the theme advanced by William and Mary’s proclamation sought to justify the Glorious Revolution by presenting their accession to the throne as having delivered the nation from the threat of Catholicism and tyranny.

“Whereas it hath pleased Almighty God in his Great Mercy to this kingdom, to vouchsafe us a Miraculous Deliverance from Popery and Arbitrary Power; and that our Preservation is due next under God, to

---

<sup>201</sup> *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, p. 1

the Revolution and Conduct of His Highness the Prince of ORANGE, whom God hath chosen to be the Glorious Instrument of such an Inevitable Happiness to us and our Posterity.”<sup>202</sup>

Noticeably their accession was sanctioned by God, through the body of William and was therefore underpinned by the notion discussed in the previous chapter; that it was William, and not Mary, who was seen as the saviour of the nation and was consequently deemed worthy of the crown. In this context and as a reflection of the decision of the Convention Parliament to place the administrative authority in William alone, the proclamation endorsed traditional gendered ideals, particularly as its focus on Mary was restricted to her traditionally feminine qualities, namely her “Great and Eminent virtues.”<sup>203</sup> But despite this emphasis the proclamation does not formally acknowledge the differentiation of power within the dual monarchy as William and Mary are declared king and queen, thus enabling the perpetration of the convenient fiction that was embodied within the concept of the dual monarchy itself. To justify the principles of the Revolution, further definition of the parliamentary nature of William and Mary’s title was provided by highlighting that the crown had been formally offered and accepted, the proclamation being effectively endorsed by the Declaration of Rights.

“And whereas the Lords and Commons now Assembled at Westminster have made a Declaration, and Presented the same to the said Prince and Princess of ORANGE, and therein desired Them to Accept the Crown, who have Accepted the same accordingly we therefore, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, together with the Lord Mayor and Citizens of London, and others of the Commons of this Realm, do with a full consent, Publish and Proclaim according to the said Declaration, WILLIAM and MARY, Prince and Princess of ORANGE, to be KING and QUEEN of England, France and Ireland, with all Dominions and Territories thereunto belonging.....”<sup>204</sup>

Thus the proclamation was essentially tied to the Declaration, and it was only by accepting this that William and Mary were proclaimed king and queen. To a great extent the

---

<sup>202</sup> *A Proclamation* (London, 1689)

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*,

Declaration was itself a form of proclamation as it both defined the new monarchs' right to the throne and, acknowledging that power was invested solely in William, declared them as king and queen. Stating the case against James II, the Declaration declared the throne vacant and constructed William as "the Glorious Instrument" of deliverance.<sup>205</sup> Leading on from this were listed the conditions to which William and Mary were to agree to by accepting the crown, thus firmly binding the succession to Parliamentary decree. It is only then that the Declaration announced that William and Mary are to be declared king and queen. In this sense the proclamation, in both format and language, can be viewed as an abridged version of the Declaration.

As the message contained in the proclamation contributed to the successful establishment of the new regime it was vital that it was disseminated to as many people as possible within the shortest given time, hence the importance of public proclamation. For example, when Mary Tudor sent one of her servants to Ipswich to issue her proclamation on 11<sup>th</sup> July 1553, he did so in the market place where many people would gather. In addition to residents of the town, many there on that day would have come from the outlying areas to the market to trade, and would in turn take the message of the proclamation back to their villages and hamlets. This was equally crucial in 1689, and William and Mary's proclamation is reported as having been delivered in numerous public places across the country, including for example, the market places at Great Yarmouth and Reading, and at the High Cross at Chichester.<sup>206</sup> In addition, the proclamation was issued in more than one place within a city or town, which was particularly important in London not only as the centre of government, but also because of the large numbers of foreign merchants and ambassadors resident there; thus ensuring that the message of the proclamation was delivered to an international as well as domestic audience. For example, following the initial proclamation of Mary Tudor in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July the council ordered the city's sheriff to ensure that the proclamation was issued in other parts of the city.<sup>207</sup> The same strategy had been used for Jane Grey who was proclaimed in four different places within London, and, according to the imperial ambassador, also at street

---

<sup>205</sup> *The Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled at Westminster Presented to Their Highnesses the Prince and Princess of ORANGE, at White-Hall the 13<sup>th</sup> of February, 1689* (London, 1689), p.2 ; *An act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown*, in A Browning ed. *English Historical Documents 1660 – 1714* (London, 1953), pp. 122 - 128

<sup>206</sup> *London Gazette*, 18 February 1689, Issue 2429; *London Gazette*, 21 February 1689, Issue 2430

<sup>207</sup> *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, p. 89

corners across the city.<sup>208</sup> Both William and Mary in 1689, and later Anne in 1702, were also proclaimed at four separate places in London. The proclamation of William and Mary was issued at Whitehall Gate, Temple Bar, Cheapside and finally at the Royal Exchange.<sup>209</sup> Whilst Anne's proclamation on 8<sup>th</sup> March 1702 is reported as having been delivered at the outer gate of St James' Palace, then at Charing Cross and Temple Bar, and at the Royal Exchange.<sup>210</sup> A similar situation can be seen in other cities, for example on 16<sup>th</sup> February 1689 the dual monarchs were proclaimed in "several parts" of Norwich, whilst in Chester on 18<sup>th</sup> February the proclamation of William and Mary was read in seven different places.<sup>211</sup>

Formal public proclamations were crucial because of their visual and auditory impact. Indeed, a formal proclamation was an opportunity for considerable civic display. When Mary Tudor was proclaimed in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July 1553 the Earls of Shresbury, Arundel and Pembroke accompanied the mayor and aldermen on horseback to the Cross at Cheape, where numerous "other lords" and "haroldes and trumpettes" were assembled, and the Garter King at Arms, richly dressed in his coat of arms, read the proclamation which was formally announced by the blowing of trumpets.<sup>212</sup> Such a gathering of authority figures accompanied by the ceremonial of heralds and trumpeters firmly centralised the proclamation, and its message, within the public sphere. Furthermore the involvement of the civic authorities provided a critical opportunity to demonstrate the city's loyalty to the new queen, which was particularly pertinent given that the city had only recently caused Jane Grey to be proclaimed. An even more impressive display of authority was witnessed in 1689 at the proclamation of William and Mary. A published pamphlet records that the Lords and the Commons were already assembled at the banqueting house at Whitehall to present the Declaration to the new monarchs, and once the crown had been accepted, both houses, accompanied by sergeants at arms, heralds of arms, trumpeters and other officers went to Whitehall Gate where:

"... the Trumpets having sounded a Call three several times, the last of which was answer'd by a great Shout of the Vast Multitudes of People there assembled; the Noise ceasing, the said Garter, King of

---

<sup>208</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86; *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 80

<sup>209</sup> *The Manner of the Proclaiming of King WILLIAM, and Queen MARY, At WHITE-HALL, and in the City of LONDON, Feb. 13 1689* (London, 1689); Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. I, p. 501

<sup>210</sup> *Post Boy*, 7 March 1702, Issue 1063, ; *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. V, pp. 491-492

<sup>211</sup> *London Gazette*, 18 February 1689, Issue 2429

<sup>212</sup> John Stowe, *The Annales; or General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615) p. 612; *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, p. 80; *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 37



Arms, read the said Proclamation by short Sentences or Periods,  
which was thereupon proclaim'd aloud by *Robert Devenish*, Esq;  
*York Herald*, being the *Senior Herald* ....”<sup>213</sup>

This ceremonial display was then extended throughout the city in the mode of a formal ceremonial procession to each place of proclamation. The procession included the civic authorities, trumpeters, pursuivants, sergeants at arms, heralds, and the Garter King of Arms, all of whom processed on horseback. These were followed by coaches containing the speakers of both houses of Parliament, the Earl Marshall of England, the Duke of Norfolk and the other peers and members of the Commons. The civic regalia were carried in the procession and the heralds, pursuivants and sergeants at arms were all dressed in coats bearing the royal arms.<sup>214</sup> The participation of Lords and Commons, and civic authorities was a vital signal of acceptance of the new regime which was further reinforced by the ceremonial elements of the civic regalia, heralds and trumpeters.

Elaborate processions and civic display were not restricted to London however, as similar scenes were reported in other cities when proclaiming the new monarchs. For instance, the *London Gazette* recorded that in Chester the sheriffs, mayor and aldermen all dressed in ceremonial scarlet, accompanied by heralds, other members of the corporation and many gentlemen rode through the city to proclaim the new king and queen. Members of the companies attended the procession with flags and streamers and the city's guns were fired in honour of the occasion. In Great Yarmouth the bailiffs and aldermen, also dressed in scarlet, along with members of the corporation processed through the town accompanied by music and six companies of the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers to proclaim William and Mary at the market place and other places within the town.<sup>215</sup> The publication of these accounts and similar events in other towns and cities, in newspapers and the popular press further projected the proclamation into the public consciousness, contributing to the successful establishment of the new regime across the realm.

---

<sup>213</sup> *The Manner of the Proclaiming of King WILLIAM and Queen MARY, at WHITE-HALL, and in the City of LONDON, Feb. 13.1689* (London, 1689)

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>215</sup> *London Gazette*, 18 February 1689, Issue 2429; *London Gazette*, 21 February 1689, Issue 2430

The proclamations of both Mary I and William and Mary were also marked by numerous public celebrations, which in addition to the formal proclamation processions formed a vital part of the confirmatory process of the new monarchs' authority. Such celebrations exhibited a number of common themes that David Cressy has referred to as "a versatile vocabulary of celebration" that existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a medium of expression of public joy and enthusiasm.<sup>216</sup> The celebrations at the proclamation of Mary Tudor in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July were characterised by their spontaneity, with contemporary accounts reporting cheering, shouting, throwing caps into the air and even money being thrown from windows. As the news spread throughout the city, these initial joyful reactions evolved further as crowds of people grouped together to celebrate. Bonfires were lit across the city, church bells were rung, and the streets were characterised by singing, music and feasting, the celebrations lasting into the night.<sup>217</sup> The joyful reaction continued the next day with *Te Deums* sung in London's parish churches and "all the bells ringing all the day longe."<sup>218</sup> Although contemporary accounts predominantly focus on the joyful scenes in London, similar reactions were seen elsewhere in England. At Ipswich, Mary's proclamation was received "amid scenes of general enthusiasm" whilst in Grantham, where such care had been taken over the wording of the proclamation, people threw their caps in the air.<sup>219</sup> In 1689 similar expressions of joy were seen on the proclamation of William and Mary. Of their proclamation in London, the diarist John Evelyn records:

"I saw the new Queene & King, so proclaim'd, the very next day of her coming to White-hall, Wednesday 13. Feb. With wonderfull acclamation & general reception, Bonfires, bells, Gunns &c."<sup>220</sup>

Evelyn's "wonderfull acclamation" is corroborated in a contemporary pamphlet that commented upon the vast crowds of people in the streets and at balconies and windows who "filled the Air with loud and repeated shouts and expressions of Joy."<sup>221</sup> As in 1553, similar scenes were repeated outside the capital. The *London Gazette* reported the reactions to the proclamation in towns and cities across the country, where the proclamation was greeted with

---

<sup>216</sup> David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989), p. 67

<sup>217</sup> *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 37; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, pp. 88-90; De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, pp. 96-97; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, pp. 11-12

<sup>218</sup> *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, pp. 89-90

<sup>219</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 113; *Vita Mariae Angliae*, p. 255

<sup>220</sup> *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. IV, p. 623

<sup>221</sup> *The Manner of the Proclaiming of King WILLIAM, and Queen MARY*

celebratory bell ringing, bonfires, music, and the firing of guns. Firework displays were reported in Guildford, and in Norwich, following the “Cheerful Acclamations of vast Throngs of People”, the “High Sheriff gave a Handsom Entertainment”, whilst in Colchester the mayor invited “gentlemen” and “dutch governors” to a “handsom Entertainment at the Moot Hall.”<sup>222</sup> In accordance with Cressy’s ‘vocabulary’ bonfires and bell ringing were significant announcements and we can therefore, view them as a reflection of the actual proclamation itself, announcing the new monarch, or monarchs, to the realm.<sup>223</sup> Bell ringing and bonfires had played an important role in English celebratory culture and had been incorporated into both regal and religious ceremonies. Bell ringing not only signified joy and celebration, but as Cressy has outlined, medieval bells were held to have a sense of mystic potency, and in the early modern period the noise of their ringing was believed to drive away evil spirits. Similarly, bonfires, in addition to providing a visual focus for celebration could convey a number of meanings, including good will and the symbolism of light in darkness.<sup>224</sup> Hence it is clear that bonfires along with the auditory elements of celebration were highly significant in both the mid sixteenth and later seventeenth centuries, reinforcing the message of the proclamation and signalling an acceptance of the new regime which was underpinned by a sense of mystic symbolism.

Further consideration of the celebrations witnessed upon the proclamation indicates that such events went beyond mere acceptance of the new regime and, reflecting the comments of the Imperial ambassadors with regard to the three regal acts, did indeed contribute directly to the confirmation of power. A dispatch from Mary Tudor’s chief officers in Guisnes to the queen in 1553 would appear to confirm this. Reporting that they had caused her proclamation to be published in the town, they confirmed that they had:

“... solemnized the said proclamation with bonfires, gunshots, and chiefly with such triumphant shouts of us your joyful liege people, as the same may be, to your Grace’s great comfort, and the better tranquillity of all your Majesties realms and dominions.”<sup>225</sup>

---

<sup>222</sup> *London Gazette*, 18 February 1689, Issue 2429, *London Gazette*, 21 February 1689, Issue 2430; *London Gazette*, 25 February 1689, Issue 2431; *London Gazette*, 28 February 1689, Issue 2432

<sup>223</sup> Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, p. 68

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69-83

<sup>225</sup> Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Vol. III, Part II, p. 174

In this sense the elements of celebration constitute a fundamental part of the process of proclamation, both to secure the queen's position and for the overall benefit of the realm. The Spanish observer, Antonio de Guaras, appears to confirm this argument when he notes that the celebrations and rejoicing are "the custom here", in that they are a customary element of the proclamation itself.<sup>226</sup> Consideration of the reactions to Jane Grey's proclamation further demonstrates the centrality of the celebrations as part of the confirmatory process. In stark contrast to the joyful scenes reported on Mary's proclamation, there are no reports of joyful celebrations when Jane Grey was proclaimed. Wingfield recorded the reaction to Jane's proclamation at Ipswich as "not without murmurs of discontent and great indignation from the common people."<sup>227</sup> And in London, Jane's proclamation was received in a similar manner, the Imperial ambassador reporting that none of those present at the proclamation showed any sign of rejoicing, and with the exception of the herald and a small number of archers accompanying him, there were no acclamations of "Long live the Queen!"<sup>228</sup> Hence Jane's proclamation was marked by a distinct lack of celebration and was thus deficient of the vital elements required to confirm power. In 1689, and largely attributable to unrest amongst the military, groups of soldiers prevented the people of Cirencester from lighting bonfires to celebrate the proclamation of William and Mary. This was clearly a matter of some concern to the civic authorities in Cirencester who wrote to their Member of Parliament on this matter, but when it was discussed in the Commons it was considered within the context of the general unrest within the military at the time rather than concerns over the effectiveness of the proclamation itself.<sup>229</sup> As an isolated incident however, in particular when compared to newspaper reports of the proclamation celebrations throughout the kingdom, this incident had little detrimental effect. Celebrations were, therefore, an essential element of the proclamation process. Indeed, the importance of the proclamation process as a whole was summarised by the Imperial ambassadors, who, in relation to Mary I, reported in 1553 that:

"... the Lady Mary has been so well proclaimed and published Queen of England that she is now true and lawful sovereign without difficulty, doubt or hindrance."<sup>230</sup>

---

<sup>226</sup> De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p. 96

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255

<sup>228</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp. 80, 106

<sup>229</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, pp. 110, 112

<sup>230</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 111

Reinforcing the proclamation was the second regal act, that of royal entry. London was the centre of government and the entry to the city signified that the monarch, in taking possession of London had symbolically taken possession of the realm. For Mary Tudor, faced with the challenge to her queenship in 1553, the need to make the royal entry as soon as possible was paramount. There was some difference of opinion as to how soon Mary should make her entry into London amid concerns over the heat and risk of plague and sickness prevalent in the city during the summer. Despite being formally proclaimed in London on 19<sup>th</sup> July, until she made her royal entry Mary was still in a vulnerable position, and although some councillors thought she should delay, others urged her to make her entry as soon as possible “to set her affairs in order and establish herself in the government of the country.”<sup>231</sup> The Imperial ambassador was clearly of the same opinion, expressing his concern in a letter to Charles V:

“As for her Majesty’s entry into London, it seems she had better hasten it as much as possible in order that she may firmly establish her rule, because she now has troops at hand, and for other reasons that have been laid before her Majesty verbally.”<sup>232</sup>

Acknowledging the need for Mary to establish her authority as soon as possible, the ambassador also recognised the strategic importance attached to Mary’s troops given Northumberland’s recently failed coup, as there may still have been some pockets of support for Jane.

Mary’s royal entry took place on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1553. Sidney Anglo has pointed out that the opportunities for “ceremonial exposition of kingship” were varied, and the royal entry into her capital presented Mary with her first opportunity to personally affirm her queenship through the mode of a formal ceremonial procession and its associated display.<sup>233</sup> In addition to the celebrations of the proclamation, it was also a further opportunity for the city and the civic authorities to demonstrate their loyalty to the new queen. Contemporary accounts offer some variations in the descriptions of the size of the actual procession. The Imperial ambassadors reported that Mary was escorted into the city by large numbers of the nobility

---

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*, p.135

<sup>233</sup> Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London, 1992), p. 98

and over a thousand armed men, both mounted and on foot, whilst the author of the *Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary* recorded that:

“The number of velvet coats that did ride before hir, aswell as strangeres as otheres, was 740; and the number of ladyes and gentlemen that followed was 180.”

In addition, he estimated that a total of 10,000 horsemen were involved in the procession.<sup>234</sup> Despite these discrepancies the sources all stress the suitably impressive size of Mary’s retinue as she entered the city, immediately followed by her sister, Elizabeth, and the premier ladies of the realm. Equally significant was the appearance of the queen herself and Mary did not waste this opportunity to display the magnificence of her queenship as Wriothesley recorded:

“... her gowne of purple velvet French fashion, with sleeves of the same, hir kirtle purple satten all thicke sett with gouldsmithes worke and great pearle, with her foresleues of the same set with rich stones, with a rich bowdricke of gould, pearle, and stones about her necke, and a riche billement of stones and great pearle on her hoode....”<sup>235</sup>

The splendour of Mary’s appearance was further enhanced by the inclusion of the symbolic regalia in the procession, as immediately before Mary, the Earl of Arundel bore the sword, whilst the mayor, having met her as she entered the city at Aldgate, rode before her with the mace. The streets from Aldgate to the Tower had been freshly gravelled and were decorated for the occasion with streamers, banners and silk cloth, and at the Tower the crafts of London had assembled with more banners and streamers to welcome the queen.<sup>236</sup> Anglo has argued that in contrast to their European counterparts, Tudor royal entries were characterised by a “rarity” of classical imagery and were essentially an expression of the hopes and expectations of citizens.<sup>237</sup> This certainly appears to be the case at Mary’s entry into London as none of the contemporary accounts record classical imagery. Instead the focus is very much on the spectacle of the procession and the appearance of the queen herself. And one incident in particular reflects popular expectations of the new regime when on her route to the Tower

---

<sup>234</sup> CSP Spanish, Vol. XI, p. 150; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 14

<sup>235</sup> *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, p. 93

<sup>236</sup> *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, pp.93-95; *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, pp.81-83; *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 38; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p.14; CSP Spanish, Vol. XI, p. 150

<sup>237</sup> Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship*, pp.107-108

Mary was presented with a group of poor children from Christ's Hospital, one of whom made an oration to her in Latin. As an analogy of her potential fecundity and hopes that she will provide an heir, she was presented as a mother of her realm, as one observer reported that the children were given to Mary to "nourish and care for them."<sup>238</sup> Essentially Mary's royal entry was an extension of her proclamation. In a similar manner to the celebrations of the proclamation, the visual impact of the royal entry procession was reinforced by auditory elements; trumpets sounded, guns were fired from the Tower, bells rung, and between Aldgate and the Tower there were four stages on which musicians played and sung, in addition to the shouts of acclamation from the crowds lining the streets.<sup>239</sup> Hence the royal entry contained the same confirmatory factors of ceremonial and celebration that were embedded within the proclamation; the key differential was the physical presence of the queen herself as the focal point of the royal entry.

## **Part 2 – Without Precedent: The Coronation of Three Regnant Queens**

Coronation was the third regal act referred to by the Imperial ambassadors in 1553. Although as the rightful heir to the throne, and having been duly proclaimed and made her royal entry, Mary Tudor's coronation was problematic on a number of levels. Crucially the established coronation ritual related solely to kings and their queens consort, not regnant queens. The situation was further complicated by matters of legitimacy and religion. The first problem was manifested in the timing of the coronation itself. Initially, and according to the established order of such events, this was planned for 1<sup>st</sup> October with the first Parliament of the new reign commencing several days after. On 9<sup>th</sup> September the preparations for the coronation were reported as being well underway, but shortly after, the Imperial ambassadors reported that some of Mary's councillors had advocated that the queen's coronation be postponed until after Parliament had met. A number of reasons were given for this. It was felt that such a move would "better" "establish and confirm the reign", as Parliament could annul the legislation of Henry VIII's reign that declared Mary illegitimate, and in addition, declare the terms of Edward's will that denied her the crown, "null and void." A further reason given

---

<sup>238</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p.151; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, p.94; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p.14

<sup>239</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp. 150-151; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, p.95; *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, p.83; *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 38; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p.14

for this proposal was the discovery of plots against the queen in London, giving rise to the fear that she may be attacked when travelling through the city to her coronation.<sup>240</sup> But whatever the rationale behind the suggestion, it constituted a remarkable irregularity to suggest such a drastic reversal of the traditional order of events, and was clearly a matter of some controversy, marked by the subsequent disagreement amongst members of the Council, and reports that Mary was distressed by the proposal.<sup>241</sup> There were several contributory elements behind this unprecedented suggestion, but further consideration of the underlying issues surrounding Mary's accession indicates that the reasons given were unsubstantiated. Mary's legitimacy was certainly an issue, but she was still the rightful heir to the throne as specified both in the 1544 Act of Succession, and the terms of Henry VIII's will. The ruling over her parents' marriage was overturned by the first Parliament of her reign but as her title to the throne had already been legally defined by statute, such a manoeuvre was not crucial prior to her coronation. And despite Edward's attempt to divert the succession through the Suffolk line by excluding Mary and Elizabeth, neither his will nor the *Device for the Succession* had been ratified by Parliament, so they did not require to be formally repealed. The fears of an attack on Mary's person during her coronation procession would appear to be unfounded, and considering the joyful reactions to her proclamation and her welcome by the city at her royal entry, such an attack appears highly improbable. And even if this had been the case, it would not have been sufficient reason to suggest delaying the coronation until after Parliament had been held.

The proposal by some members of the Council to delay Mary's coronation is explored in some depth by Alice Hunt, who has argued persuasively that it was a response to the unprecedented situation posed by the accession of a woman to the English imperial crown, which would at a stroke institutionalise a "female and Catholic supremacy."<sup>242</sup> Although as outlined in the previous chapter, Mary was deeply uncomfortable with the office of supremacy, it was, like that of her brother and father, defined by statute, and could only be reversed by act of Parliament. Thus, ironically, Mary would be dependent upon the consent of Parliament to enact legislation that would countermand her father's revolutionary

---

<sup>240</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp 210, 214, 238

<sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, p,238

<sup>242</sup> Hunt, *Drama of Coronation*, p.111; Alice Hunt, 'The Monarchical Republic of Mary I', *Historical Journal*, 52, 3 (2009), pp. 563, 571; Alice Hunt, 'Legitimacy, Ceremony and Drama: Mary Tudor's Coronation and Respublica', in Peter Happe and Wim Husken eds., *Interludes and Early Modern Society: Studies in Gender, Power and Theatricality* (Amsterdam, 2007), pp.336-338



redefinition of monarchical authority.<sup>243</sup> Notions of authority were of crucial significance regarding the proposal to delay the coronation as this suggests that Mary's right to the crown was intrinsically bound to Parliament, and that Parliament, rather than the coronation ceremony, would confirm her authority and establish her reign. Traditionally, the crowned monarch had legitimized Parliament, not the other way round.<sup>244</sup> In this manner Mary's authority could potentially be limited by Parliament, which raises the question of why some members of the Council deemed this necessary. Certainly the Imperial ambassadors believed that the reasons originally put forward for the proposal were merely excuses, and that those who sought to delay Mary's coronation until after Parliament had met did so for several reasons, specifically:

“..... to cast doubts upon and put in question the Queen's right to the throne; to render her more dependent on the Council and Parliament than she should be; bridle her so that she cannot marry a foreigner, and bring about her marriage to Courtenay according to the bishop of Winchester's design; prevent the establishment of religion and, generally, put their intrigues into execution.”<sup>245</sup>

Religion was clearly a contributory factor as there can be no doubt that many who had embraced the new, Protestant faith had very real concerns about the prospect of England being returned to Rome under Mary. More generally, members of the Council, uncertain about the government of a woman, and more specifically an unmarried woman, also sought to control the body of the queen by attempting to limit her authority. Hence there was common ground across the religious divide centred on the need to 'bridle' Mary and impose limitations upon her queenship. Hunt asserts that the proposal was a consequence of anxieties as to how the Council and Parliament determined monarchical, and in this case, female monarchical authority. Furthermore, the precedent of Edward VI's minority rule was also a contributory factor as politically experienced men had developed “a system of government-by-council.”<sup>246</sup> The belief that monarchical power could to some extent be limited was considered early in the sixteenth century by the political theorist Claude de Seyssel. Writing about the French monarchy, which, by virtue of Salic law, excluded women from the

---

<sup>243</sup> Hunt, *Drama of Coronation*, p.124

<sup>244</sup> *Ibid.*, p.125; Hunt, 'Monarchical Republic', pp.562-563

<sup>245</sup> *CSP Spanish Vol. XI*, p.239

<sup>246</sup> Hunt, 'Monarchical Republic', pp. 563-564; Hunt considers that it was highly likely to be the large number of former Edwardian councillors who formed part of Mary's rather unwieldy Council that put forward the proposal to delay her coronation, 'Monarchical Republic', p. 561

succession, he pointed to three ‘bridles’ that could be used to regulate the absolute power of a king: religion, justice and polity could bridle or control if the monarch was considered incapacitated by youth or otherwise.<sup>247</sup> In this context, some of Mary’s councillors clearly viewed her as incapacitated by her gender, and consequently the queen needed to be effectively bridled for the benefit of the realm. Such concerns with regard to the need to ‘bridle’ a woman who sought to exercise power were also expressed by Knox, who cited Augustine’s assertion that a woman who aspired “to any dominion” “ought to be repressed and brideled be times.”<sup>248</sup>

The proposed delay in the coronation did not occur and Mary successfully negotiated this controversial issue by symbolically acknowledging the incapacity presented by her gender, and following the advice of the emperor Charles V, who advocated:

“Let her be in all things what she ought to be; a good Englishwoman, and avoid giving the impression that she desires to act on her own authority, letting it be seen that she wishes to have the assistance and consent of the foremost men of the land .....”<sup>249</sup>

Hence shortly before the coronation, she summoned members of the Council before her at the Tower, and addressed them on her knees, referring to her accession and the duties of kings and queens. In a clearly moving speech she pointed out that in her determination to fulfil her duty as queen “she had entrusted her affairs and person” to them.<sup>250</sup> In this way Mary was admitting to the perceived incapacities of her gender and willingly submitting her queenship to their care whilst successfully evading a manoeuvre that threatened to limit her monarchical authority.

Mary’s coronation took place, as originally planned, on 1<sup>st</sup> October. According to precedent, the coronation was spread over two days; the state entry on the eve of the coronation ceremony, when the new monarch formally processed through the city from the Tower to Westminster, and the ritual of the coronation ceremony itself. Both elements had to a great

---

<sup>247</sup> De Seysell, *The Monarchy of France*, p. 51

<sup>248</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.20

<sup>249</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 111

<sup>250</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 259

extent been formally prescribed by texts that laid out the established rituals of coronation ceremonial, specifically the medieval *Liber Regalis*, and from the latter fifteenth century, the *Little Device*, which originated from the coronation of Richard III and was used for the subsequent coronations of both Henry VII and Henry VIII.<sup>251</sup> However neither of these texts catered for the anomaly of a regnant queen; monarchy, until 1553, was centred upon kingship. Judith Richards has argued that there was an element of uncertainty over Mary's coronation, particularly the state entry on 30<sup>th</sup> September, as she attributes discrepancies in witness accounts to uncertainty over whether individuals had viewed Mary as a monarch or a queen consort.<sup>252</sup> The discrepancies in the sources stem from the description of Mary found in *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary* which was later developed by the antiquarian, John Stowe, in his *Annales of England*. In a marked difference to other sources, the *Chronicle of Queen Jane* describes Mary as dressed in "blew velvet" on the eve of the coronation, although the account does correctly describe the circlet of gold on her head and the canopy borne over her litter.<sup>253</sup> Other sources either record that she wore cloth of gold furred with miniver and ermine, or do not provide details of her dress. A comparison of the sources to the guidance set down in the *Little Device* and *Liber Regalis* can offer an alternative explanation to the sense of uncertainty put forward by Richards, as during the course of the procession through the city and the ceremonial ritual of the next day, Mary was essentially transformed from woman to monarch. For example, on the 30<sup>th</sup> September for her procession from the Tower to Westminster, Mary was the embodiment of the queen consort described in the *Little Device* as she appeared wearing:

“... a mantle and kirtle of cloth of gold, furred with miniver and powdered ermines, on her head a circlet of gold set with stones and pearls, sat in her litter garnished with white cloth of gold with two traps of white damask, with cushions. Her footmen on both sides, in rich coats. The canopy of white cloth of gold, borne by five knights.....”<sup>254</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, pp. 84, 142; Dale Hoak, 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy', in C.S. Kington and Richard Mortimer eds., *Westminster Abbey Reformed 1540-1640* (Aldershot, 2003), pp.118-120

<sup>252</sup> Judith Richards, 'Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy', *Historical Journal*, 40, 4 (1997), pp., 900-902

<sup>253</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 28

<sup>254</sup> *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, p.10; see also, J.R. Planche, *Regal Records: or a Chronicle of the Coronation of the Queens Regnant of England* (London, 1838), p. 6; Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Vol. 3, Part I, p. 54

The *Little Device* specified that a king should ride on horseback, wearing green or white cloth of gold with a long purple velvet gown furred with ermine, but instead Mary chose to acknowledge her gender and present herself within the guidelines set for a queen.<sup>255</sup> Her decision to appear in this manner at the early stage of the coronation process is striking. In the same manner of her speech to the Council shortly before the coronation, when she entrusted her queenship to them, she was in effect orchestrating her gender to her own advantage. Thus on the eve of her coronation, sitting in an open litter so she could be clearly seen by the crowds, Mary appeared as a woman rather than attempt to blur gendered boundaries and appear as a king.

Representations of the queen in the pageantry and associated celebrations of the coronation procession are not as clearly defined and contain mixed messages. The Spanish observer, Antonio de Guaras recorded that there were many triumphal arches and pageants in the streets and one of the first of these that Mary encountered on her route through the city was that erected by the Genoese residents at Fenchurch, which according to De Guaras was one of the largest, and “exceeded all the rest in novelty and elegance of design.” This comprised a triumphal arch guarded by four giants that was marked with Latin inscriptions paying tribute to Mary and praising her virtue.<sup>256</sup> A further impressive pageant was that of the Florentines at Gracechurch. This was an innovative design featuring a device dressed as an angel holding a trumpet in his hand. The actual trumpeter was concealed within the pageant and when he blew his trumpet, the angel put the trumpet to his mouth at the same time, so it appeared that it was the angel playing the trumpet. The significance of the angel is twofold. Most obviously, the angel is a messenger from God blowing his trumpet in honour of the new queen; signifying that Mary’s reign was endorsed by God himself. Secondly, the angel’s clothing: dressed in green, similar to the Tudor livery of green and white, the angel epitomised the clothing specified for the king in the *Little Device*, namely the doublet of green or white cloth of gold. This pageant also featured four statues or illustrations of the virtues, and Mary was depicted alongside Pallas Athena, Judith and Tomyris.<sup>257</sup> Sydney Anglo has pointed to the inclusion of Judith and Tomyris as a striking allusion to Mary’s

---

<sup>255</sup> *Little Device for the Coronation of Henry VII*, in L.G. Wichkam Legg, ed. *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901), pp. 222-224; *Device for the Coronation of King Henry VII*, in William Jerden ed. *Rutland Papers*, (London, 1834), pp., 4-7; *Liber Regalis*, in *English Coronation Records*, pp. 122

<sup>256</sup> De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, pp. 119-120; *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p. 45; *Regal Records*, pp. 9-10

<sup>257</sup> Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p. 32; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 29

victory over the duke of Northumberland and his execution shortly before the coronation, as both these women had conquered powerful enemies and decapitated them.<sup>258</sup> Such an allusion is certainly reflected in the Latin inscriptions upon the pageant which refer to Mary as a conqueror, an avenger of liberty and deliverer of her country in addition to her unconquered virtue.<sup>259</sup> But the invitation to compare Mary to the Greek goddess of wisdom, the biblical figure of Judith and the ancient Massagetain queen, Tomyris, also contained a robust message that sought to allay contemporary anxieties about female rule. Mary not only had the wisdom and judgement required in a ruler, but like Judith, who saved Israel from the Assyrians by killing their leader Holofernes, and Tomyris, who led her army to defeat the Persians, Mary had the masculine qualities of courage and leadership and was capable of defending her realm, through warfare if required.

Other pageants celebrated Mary's feminine qualities. At Cornhill three children appeared dressed in women's clothes; the child in the middle represented the queen with a crown on her head and a sceptre in her hand, and was called Grace. To her right was Virtue holding a cup, whilst on her left was Nature bearing an olive branch.<sup>260</sup> Thus similar to the Genoese and Florentine pageants, Mary was represented as a virtuous queen and through the olive branch as a restorer of peace, which was particularly pertinent given the tumultuous circumstances of her accession. Hence the Mary that emerges from the various scenes the pageantry is both masculine and feminine as the pageants attempted to negotiate the new phenomenon of regnant queenship and acknowledge the circumstances of Mary's accession. In 1553 the construction of regnant queenship through pageantry was in its infancy but many of the themes embodied within Mary's coronation pageantry were to resurface and be further developed at Elizabeth's coronation in 1559.<sup>261</sup>

---

<sup>258</sup> Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy*, (Oxford, 1997) pp. 320-321

<sup>259</sup> Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p.32

<sup>260</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 29

<sup>261</sup> Elizabeth was presented as a woman capable of both leadership and judgment, and who, with God's aid delivered her people from an oppressive force. However, whereas Mary had delivered her realm from the tyranny of Northumberland, Elizabeth was represented as the deliverer of the realm from Catholicism and idolatry. The theme of virtue also emerged in 1559 in a pageant entitled *The Seat of Worthy Governance*. In this instance the theme was much further developed than it had been for Mary, as virtues are defined and set against vices to demonstrate that Elizabeth was "established in the Seat of Government" as long as she espoused virtue and held vice at bay; *THE PASSAGE of our most dread Sovereign Lady, Queen ELIZABETH, through the City of London to Westminster, the day before her Coronation* (London, 1559), in A.F. Pollard, *Tudor Tracts 1532 – 1588* (Westminster, 1903), pp. 375-377, 386-387

According to Stowe, Mary's coronation ceremony on 1<sup>st</sup> October was carried out according to the "old custom".<sup>262</sup> Given the comments of the Imperial ambassador, that Mary was crowned according to the rites of the old religion, it would appear that Stowe was referring to a Catholic coronation service.<sup>263</sup> However, although Mary was crowned according to Catholic rites, Stowe's reference to "old custom" can also be considered within the context of the traditional coronation ceremony as defined in the *Liber Regalis* and the *Little Device*. Following established guidelines, Mary's coronation was held on a Sunday and within the Abbey and a stage or platform was specially erected for the ceremony. The *Little Device* specified that the king should wear a coat and mantle of crimson satin, furred with miniver, and a crimson satin cap trimmed with ermine and gold ribbon, whilst the queen should be dressed in a surcoat and mantle of crimson velvet furred with ermines, and wearing her hair loose about her shoulders with a gold circlet on her head.<sup>264</sup> Initially, Mary appeared once again as a queen consort as accounts describe her wearing a crimson velvet mantle lined with ermine, in the procession into the Abbey. But throughout the course of the coronation ceremony itself, Mary effectively transcended gendered boundaries and was formally reconstructed as a king. The transformation process commenced as she mounted the specially erected platform, ascending twenty steps to a stage, and then a further ten steps to her ceremonial chair. The significance of this part of the ritual was emphasised by its visual aspect; not only was the queen raised onto a stage, she was then led to the four corners of this platform and formally displayed to those assembled in the abbey.<sup>265</sup> Significantly the *Little Device* ascribes this action specifically for the king, and the queen consort is not displayed in this manner. Further evidence of Mary's reconstruction can also be seen in the coronation sermon delivered by George Day, Bishop of Chichester, with its emphasis on obedience to kings.<sup>266</sup> The most significant element of Mary's reconstruction however, was the anointing, or unction. An Old Testament ritual, anointing the chosen leader with holy oil symbolised a sacred moment of rebirth.<sup>267</sup> In Mary's case this symbolically transformed her into a king. Furthermore she was also anointed as a king. A queen consort would only be anointed twice, on her head and breast, but Mary was anointed on her breast, shoulders, forehead and

---

<sup>262</sup> Stowe, *Annales*, p. 617

<sup>263</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p. 262

<sup>264</sup> *Little Device* in *English Coronation Records*, pp. 225-226; *Little Device* in *Rutland Papers*, pp. 8-9

<sup>265</sup> De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p. 120; Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p. 33; Planche, *Regal Records*, p. 16; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 31

<sup>266</sup> Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p. 33; Planche, *Regal Records*, p. 17

<sup>267</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, pp. 5, 9

temples.<sup>268</sup> Furthermore, once anointed, she then received the coronation regalia as a king. Traditionally, a queen would not be girt with the sword and spurs, but Mary was girt with both.<sup>269</sup>

Despite this symbolic transformation of Mary, there were however, certain anomalies that indicate the existence of uncertainties with regard to crowning a regnant queen. For example, although receiving the regalia as a king, Mary was presented with two sceptres as one account recorded her as:

“holding in her hands two sceptres the one of the King, the other bearing a dove which, by custom is given to the Queen.”<sup>270</sup>

According to the *Liber Regalis*, the sceptre given to the king was made of gold with a cross on its top, whilst that for the queen is specified as being small, and made of gilt with a dove on its top.<sup>271</sup> That Mary was presented with both sceptres is problematic as it would appear to confirm Judith Richards’ assertion of uncertainty as to the perceptions of Mary as monarch or queen consort. Overriding this argument however is that Mary was given the king’s sceptre and girt with the sword and spurs, which combined with the anointing and other aspects of the ceremony, ensured that Mary was very much confirmed as a king. Given the lack of precedent for crowning a regnant queen, presenting Mary with both sceptres was most likely a circumspect measure acknowledging both her gender and her monarchical authority. But other rituals associated with the coronation were not so easily negotiated. For instance, Mary’s gender certainly limited her participation in the creation of the Knights of the Bath. Traditionally an important part of the celebrations, new Knights of the Bath were created by the king on the eve of his coronation. This ritual involved the new knights plunging naked into a bath of water and kissing the king’s shoulder. Given early modern notions about gender and acceptable behaviour for women, it would have been unthinkable for Mary to perform a ritual that involved physical contact with naked men. So although Mary instituted twenty one

---

<sup>268</sup> Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p. 33; De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p. 121

<sup>269</sup> De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p. 121; Planche, *Regal Records*, pp. 19-20

<sup>270</sup> Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p. 34; De Guaras, *Accession of Queen Mary*, p. 121

<sup>271</sup> *Liber Regalis*, pp. 121-122

new Knights of the Bath, she was unable to perform the ritual herself and the Earl of Arundel performed this on her behalf.<sup>272</sup>

The coronation of William and Mary in 1689 was also problematic. In a marked contrast to 1553, there was no question of delaying the ceremony until after Parliament had met; instead the need for the coronation to take place as soon as possible was paramount given the circumstances surrounding the dual monarchs' accession, and particularly as James II was preparing to invade Ireland in an attempt to regain his throne. Furthermore, there was no requirement for a 'bridle' to Mary II's power, as she was already effectively bridled; as a married woman she was subject to her husband, whilst the decision of the Convention Parliament to place the administrative power solely in William, ensured that no further limitations upon her authority were deemed necessary. Finally, the dual monarchy was by definition a parliamentary construct as opposed to the personal monarchy of Mary Tudor. The most singular, significant challenge to the established coronation ceremonial for William and Mary was their unprecedented status as England's first dual monarchs. Previous coronations of kings and their queens had been for queens consort, but Mary II was queen in her own right and there was no precedent for crowning dual monarchs. William and Mary's coronation needed to reflect the nature of the dual monarchy, and although Mary was a regnant queen the administrative authority was vested solely with William, hence this crucial differentiation of power within the dual monarchy needed to be acknowledged. Furthermore, in order to secure the future of Protestant monarchy in England, it was necessary to utilise the coronation as a means to legitimise the Glorious Revolution and its consequent constitutional remodelling.

Shortly after William and Mary had been proclaimed king and queen a committee of the Privy Council was established for the coronation and the date of 11<sup>th</sup> April set for the ceremony. The lack of precedent for crowning dual monarchs necessitated a significant reworking of the established ceremony. By 1689, with some changes accommodating previous monarchs' religious preferences, the ritual elements of the coronation ceremony had

---

<sup>272</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, p.262; this issue did not prove problematic for either Mary II or Anne as the last reference of this ceremony attached to a coronation was for James II in 1685, Strong, *Coronation*, p.318



essentially remained as prescribed by the *Liber Regalis*.<sup>273</sup> But Mary's anomalous position as the half of a dual monarchy that was not vested with administrative authority presented a significant challenge to the established ritual. Strong has argued that distinct efforts were made to construct Mary as William's equal in the coronation and initially, this would certainly appear to be the case.<sup>274</sup> As such, it was planned that she should be crowned according to her regnant status, as the committee established to organise the coronation reported to William, informing him that a revised version of the ceremonial would be required:

“ The Duke of Norfolk Earl Marshall hath brought a Scheme of the Proceedings at the last Coronation, and also offered a new Scheme for this Coronation, in regard yor Matie and the Queen are to be both Crown'd as Sovereigns.”<sup>275</sup>

To allow for this, two sets of regalia would be required and the report advocated that amongst the other regalia the queen should have “an Orb of gold, adorned as the Kings, and a Scepter adorn'd as the Kings instead of the Ivory Rod.” Furthermore, in keeping with the instructions in the *Liber Regalis* for the coronation of a king, it was fully intended that Mary should be girt with the sword as “2 Swords with Scabbards of Purple Velvet for the King and Queen to be girt with” were to be ordered.<sup>276</sup> But to crown Mary in exactly the same manner as William was problematic because it could be seen as undermining the settlement of the Revolution, as the administrative power was vested solely in William, not Mary. Therefore whilst it may have been desirable that Mary was crowned as a regnant queen, it was also necessary to construct her queenship in a manner that reflected the differentiation of power within the dual monarchy so Mary could not be held to be competing with her husband's authority. To do this certain subtle adjustments had to be made. Hence for the journey to Westminster (now from Whitehall rather than the Tower), rather than appear as joint monarchs, William and Mary adhered to the instructions in the *Little Device* for a king and queen consort, which specified that the king should leave the Tower first, to be followed by the queen soon after. William and Mary left Whitehall at different times and travelled

---

<sup>273</sup> For example, as a Catholic, James II had the Eucharist removed from the coronation ceremony, and Mary Tudor requested a new supply of holy oil rather than use that which had been used to anoint her Protestant brother, Edward VI.

<sup>274</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, p.310

<sup>275</sup> *The Report concerning the Coronation of king William and Queen Mary*, in J. Wickham Legg, ed. *Three Coronation Orders* (London, 1900), p. 3

<sup>276</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5

separately, William leaving first in his royal barge at quarter past ten in the morning whilst Mary, travelling by land in her chair, left shortly before eleven o'clock.<sup>277</sup> And in the short procession from Westminster Hall to the Abbey, although together under one canopy of estate, both in robes of crimson velvet furred with ermine, it was William who was positioned on the right hand side indicating his precedence over his wife. Furthermore, William was wearing a crimson velvet cap whilst Mary, wore a "Rich Circlet of Gold on her Head."<sup>278</sup> The *Little Device* specified a cap of crimson satin furred with ermine for the king, whilst the queen would have on her head a "riche cercle of gold."<sup>279</sup> Inside the Abbey, they were presented as joint monarchs. In accordance with the established ceremonial, a special "Theatre" or stage had been constructed and upon ascending this stage, both William and Mary were presented as monarchs to the four sides of the Abbey by the bishop of London, who announced:

"Sirs I here present unto you King William and Queen Marie;  
wherefore undoubted King and Queen of this realm; Wherefore all  
you, who are come this day, to do your Homage, and Service; are you  
willing to do the same."<sup>280</sup>

Further acknowledgment of Mary's regnant status can be seen in the arrangement of the chairs that were provided for the dual monarchs during the ceremony. Both the *Liber Regalis* and the *Little Device* specify that when a king and queen consort are to be crowned together the queen's chair or throne should be on the left of the king's, and should be lower than his. An illuminated image from the late fourteenth century Lytlington Missal reinforces this precedent as it shows a newly crowned king and queen enthroned, with the king's throne noticeably higher than that of the queen.<sup>281</sup> But the accounts of William and Mary's coronation, although referring to the two chairs for the monarchs, make no mention that Mary's chair was lower than William's, and an engraving of a scene from the coronation by the Dutch engraver, Romeyn de Hooghe, shows the couple seated under a canopy, both at the

---

<sup>277</sup> *An Account of the Ceremonial at the Coronation of Their Most Excellent Majesties King William and Queen Mary* (London, 1689), p. 1; *Little Device* p. 223

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3

<sup>279</sup> *Little Device*, pp. 225-226; *Little Device*, in *Rutland Papers*, p.9

<sup>280</sup> *Coronation Order of King William III. And Queen Mary II.*, in L.G. Wickham Legg, ed. *English Coronation Records*, pp. 322-323

<sup>281</sup> Illumination from Lytlington Missal reproduced in Strong, *Coronation*, p. 89

same height.<sup>282</sup> But in recognition that the administrative power was vested solely in William, the ceremonial St Edwards' chair was reserved for him, and an alternative chair had to be provided for Mary.<sup>283</sup> They were both anointed four times, as kings. But although the anointing was conducted simultaneously, the ritual was performed in such a manner that stressed William's precedence over his wife as the palms of William's hands, his shoulders, head and breast were anointed before Mary's. Despite the original plans for both William and Mary to be girt with the sword, in the actual ceremony this only applied to William. And whilst the spurs were presented to Mary by the Dean of Westminster, her heels were not touched with them as they were for William. This is in sharp contrast to Mary Tudor, who was girt as a king with sword and spurs.

Other aspects of the ceremony however, attempted to construct the dual nature of the monarchy; for example although William was crowned before his wife, and following the ritual of crowning, recognising both William and Mary, the choir sung an anthem based on the text of Isaiah 49:23, "For Kings shall be thy Nursing Fathers, and Queens thy Nursing Mothers," which also acknowledged the dual monarchs' status as defenders of the English, Protestant church.<sup>284</sup> The coronation oath, which had been revised to reflect the principles of the Revolution, was sworn simultaneously, and at the coronation banquet at Westminster Hall William and Mary sat under one large canopy of estate, whereas at the coronation of James II in 1685, the king had sat under one large cloth of estate, whilst his consort, Mary of Modena, was seated under a separate, smaller cloth of estate.<sup>285</sup> The coronation sermon preached by the Bishop of Salisbury, Gilbert Burnet, also sought to define the dual nature of the monarchy; but in contrast to the theme of Mary Tudor's coronation sermon, Burnet's focus, reflecting the principles of the Glorious Revolution, was the duty of princes to exercise just and righteous government. Highlighting the plight of ancient Rome under the rule of "Execrable Monsters" including Caligula, Nero, Tiberius and Domitian, Burnet justified the Revolution. As Rome had recovered through "the return of good Princes", thus England would recover from the tyranny of James II's government through the dual monarchy of

---

<sup>282</sup> Romeyn de Hooghe, *The Coronation of William and Mary* (1689), from the original at The British Museum. It should be noted however that it is doubtful de Hooghe was actually present at the coronation ceremony and his illustration is not directly representative of the interior of the abbey.

<sup>283</sup> *Ceremonial of the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary*, in J. Wickham Legg, ed. *Three Coronation Orders* (London, 1900), pp. 98-101

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 102-103; *Coronation Order of King William III. And Queen Mary II*, pp. 328-329, & 333

<sup>285</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 326; *Ceremonial of the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary* p. 107

William and Mary. Representing both as monarchs, William and Mary were the “GREAT SOVERAIGNS” from whom England expected “the Glorious Reverse of all cloudy days.”<sup>286</sup> The coronation ceremony can therefore be seen to have been subtly reinterpreted to acknowledge the unprecedented nature of the dual monarchy. In some instances Mary, according to the *Liber Regalis*, was presented as a consort, but in other aspects she was presented as a regnant queen but with subtle differences that reflected her anomalous position.

William and Mary’s coronation lacked the spectacle of the formal royal entry and its associated pageantry that had traditionally been held on the eve of the coronation for earlier monarchs. Carolyn Edie has argued that this was a result of a lack of money and time, in particular given the urgency to crown the dual monarchs, a view that is corroborated by Strong.<sup>287</sup> In addition to these reasons, a cultural shift away from such display may well have been a contributory factor, as, with the exception of Charles II in 1661, the significance of the royal entry diminished considerably under the Stuarts. James I’s entry was delayed until after the coronation, and there was no royal entry for Charles I, James II or Anne.<sup>288</sup>

Representations of the dual monarchy were instead expressed in different media. One of these was the variety of medals that were produced to commemorate the coronation. The imagery employed on these endorsed the Revolution and reflected the nature of the dual monarchy. The obverse of the official medal featured the conjoined busts of the new monarchs whilst the reverse depicted William as Jove thundering against James II as Phaeton and driving him from the realm.<sup>289</sup> Although depicted on the obverse of the medal, the emphasis is clearly on William, and was a reflection of the underlying belief, discussed in the previous chapter, of the king as the nation’s saviour.<sup>290</sup> A similar message is embodied in another coronation medal depicting William as Jupiter enthroned, whilst James II as Saturn is driven from the realm. Suppliant before Jupiter are two female figures that can be identified as Mary and her

---

<sup>286</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached at the Coronation of William III and Mary II* (London, 1689), pp. 23-28

<sup>287</sup> Carolyn Edie, ‘The Public Face of Royal Ritual: Sermons, Medals, and Civic Ceremony in Later Stuart Coronations’, *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 53, 4 (Autumn, 1990), p.320; Strong, *Coronation*, p.309

<sup>288</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, pp. 299, 308-309

<sup>289</sup> Edward Hawkins, Augustus. W. Franks and Herbert. A Grueber, eds., *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the Death of George II*, Vol. I (London, 1885), pp. 662-663

<sup>290</sup> See Chapter 1, pp. 37-38

sister Anne. Significantly, and to reinforce his precedence over his wife, the obverse of this medal only features the bust of William.<sup>291</sup>

Other medals focus specifically on the dual nature of the new regime. For instance one depicts the busts of William and Mary in profile, William wearing armour and a crown of laurel leaves, in the foreground, whilst on the reverse the couple are enthroned, facing one another under a canopy of estate, whilst two bishops hold a single crown above them both. Another medal also features the emblem of the single crown. The busts of William and Mary facing each other above an open book with a cornucopia on either side and framed by a garland of entwined oranges and roses; the oranges representing William and the House of Orange, the roses, Mary and England. Above them is a single floating crown with the sceptres of England, France, Scotland and Ireland on either side; the theme of unity shown as being endorsed by God through the inclusion of the Eye of Providence looking down on the king and queen.<sup>292</sup> The symbolism of the floating crown was not new, having been used previously on the coinage of Philip and Mary. Whilst its symbolism in the sixteenth century invites questions over the extent of Philip's authority in England, its appearance in 1689 serves solely to define the new phenomenon of dual monarchy.<sup>293</sup>

As a further endorsement of the Revolution two medals feature an eagle ejecting an eaglet from its nest, with two eaglets safely remaining; the conjoined busts of William and Mary on the obverse. The ejected eaglet is James Francis Edward Stuart, the Prince of Wales, and the medal is a celebration of the triumph of Protestant legitimacy over Catholic illegitimacy, as the Revolution had secured the rights of the legitimate Protestant heirs, Mary and Anne over the illegitimate, Catholic son of James II. Another medal depicted an eagle flying towards the sun, carrying one eaglet but dropping another. Mary as the legitimate heir is the eaglet carried to safety, the illegitimate Prince of Wales once again the rejected eaglet. It is noteworthy that in contrast to the other coronation medals, the obverse of this medal features only Mary, thus

---

<sup>291</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. I, p. 675, Plates LXXI – LXXX, Plate LXXII, Nos., 8-9

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.*, pp., 668-669; Plate LXXI, Nos. 10-11

<sup>293</sup> The symbolism behind the floating crown and the questions it raised concerning the tension between political and conjugal authority during Mary Tudor's reign is considered in Chapter 3, pp. 138-139

constructing her queenship through her own legitimate right to the throne as James II's eldest daughter.<sup>294</sup>

Despite the lack of a state entry, William and Mary's coronation was very much a public occasion. The procession from Westminster Hall to the Abbey, whilst not having the same impact as the state entry on the eve of the coronation, was nevertheless a visual spectacle of some merit. The king and queen, under a rich canopy of estate, were preceded by heralds, clerks of the chancery, sheriffs and aldermen, gentlemen of the privy chamber, judges, the choir of Westminster and the Chapel Royal, and the prebends of Westminster. These were followed by baronesses, barons, pursuivants and heralds of arms, duchesses, dukes, the Lord Privy Seal, Lord President of the Council and the Archbishop of York, then Prince George of Denmark, Duke of Cumberland, in his robes of state, followed by the Lords bearing the coronation regalia and crowns. And following the ceremony the whole procession, with the exception of the church of Westminster returned to Westminster Hall in the same manner. Contemporary accounts report crowds of people in the streets and at windows and balconies to witness the event. Furthermore there was a large congregation in the Abbey as both the Lords and Commons occupied specially erected scaffolds that took up the whole of one side of the building.<sup>295</sup> As with reactions to the proclamation, the event was marked by shouts of acclamations and scenes of public celebration. In London the celebrations lasted into the night, and were marked with bonfires, fireworks, bell ringing and the usual drinking to the health of the new king and queen.<sup>296</sup> Similar scenes of celebration were witnessed outside of the capital. Henry, Earl of Clarendon, who did not attend the ceremony and remained at his country residence, recorded "This being the coronation day, the bells rung all day long; and in the evening there were bonfires in the parish."<sup>297</sup> The reports in the popular press of coronation celebrations across England further testify to the public nature of the coronation. Newspapers and printed accounts of the event were freely and cheaply available, ensuring that the messages embodied within the coronation were disseminated throughout the realm. Indeed, the use of the popular press generated a great deal of public interest in such events, a point that the later Stuart monarchs were fully aware of, in William and Mary's case,

---

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.*, pp., pp. 664-665 and 676; Plate LXXI, nos. 3-4; Plate LXXIII, no. 2

<sup>295</sup> *An Account of the Ceremonial at the Coronation of their most Excellent Majesties King William and Queen Mary*, pp. 2-3; Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. I, p. 520; *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. IV, pp. 632-633

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4

<sup>297</sup> *The State Letters of Henry Earl of Clarendon Lord Lieutenant of Ireland during the Reign of K. James the Second and his Lordship's Diary for the Years 1687, 1688, 1689 and 1690* (Oxford, 1762), p. 182

recognising the opportunity this presented to further promulgate the principles that underpinned the construction of the dual monarchy.<sup>298</sup> Burnet's coronation sermon was published, as was the official account of the ceremonial by the order of the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshall of England. And in the week leading up to the coronation, newspapers advertised that the form of the proceeding to the coronation of William and Mary was to be observed, and would be published.<sup>299</sup>

Accounts of popular celebrations at the coronation also to some extent conceal the inherent tensions over the political settlement and pockets of continuing support for exiled James II. This was manifested by several distinctive absences from the coronation. Indeed the diarist John Evelyn noted that:

“Much of the splendor of the proceeding was abated, by the absence of divers who should have made it up: There being but as yet 5 Bish: 4. Judges, (no more at present, it seems as yet sworn) & severall noblemen & greate Ladys wanting.”<sup>300</sup>

Most noticeable of the absentees from the clergy was the Archbishop of Canterbury, hence the involvement of the Bishop of London, Henry Compton, who served on the committee for the coronation and officiated at the ceremony with the Archbishop of York. Following the proclamation of the coronation on 16<sup>th</sup> March several letters were received and warrants issued excusing some members of the nobility from attending the ceremony.<sup>301</sup> In addition to the absentees was a report of a letter written to Mary by her father in a memorandum by Lord Nottingham, in which James stated that whilst he had been willing to excuse what had already been done through a wife's obedience to her husband:

“her being crowned was in her own power; and if she did it, while he and the prince of Wales were living, the curses of an angry father would fall on her, as well as of a God who commanded obedience to parents.”<sup>302</sup>

---

<sup>298</sup> Edie, 'Public Face of Royal Ritual', pp.311-312

<sup>299</sup> *London Gazette*, 4 April 1689, Issue 2442; *London Gazette*, 8 April 1689, Issue 2443

<sup>300</sup> *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. IV, p. 633

<sup>301</sup> *CSP Domestic, William and Mary*, pp.53-55

<sup>302</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Appendix, Book I. p. 15

The situation must have caused considerable embarrassment to the new regime, and although not preventing the formal confirmation of power conferred by the coronation itself, it accorded the printed accounts of the ceremonial, the coronation sermon and the associated celebrations a crucial political significance for the dual monarchs.

Similar to that of William and Mary, Anne's coronation in April 1702 was marked by growing public interest in the occasion, with vast crowds gathering in London to witness the coronation; and accounts of the ceremonial, the associated celebrations, and the coronation sermon, all published in the popular press.<sup>303</sup> Held on 23<sup>rd</sup> April, the contemporary historian and Whig pamphleteer, John Oldmixon, recorded that some viewed the choice of date as a mark of respect to Charles II and James II, both of whom were crowned on this day.<sup>304</sup> The date was also relevant as St George's Day because of its patriotic connotations, which was particularly pertinent given the repeated emphasis on the queen's Englishness in representations of her throughout the reign, and alluded to in her first speech to Parliament following her accession, when she assured both houses that "her heart was intirely English."<sup>305</sup> Anne, like William and Mary, was a parliamentary queen, her title to the crown having been defined by Parliament in the 1689 Bill of Rights and again in the 1701 Act of Settlement. The crucial point of difference however, was that unlike the dual monarchs who faced the critical issue of being crowned whilst James II was still living, Anne was able to draw upon notions of hereditary succession at her coronation as James had died six months prior to her accession. Hence the choice of April 23<sup>rd</sup> whilst emphasising her English blood also served to highlight her royal Stuart blood in a manner that Mary II had been unable to do. As in 1689, there was no formal royal entry on the eve of the coronation, but this does not appear to have diminished the significance of the occasion as the procession from Westminster Hall to the Abbey on the day of the coronation was by all accounts impressive and marked by its magnificence. Both Edie and Bucholz have noted Anne's attachment to and keen observance of ritual and ceremonial, and this is clearly evident.<sup>306</sup> Preceded by a

---

<sup>303</sup> *Post Boy*, 21 April 1702, Issue 1082 comments on the vast numbers of people who have come to the city to see the coronation

<sup>304</sup> John Oldmixon, *History of England During the Reigns of King William, Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I* (London, 1733), p.280

<sup>305</sup> Burnet, Gilbert, *Bishop Burnet's History of his own Time*, Vol. 5 (Edinburgh, 1753), p.79; Strong, *Coronation*, p.309; Further consideration of the relevance of Anne's Englishness and how this played a significant role in the queen's representation is found in Chapter 4, pp.218-219

<sup>306</sup> Edie, 'The Public Face of Royal Ritual'; Robert Bucholz, 'Nothing but Ceremony': Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual', *The Journal of British Studies*, 30, 3 (Jul., 1991), pp.289-291



large procession, including Westminster officials, drums, trumpeters, the choir of Westminster, members of the Privy Chamber, bishops, archbishops, the Lords who bore the coronation regalia, Prince George of Denmark, and numerous members of the nobility, Anne was carried in an open chair, under a canopy of estate held by twelve barons of the Cinque Ports, along a route lined with blue cloth.<sup>307</sup> Despite being an invalid and having to be carried because of her severe gout, Anne's royal appearance made a considerable impression as noted by the traveller, Celia Fiennes, who recorded seeing the queen wearing a mantle of crimson velvet furred with ermine over a richly embroidered gown of gold tissue, with a petticoat of gold and silver lace, with the Order of the Garter about her shoulders, a crimson velvet cap under a circlet of diamonds on her head, and diamonds in her hair, which Fiennes noted "brill'd and flamed" as she moved.<sup>308</sup> Hence Anne's coronation procession and the manner of the queen's appearance provided the watching crowds with a visual affirmation of her queenship, demonstrating that these elements of ceremonial display were as significant to the confirmation of power in 1702 as they had been in 1553, even without the spectacle of the royal entry.

Also still of crucial significance was the actual ritual of coronation itself. Despite the existence of established guidelines for the ceremony such as the *Liber Regalis* and the *Little Device*, the coronation service can be seen to have been subtly reinterpreted over the period to accommodate the various challenges presented by the particular factors of regnant queenship, dual monarchy, and the changing religious preferences of incumbent monarchs. In this context the ritual was underpinned by a critical sense of fluidity in its confirmation of monarchical power. For example, Strong has identified a number of changes in the coronation ceremonies of 1689 and 1702 such as the eradication of a number of ancient prayers, including the blessing of the oil, and a reduction in the number of places where a monarch was anointed; changes that Victorian scholars of the coronation perceived as the "butchering" of the established ritual by the later Stuarts. He argues however that such changes ensured the survival of the coronation, proving it could clearly be adapted to fit the required situation.<sup>309</sup> But although the changes of the later Stuart period may appear more radical, the process of adaptation, as we have already seen, began with the coronation of

---

<sup>307</sup> *London Gazette*, 23 April 1702, Issue 3804; Planche, *Regal Records*, pp.103-108

<sup>308</sup> Celia Fiennes, *The Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, ed., Christopher Morris (London, 1947), p.300

<sup>309</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, pp. 336, 338-339

Mary Tudor, when contemporaries sought to reconcile the unprecedented phenomenon of regnant queenship to the existing ceremonial.

Despite changes in the ceremonial over the period and the emergence of parliamentary monarchy, in 1702 Anne appeared at her coronation dressed in the same manner as Mary Tudor had been in 1553. Wearing royal robes of crimson velvet furred with ermine and a gold circlet on her head, contemporary accounts recorded that Anne's circlet was set with diamonds.<sup>310</sup> In this manner Anne, like Mary I, initially appeared at her coronation as a woman, but was then transformed into a king through the ritual of anointing. Both Mary I and Mary II had been anointed in four places, as kings, but there is conflicting evidence for Anne's anointing. One account notes that she was anointed in three places, on her head, breast and the palms of her hands, whilst Celia Fiennes records that the queen was anointed four times on the palms of her hands, her breast, forehead and temples.<sup>311</sup> One of the changes noted by Strong was a reduction of places where the new monarch was anointed, although he acknowledges that there is some confusion over this point, but as the *Liber Regalis* advocated that a queen consort was to be anointed only twice, we can safely conclude that Anne was anointed very much as a king.<sup>312</sup> Following her anointing Anne was presented with the royal regalia, and in contrast to Mary II, was girt as a king, with both sword and spurs, Fiennes recording the moment that the spurs touched her heel.<sup>313</sup> As such the positioning of the royal regalia at Anne's coronation bore striking similarities to that of Mary Tudor, and this is further evident when, like Mary I, she was presented with both sceptres; one with the cross and one with the dove.<sup>314</sup> Like Mary I, Anne was crowned as sole monarch, making such a manoeuvre suitably fitting to the occasion. But other aspects of Anne's coronation bore a marked similarity to the coronation of William and Mary. Strong has argued that the coronations of 1689 and 1702 transformed the coronation ceremony into an apparatus which legitimised the Revolutionary settlement, binding the post Revolutionary monarchy to the commonwealth and the Protestant church, and effectively becoming "an anti-Catholic

---

<sup>310</sup> Planche, *Regal Records*, pp. 99,107; Fiennes, *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p.300; *London Gazette*, 23 April 1702, issue 3804

<sup>311</sup> Planche, *Regal Records*, p.123; Fiennes, *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p.301

<sup>312</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, p. 338; *Liber Regalis*, p.123

<sup>313</sup> Fiennes, *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 301 ; Planche, *Regal Records*, pp.124-125 ; Abel Boyer, *The History of the reign of Queen Anne*, Vol., I of XI (London, 1703), p.26

<sup>314</sup> Fiennes, *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p.301; Planche, *Regal Records*, p.126 ; Boyer, *History of Queen Anne*, p.26; *London Gazette*, 23 April 1702, Issue 3804

festival.”<sup>315</sup> Much has been made of the maternal imagery employed in Anne’s coronation sermon by John Sharp, Archbishop of York, based on the text of Isaiah 49:23, “Kings shall be thy Nursing Fathers and Queens they Nursing Mothers” that positioned Anne as mother of her realm. But whilst Sharp indeed constructs Anne in this manner, he also highlights the obligations of princes to their subjects, and also to the Church, noting that:

“... Kings and Queens should submit their sceptres to that of Jesus Christ, and become Nursing Fathers and Nursing Mothers to his Church and People.”<sup>316</sup>

His emphasis on the Church continues as he recalls the Reformation, engendered in Henry VIII’s reign and, he asserts, perfected by Elizabeth, before placing Anne as the trustee of the church in England.<sup>317</sup> The same text from Isaiah was also the basis of an anthem sung at William and Mary’s coronation, and in this context was used to place both the dual monarchs and Anne as defenders of the English Protestant church, constituting a clear reflection of the Revolutionary settlement. Likewise, by 1702 the coronation oath had also developed to fit the political and religious needs of the commonwealth, and underpinned by the Act of Settlement that secured the future of Protestant monarchy in England, Anne’s oath denied the Catholic belief in transubstantiation and branded the invocation of the Virgin Mary and the saints idolatrous.<sup>318</sup> Thus Anne’s coronation constituted a continuation of the appropriation of ceremonial to define the post Revolutionary monarchy.

Although marked in many ways by either a continuation or development of elements of previous coronation ceremonies, Anne’s coronation can also be considered as unprecedented as for the first time a married regnant queen was crowned without her husband, George of Denmark being wholly excluded from the ritual. George’s lack of official royal status had been defined in the Act of Settlement hence his participation in the coronation was merely as one of England’s premier noblemen, as Duke of Cumberland, rather than as the queen’s husband. He had a prominent position in the coronation procession and at the coronation service he was first to do homage to the queen. At the coronation banquet he was sat with other members of the nobility until Anne invited him to dine with her, but even then the difference between his status and that of his wife was clearly differentiated; the queen was sat

---

<sup>315</sup> Strong, *Coronation*, p. 339

<sup>316</sup> John Sharp, *The Archbishop of York’s Sermon at the Coronation of Queen Anne* (London, 1702), p.3

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.15-16

<sup>318</sup> Planche, *Regal Records*, p.119

under her canopy with George at her left hand side, excluded from the canopy.<sup>319</sup> The difference between the positioning of the royal couple and that of previous monarchs was noted by contemporaries, Celia Fiennes commenting that William and Mary had sat together under one canopy of estate, whilst Mary of Modena had sat on the left of James II, both under their own individual canopies.<sup>320</sup> But crucially, William and Mary, and James II were all crowned monarchs, and Mary of Modena, a crowned queen consort, whilst George was not. Considering George's exclusion from the coronation ritual Agnes Strickland remarked that:

“It was one of the most singular features of the times, that, contrary to every precedent in British history, the consort of the queen was excluded from all participation in her regal dignity.”<sup>321</sup>

On closer consideration Strickland's comments appear somewhat melodramatic, as Anne was only England's fourth regnant queen. Furthermore, Mary I and Elizabeth I were unmarried women at their coronations, so the only regnant queen to have been crowned with her consort was Mary II, and of course, William was king in his own right, not merely a consort. In 1702 regnant queenship was no longer unprecedented but the coronation of a married regnant queen, whose husband had no title to the crown was distinctly unprecedented and Anne's coronation represented the ritual separation of George's conjugal authority from her queenship.

In the sixteenth century the three regal acts of proclamation, royal entry and coronation combined to confirm the new queen's monarchical authority. By the latter seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the royal entry on the eve of the coronation ceremony no longer occurred and only two regal acts remained to confirm power. Proclamations not only announced the new queen's title to the throne they also defined the nature of that title; whether that was by hereditary blood right or Parliamentary decree, and whilst proclaiming the new queen as soon as possible was a critical response to political and constitutional turmoil, as in the cases of Mary I and Mary II, early proclamations were not uniquely required because of the gender of the new monarch. Public participation was a vital element of the confirmatory process and celebrations formed a key part of both proclamations and

---

<sup>319</sup> Boyer, *History of Queen Anne*, p.26; Fiennes, *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p.303

<sup>320</sup> Fiennes, *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 303

<sup>321</sup> Agnes Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest*, Vol., VI (London, 1889), p.204

coronations with both formal and informal celebrations constituting more than mere acceptance of the new monarch. Despite the lack of a formal royal entry in 1689 and 1702, visual affirmations of queenship remained an important part of the confirmatory process and although lacking the pageantry of Mary Tudor's royal entry, the coronation processions of William and Mary, and Anne provided public spectacle and fuelled a growing public interest in the coronation ceremonial. This spectacle was further re-enforced through the publication of accounts of the ceremonial in the popular press and via the media of coronation medals to commemorate the event. Regnant queenship presented significant challenges to the established coronation ceremonial, particularly at Mary Tudor's coronation when existing guidelines only related to kings and consort queens. Mary's coronation also demonstrated that through subtle reinterpretation of the existing ritual, contemporaries were able to adapt the ceremony to meet the challenges presented by a female ruler. In this context, the coronation ceremony revealed evolutionary characteristics that enabled it to respond to the unprecedented nature of dual monarchy and that of a married regnant queen whose consort was legally and ritually excluded from her queenship, thus ensuring its significance as a crucial part of the confirmatory process across the period.

## 3

# Conjugal versus Political Power

---

“Consider how Unprecedented a thing it is in this Kingdom to see the Husband a Subject to his Wife; and how contrary to Nature’s Custom, and the Apostolical Institutions it is, that the Man who Claims of Right a Superiority, must be in Subjection, if the Woman pleases?”<sup>322</sup>

Echoing the arguments of John Knox almost a century and a half earlier, the anonymous writer of a pamphlet published soon after Anne’s accession in 1702, expressed the view that for a woman to be head of her husband was both unnatural and ungodly. Reinforced through both Biblical teaching and natural law, contemporaries believed that women should be subject to their husbands. Thus a married regnant queen posed a problem for the political nation; for how could an appropriate balance between conjugal and political power be achieved when a woman, through her blood right, was raised to a position above that of her husband? The question of this balance was first brought to the forefront of English politics with the marriage, in July 1554, of Mary I to Phillip of Spain, when contemporaries, already adjusting to the phenomenon of regnant queenship, had to negotiate the unprecedented situation of having a male consort on the throne of England. Whilst both Mary II and Anne were already married when they ascended the throne, Mary Tudor ascended the throne as a single woman, and it was expected that she would marry. Given sixteenth century beliefs about women, a husband would constrain her weaker, irrational nature, guide her with the burden of government, and provide her with an heir. And in many ways, by 1702, the queen’s husband was believed to play a similar role, supporting his wife, and crucially, in the attempt to secure the Protestant succession, providing male heirs. But marriage for a regnant queen raised important questions about the nature of her authority, and for Mary I generated considerable anxieties around the prospect of England being dominated by a foreign power. Questions of monarchical authority within the context of conjugality were also central to the

---

<sup>322</sup> Anon., *A letter to a member of Parliament, in reference to His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark* (London, 1702)

decision in 1689 to create England's first dual monarchy, of William and Mary, with the administrative authority vested solely in William. This made Mary II an ambiguity, as a regnant queen without monarchical authority, a situation that was to cause problems when it became necessary for her to act as regent in 1690.

This chapter will consider the balance between conjugal and political power through an examination of the various legislative and representational strategies used to address the issues raised by married regnant queenship. Prior to Mary Tudor's marriage Parliament passed an act for the Queen's Regal Power that defined her position and authority as queen. Combined with a comprehensive list of articles within the marriage treaty, this was an initial attempt to address the issues raised when a regnant queen, conforming with contemporary expectations, placed herself under the headship of a husband. Although both Mary II and Anne were already married the need for legal and political definitions of power was still extant; with the Bill of Rights in 1689, and again in 1690 when the Regency Bill was deemed necessary to enable Mary II to govern in William's absence, but without having any detrimental effect to his position as male monarch. Likewise, the Bill of Rights, and the 1701 Act of Settlement also defined Anne's power, though made no provision for that of her husband, George of Denmark. This lack of legislative definition of George's position has proved problematic when trying to assess his participation in Anne's queenship. His informal role combined with his lack of political ambition has resulted in his portrayal as insignificant, and his role in Anne's queenship being overlooked by historians until recently. Indeed, Charles Beem, in his recent and very interesting work on George, considers George's supposed insignificance to be "highly significant" for Anne's queenship, and for the evolution of female rule, developing his argument that such evolution actually "disposed of the male counterpart completely."<sup>323</sup> A reappraisal of the sources offers a different interpretation that places George of Denmark, as Anne's "male counterpart", as very much a vital element of her queenship. Symbolic and ceremonial representations of Philip and Mary both reinforced and contradicted the legislative definitions of queenship providing mixed messages about the balance between conjugal and political power, and this was particularly evident in the ceremonial positioning at their wedding and the interpretations of their authority in the pageantry of the royal entry. In addition, the balance of power was also expressed in illustrations on coins and medals; for Philip and Mary, and particularly so on

---

<sup>323</sup> Beem, *The Lioness Roared*, pp. 101-102, 137

those struck during Mary II's regencies, which were the only opportunity she had to legally govern the country and exercise monarchical power. Poems, pamphlets and sermons provide another media for analysing the representation of authority, that include the reinforcing of traditional gendered messages around Mary Tudor's marriage, representation of Mary II as a capable but temporary governor eclipsed by her husband's masculine authority, and the portrayal of George of Denmark as an essential element in enabling Anne's role as governor.

Two further key areas for married queens are also considered in this chapter. Firstly, the critical question of whether the queen's husband should be crowned. Marriage to Mary Tudor made Philip a king in name, but George of Denmark did not achieve that regal style, either officially or otherwise. A crown could have significantly altered the balance of power between the queens and their consorts, confirming in Philip's case his title as king, and for both men significantly increasing their authority. Although Philip and George were never to be crowned kings of England, there were both expectations and some support for their coronations. But there were extensive anxieties, particularly in the case of Philip, of the potential consequences of such a ceremonial manoeuvre. The chapter will consider the reasons why Philip and George were not crowned, and the impact this had upon the delicate balance of power between queen and consort. Finally, the issue of failed maternity will be explored. A crucial element of married regnant queenship was the provision of an heir; a healthy and preferably male child, or indeed children, to ensure both dynastic and religious continuity. Neither Mary Tudor nor Mary II bore any children, and, although Anne may have proved her fecundity with seventeen pregnancies, she ascended the throne, and died, childless.

## **Part 1 – Gender and Legal Constructs of Authority: In Theory and in Practice**

The Parliament of April 1554 produced two pieces of legislation that were essentially gendered in their formulation; it ratified the marriage treaty between Philip and Mary, and passed the act for the Queen's Regal Power. The marriage treaty sought to impose limits on Philip's authority in England whilst the act for the Queen's Regal Power defined Mary's authority as equal to that of kings of England in that:



“by force and virtue of the same regal power dignity honour authority prerogative pre-eminence and jurisdictions doth appertain, and of right ought to appertain and belong unto her highness, as to the sovereign supreme Governor and Queen of this realm and the dominions thereof, in as full large and ample manner as it hath done heretofore to any other her most noble progenitors, Kings of this realm.”<sup>324</sup>

The purpose of this act has been the subject of some debate amongst historians, but crucially it defined the nature of Mary’s authority as it sought to address some of the ambiguities posed by the accession of a regnant queen. The account of the lawyer, William Fleetwood, written during Elizabeth’s reign, states that the act was a response by the chancellor, Stephen Gardiner, to an anonymous tract which alleged that as Mary was female she was not bound by the existing law and could therefore act as a ‘conqueror’ to establish any policy that she wished.<sup>325</sup> If this was indeed the case, it was deemed necessary to constrain her power by defining her authority to be the same as that of a king. Hence, as Anna Whitelock points out, this legislation essentially clarified Mary’s authority by placing her under the same statute law as her male predecessors.<sup>326</sup> But if the act was solely to address the ambiguities of a regnant queen’s power, one has to question, as Jennifer Loach has done, why it was not put before the first Parliament of Mary’s reign in October 1553.<sup>327</sup> It is vital therefore to consider this act within the wider context of Mary’s marriage as it would appear that it only become necessary to legally define the queen’s authority once the prospect of her marrying became a reality. Indeed, as David Loades argues, the act was directly related to the marriage treaty as a result of doubts about Mary’s status upon her marriage.<sup>328</sup> Hence, being passed following the suppression of a rebellion triggered by anxieties over the proposed Spanish marriage and at the same time as the ratification of the marriage treaty, the act must be seen as an attempt

---

<sup>324</sup> An act declaring that the regal power of this realm is in the Queen’s Majesty as fully and absolutely as it ever was in any of her most noble progenitors Kings of this realm’, in C.H. Williams ed. *English Historical Documents, V. 1585-1558* (London, 1967), pp.463-464

<sup>325</sup> J.D. Alsop, ‘The Act for the Queen’s Regal Power, 1554’ *Parliamentary History*, 13, 3 (1994), pp. 261, 267; Dennis Moore, ‘Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor Queenship Controversy’, in C. Levin and J. Watson eds., *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Detroit, 1987), pp. 244-245; William Huse Dunham Jr., ‘Regal Power and the Rule of Law: A Tudor Paradox’, *Journal of British Studies*, 3, 2 (1964), pp.45-46; An analysis of Fleetwood’s *Itinerarium ad Windsor* along with an annotated version of the text is provided in Charles Beem and Dennis Moore eds., *The Name of a Queen: William Fleetwood’s Itinerarium ad Windsor* (Basingstoke, 2013)

<sup>326</sup> Whitelock, *Mary Tudor: England’s First Queen*, p. 228

<sup>327</sup> Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. 97

<sup>328</sup> Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, p. 218

to address the anxieties generated by the marriage of a female ruler, and in particular, her marriage to a foreign prince.<sup>329</sup>

Fears of England becoming dominated by a foreign power were at the forefront of English politics at Mary's accession, as seen in Chapter One with the attempt to exclude both Mary and Elizabeth from the succession in favour of Jane Grey.<sup>330</sup> Indeed, only three months after her accession, the imperial ambassador, Renard, pointed out to Mary that some of her subjects would be against a foreign match because of the English tendency to xenophobia, and also cited the same anxieties that were expressed in the *Letters Patent* at the end of Edward's reign; namely that a foreign prince would want to change English laws and customs, and alter the administration of the kingdom. Furthermore he pointed out her councillors would fear that such a match would allow foreigners into the government of the realm.<sup>331</sup> In November 1553 Parliament had petitioned Mary to marry from within the realm, and Renard reported to the Emperor that several key nobles had pleaded with Mary to choose an Englishman for a husband because they feared a foreign husband would utilise English money and artillery to further his own purpose, and that he would seek to take the crown for himself should the couple have a child.<sup>332</sup> Fears of foreign domination were not a new phenomenon. In 1515, the French political theorist, Claude de Seyssel, extolled the virtues of the Salic law in France which prevented the succession of a woman to the French crown. De Seyssel asserted that this law was:

“... excellent, for by falling into the feminine line it can come into the power of a foreigner, a pernicious and dangerous thing, since a ruler from a foreign nation is of a different rearing and condition, of different customs, different language, and a different way of life from the men of the lands he comes to rule.”<sup>333</sup>

Such concerns had indeed underpinned Henry VIII's dynastic policy and his desperate longing for a male heir to succeed him. That such a scenario was certainly a very real concern can be found in the French king's reaction to the news that Mary planned to marry Philip.

---

<sup>329</sup> Wyatt's Rebellion of January/ February 1554

<sup>330</sup> One of the reasons given in the *Letters Patent* that sought to exclude Mary and Elizabeth from the crown was that as they may marry a foreign prince which would result in England's domination by a foreign power

<sup>331</sup> *CSP Spanish, Vol. XI*, p. 300; *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 93

<sup>332</sup> *CSP Spanish, Vol. XI*, pp. 363-364

<sup>333</sup> De Seyssel, *The Monarchy of France*, p. 48

Articulating his concerns that Mary should consider such an alliance with France's enemies, Henri II, expressing contemporary beliefs of authority within marriage, made clear to the English ambassador, Nicholas Wotton, whom he thought would be governing England once Philip and Mary were married, as "he knew marital authority to be very strong with ladies." And it is within this context that he foresaw Philip as ultimately taking control of the English government as he continued:

"Neither the Council nor the Queen would be able to withstand the authority that the Prince of Spain would acquire by the marriage, for he would change the council, win over the Queen to his own views and do what he liked. If Wotton had ever been married, or understood what marriage could do with a woman....."<sup>334</sup>

Further evidence that the act for the Queen's Regal Power was directly related to anxieties that Philip's conjugal authority would eclipse Mary's sovereign authority is provided by Bishop Gilbert Burnet, who, writing in the later seventeenth century, asserted that the purpose of the act was essentially to prevent Philip from exploiting Mary's power. Referring to William Fleetwood's account of a plot centred on the ambiguity of Mary's authority, he also attributed the legislation to Gardiner, but on the grounds that once married to Philip, the Spaniards could influence Mary and exploit her power for their own devices. To reinforce his argument Burnet cited the example of Henry VII using his wife, Elizabeth of York's, claim to the throne to take the government of England into his own hands; hence Gardiner's fear that in a similar manner the Spanish, namely Philip, could claim power by effectively utilising the "Authority which Marriage gives the Husband over the Wife."<sup>335</sup> It was these anxieties, combined with fears of the reinstatement of Catholicism that would almost certainly occur if Mary married the Catholic Philip, that resulted in Wyatt's Rebellion during January and February of 1554; the aim of which was to depose Mary, and replace her with Elizabeth who would be married to Edward Courtenay, son of the marquis of Exeter, and recently created Earl of Devon.<sup>336</sup> Although eventually unsuccessful, Wyatt's Rebellion is significant, not only because of the threat it posed to Mary's regime, but also as a further expression of the anxieties caused by the prospect of the queen's marriage to a foreigner.

---

<sup>334</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp. 467-468

<sup>335</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1683), pp. 277-279

<sup>336</sup> Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions* (Abingdon, 2014), pp.92-101; Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 211-215; Richards, Judith, *Mary Tudor* (Abingdon, 2008), pp.149-153; Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 212-218

Shortly after her accession there had been rumours that Mary would marry Edward Courtenay. Certainly as an Englishman and as a great grandson of Edward IV with royal blood in his veins, Courtenay would have been preferable for those who feared the potential consequences of a marriage with a foreign prince, but there is no evidence that Mary seriously considered him as a potential husband. In seeking to diffuse fears of a foreign match, and to promote Habsburg interests, Renard considered three potential consequences of Mary marrying Courtenay that had been brought to his attention. Firstly, if Mary and Courtenay had no children, Courtenay would attempt to make himself king; secondly, if they were to have children he would seize control of the government during any minority, not merely as protector, but as king; and finally, because of his undesirable nature he would dismiss all Mary's councillors and servants and replace them with those of his choice.<sup>337</sup> It was certainly within imperial interests to ensure that Courtenay was ruled out as a potential candidate for Mary's hand, if indeed he ever was a serious possibility, which is questionable. Paradoxically though, the points referred to by Renard would also apply to Philip, as the ambassador's arguments were underpinned by the authority of a husband over his wife, and would have been valid whoever the queen chose to marry. Clearly though, there was the belief that Mary's husband, whether English or foreign, would have the potential to achieve political influence, and even monarchical authority through the medium of conjugal power. Thus the act for the Queen's Regal Power sought to reinforce Mary's position prior to her marriage and act as a buffer to the perceived political intervention that her husband would inevitably have. It defined the office of queen, legislating that Mary's authority as regnant queen was equal to that of a king, which as Constance Jordan has asserted effectively transformed the political arena into one in which Mary's gender was not a barrier as her body politic was defined as male.<sup>338</sup>

If the legislation is considered within the context of the medieval theory of the king's two bodies, by defining Mary's body politic as male, as queen and governor she was not therefore subject to the authority of a husband. However, her body natural, her gendered body,

---

<sup>337</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp.323-324; Courtenay was described as being "proud, poor, obstinate, inexperienced, and vindictive in the extreme."

<sup>338</sup> Constance Jordan, 'Woman's Rule in Sixteenth Century British Political Thought', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40, 3 (1978), p.428

remained female, so would still be subject to a husband's authority.<sup>339</sup> This is a point taken up by the Protestant writer, John Aylmer, who, when faced with the same problem in Elizabeth's reign, argued in his *An Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subjects* that:

“God hath apoynted her to be subject to her husband ....., therefore she maye not be the heade, I graunte that, so farre as pertaineth to the bandes of marriage, and the office of a wife, she must be a subjecte: but as a Magistrate she may be her husbands head, For the Scripture saithe not.”

Thus Aylmer differentiated between conjugal and political power in the case of a regnant queen and sought to reconcile the tensions between the two distinct elements of authority. Significantly though, he also warned of the dangers of blurring these distinctions, and in a veiled reference to Mary, pointed to the consequences for the realm of a married queen prioritising her conjugal duty over her political duty and becoming “an euel head to the country.”<sup>340</sup> Writing during the reign of a Protestant queen, such criticism of the previous Catholic regime is hardly surprising, but crucially, the potential for a married regnant queen to blur conjugal and political authority still remained. Mary was fully aware of the possible tensions between her conjugal and political duties once she was married. Indeed, shortly after the prospect of marriage had first been raised she had expressed her thoughts on this balance to Renard. She would, she stressed, follow God's commandment and love and obey her husband, but she would not allow him to “encroach in the government of the kingdom”, or to fill offices with foreigners, as she knew the country would not tolerate such “interference”.<sup>341</sup>

Working in conjunction with the act for the Queen's Regal Power and aimed at preventing such “interference” by the queen's husband was the marriage treaty, which was ratified following lengthy negotiations and enshrined in English law to protect Mary's monarchical authority and negate the possibility of domination by a foreign power. So crucial was this treaty in addressing the anxieties caused by her proposed marriage to Philip, that in January 1554 Mary had written to the counties advising them that a treaty was being concluded that contained “covenants for the preservation of the laws and surety of our realm,” and that the

---

<sup>339</sup> E.H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1979), p.7

<sup>340</sup> John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subjectes, against the late blowne Blaste, concerning the Government of Wemen wherin be confuted all such reasons as a straunger of late made in that behalf, with a brief exhortation to Obedience* (1559), sig.C4v; sig.G.3

<sup>341</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XI, pp. 289-290

articles of this treaty would be published and distributed in all parts of the country.<sup>342</sup> Such an attempt to reassure was deemed necessary as by early January details of the conspiracy that was to lead to Wyatt's Rebellion had leaked out.<sup>343</sup> Indeed one of the regime's key strategies in diffusing the Rebellion was Mary's steadfast reassurance to her subjects, and this was clearly evident when at the height of the Rebellion she publicly addressed Londoners at the Guildhall assuring them that she would rather remain a virgin and only chose to marry for the benefit of the realm and in the hope of providing an heir. She asserted that she would not marry without the consent of the Council, nor would her marriage be "to the empeachment of any part or parcel of the royall state of this Realme of England."<sup>344</sup> Hence the terms of the treaty were underpinned by the need to protect the realm and thus sought to restrict Philip's influence. For instance, the treaty stipulated that he was to have no involvement in the disposition of offices, lands and revenues, which would remain solely in Mary's control, nor was he to promote or place any foreigners in English positions of office. He was prohibited from making changes to English laws and customs, and from taking Mary, or any children of the marriage, out of the kingdom unless sanctioned to do so. And in addition to outlining the succession of any heirs, if there were no children and Mary were to die before him, he would have no right to challenge the succession of the next in line to the throne. Furthermore, it was stipulated that as a result of the marriage England was not to be drawn into the Habsburg war with France.<sup>345</sup> Considering these terms, Constance Jordan has argued that the treaty effectively created a "ceremonial space" in which Philip could operate whilst the actual government of the realm was left to Mary and her councillors.<sup>346</sup> This would initially appear to be the case. However, a further examination of the ambiguities within the treaty and how it actually worked in practice leads us to question whether the situation was quite so firmly established.

Legal constructs of authority could however prove rather less fixed when actually put into practice. Indeed, Glyn Redworth has successfully argued that the legislative attempts to restrict Philip's authority in England were a failure as he was able to exercise political

---

<sup>342</sup> *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, p. 17

<sup>343</sup> Fletcher and MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, p.93

<sup>344</sup> Foxe, *Acts and Monuments [...]* (1576 edition), [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield). Available from: <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>. [Accessed: 23.07.08]

<sup>345</sup> *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. 2, pp.21-26 : *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, pp. 13-14,

<sup>346</sup> Jordan, 'Woman's Rule in Sixteenth Century Political Thought', p. 427

influence when it suited him to do so.<sup>347</sup> Two key contributory factors enabled this; firstly an underlying preference for male government, and secondly ambiguities in the marriage treaty itself as it failed to fully define Philip's role in England. For example, it constructed him, certainly in name, as a king of England rather than a consort, specifying that for the duration of the marriage he would enjoy, "jointly together" "the style, honor, and kingly name of the realms and dominions" of his wife. Hence following the marriage the couple's regnal styles were announced as:

"Philip and Mary by the grace of God King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; Defenders of the Faith; Princes of Spain and Sicily; Archdukes of Austria; Dukes of Milan, Burgundy and Brabant; Counts of Hapsburg, Flanders and Tyrol."<sup>348</sup>

Contemporary accounts also acknowledged Philip's new status, as upon his marriage to Mary they cease to refer to him as Prince of Spain, and instead refer to him as king. Clearly the treaty did not envisage Philip as being a king with sovereign power, but marriage to Mary made him king, legally and in the eyes of contemporaries. Furthermore, the treaty allowed for Philip to have some influence as it specified that he would assist Mary with the government of the realm, although it failed to define the nature of this assistance. In effect this provided Philip with a window of opportunity to have far more influence than the 'ceremonial space' that Constance Jordan referred to.

Philip certainly took an active interest in the government of England and this is demonstrated by the amount of correspondence between him, the Privy Council, and other English officials during his time as king. When in England, he regularly attended Privy Council meetings, and despite his poor command of the English language was informed of administrative issues as the Privy Council had decreed that such matters be recorded in Latin or Spanish for him to consult.<sup>349</sup> In addition to this, he created the Select Council, whose purpose was to keep him fully informed of English affairs during his absences abroad. Redworth has speculated on whether Philip's motives for creating the Select Council prior to his leaving England in

---

<sup>347</sup> Glyn Redworth, ' "Matters Impertinent to Women": Male and Female Monarchy under Philip and Mary', in *English Historical Review*, 112, 447 (1997), p.611

<sup>348</sup> *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol.2, pp.45-46

<sup>349</sup> Redworth, 'Matters Impertinent to Women', pp. 600-601

August 1555 were political, as given contemporary medical beliefs about women's susceptibility to hysterical illnesses during the absence of a husband this may have provided him with an opportunity to further his influence.<sup>350</sup> This may have been the case, but it is crucial not to overstress the importance of the Select Council as it does not appear to have been an independent administrative body; rather as Dale Hoak argues it was little more than an "ad hoc committee of the Privy Council" which was only viewed by the Spanish as a separate body.<sup>351</sup> However, the fact remains that whilst absent from England Philip had a vehicle through which to communicate directly with Mary's councillors which enabled him to keep up to date with the affairs of the Marian government and provided him with an opportunity for influence. Furthermore as Philip was only in England for just over a year following the marriage in July 1554, and then only for five months in 1557, a formal medium of communication with the English government was crucial to his position and potential influence. It would appear that Philip believed he had a vital role in governing the realm and did not consider that his absence from England should necessarily diminish this. Indeed he positioned himself as an intrinsic element of Mary's queenship. For example, in a letter to Parliament in October 1555, excusing his absence he pointing out:

"..... that although the Queen, who represented their joint authority, would act in his stead, yet he would have greatly wished to be himself likewise on the spot, but if personally at a distance, he was more than present with them mentally, retaining the same thought, wheresoever he might be, for the interests of England, for their protection and maintenance...."<sup>352</sup>

Hence Philip placed himself as the politically dominant partner within the marriage, with Mary as merely a representative of their authority in his absence. Furthermore he sought to reassure Parliament that as their king his role was to protect the nation's interests, thus placing himself, and not Mary, in a politically active role. But Philip had taken an active role before he left England, which became apparent shortly after the marriage. In September 1554 Cardinal Pole had written to Philip concerning the restoration of England to Rome. Although it was well known that Mary was anxious to achieve this, it is to Philip whom Pole reached out, complaining that:

---

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.602-603

<sup>351</sup> Dale Hoak, 'Two Revolutions in Tudor Government: the Formation and Organization of Mary I's Privy Council', in Christopher Coleman and David Starkey eds., *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration* (Oxford, 1986), pp.108-109

<sup>352</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), p.228



“A year has passed since I began to knock at the door of this royal house, and none has been opened to me.”<sup>353</sup>

Clearly frustrated by delays Pole evidently viewed Philip as being able to achieve what Mary by herself had not yet been able to do. As Mary’s husband, Philip had the authority to ‘open the door’ to Pole, and crucially, to Rome, which as we have seen was a contributory element in Wyatt’s rebellion. Likewise, in his speech to Parliament in November of that year Pole publicly cited Philip’s ability to bring this about. Praising Mary and alluding to her Godly queenship he compared her to the Virgin, but it was Philip with his kingly qualities of “might, armour, and force” who would enable the change in religious policy, as Pole continued, comparing Philip to Solomon who completed the work began by his father, David.<sup>354</sup>

The view of Philip as the more able governor was perpetuated throughout the reign, as Philip’s political and military experience, combined with his gender were perceived by contemporaries as the preferred qualities for an early modern ruler. Furthermore the perception of Philip as more politically active was given credence by Mary herself. For example, she reinforced Pole’s sentiments by crediting the successful return of England to the Catholic Church to Philip, stating that “this success was largely obtained thanks to the wise guidance of my said Lord.”<sup>355</sup> Furthermore, and confirming contemporary notions about male and female government, Mary openly admitted that the realm benefited from Philip’s government. In a letter to the Emperor in September 1556, lamenting Philip’s absence and begging for his return, she wrote:

“I assure your Majesty that I am not moved by my personal desire for his presence, although I confess I do unspeakably long to have here, but by my care for this kingdom. Unless he comes to remedy matters, not I only but also wiser

---

<sup>353</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.53

<sup>354</sup> John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (1570 edition) (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed:30.10.2011] ; A brief assessment of Philip’s role in reconciling England with the papacy is provided by David Loades in ‘Philip II and the Government of England’, in Cross, C. Loades, D and Scarisbrick, J.J. eds., *Law and Government Under the Tudors. Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton Regis Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge on the Occasion of his Retirement* (Cambridge, 1988), pp.188-189

<sup>355</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p. 117

persons than I fear that a great danger will ensue for the lack of a firm hand, and indeed we see it before our eyes.”<sup>356</sup>

In citing him as an essential element of her queenship the implication is that without him she felt unable to govern effectively. As a woman she may have struggled to manage the group of men that comprised her somewhat unwieldy Council, hence the perceived need for a firm, and crucially, male hand to take control. This was certainly what the queen implied in November 1556 when she had wrote to Philip requesting that he return to England as he was needed:

“.... to provide against so many evils which might easily befall that kingdom, owing to the diversity of opinion of the Lords of the Council and other principal personages.”<sup>357</sup>

As stipulated in the terms of the marriage treaty Mary needed Philip’s assistance with her task of governing the realm so Philip was an essential element of Mary’s queenship. Furthermore, by placing herself under the headship of a husband she needed to present herself as a loving and dutiful wife, deferring to her husband’s superior abilities. But it is also evident that Philip’s presence was required in England by others, as she referred to “wiser persons” in her letter to the Emperor in September. And in March 1556 the Venetian ambassador reported that Mary had sent an envoy, Sir John Mason, to Philip to discuss his return to England. Mason had pressed Philip on this issue not just “to comfort the Queen” with his presence, but “also the peers of the realm,” and in a reference to Mary’s fecundity adding that there was still hope of producing an heir.<sup>358</sup> Philip’s presence in England was required by the English political nation, not only for a perceived need for strong male government, but also, to provide the nation with an heir.

Other indications of the preference for Philip’s authority had been evident from much earlier in the reign. Only a month after the wedding Philip’s confidant, Ruy Gomez de Silva, reported that two factions had appeared, one for the queen, the other for the king.<sup>359</sup> And in

---

<sup>356</sup> *Ibid.*, p.276

<sup>357</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol., VI (II), p.806

<sup>358</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol., VI (I), p.376

<sup>359</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.35; Loades refers to a “king’s party” within Mary’s council in Loades, ‘Philip II and the Government of England’, p.184

November 1554 Lord Paget expressed the opinion that given “the Queen’s gentle character and inexperience in governing” the realm would be better governed if “the King should take over the task himself” with the assistance of the Council. And even touching on English xenophobia, Paget didn’t necessarily see this as an insurmountable obstacle as he felt this was more amongst the people than the nobility, feeling certain that goodwill on both sides would make such an outcome achievable.<sup>360</sup> Crucially, Paget’s view was expressed during Mary’s pregnancy and around the time that the issue of a regency was being debated. Given the dangers posed by childbirth for early modern women, and England’s recent experience of the rule of a minor king, Edward VI, it made sound political sense for arrangements to be put in place for a regency should Mary die in childbirth. It also presented an opportunity for Philip to obtain greater authority in England. The matter was debated at the Parliament of November 1554 alongside modifications to the treason laws that, accommodating the anomaly of a male consort, would extend to Philip the same protection offered to a female consort under existing legislation. And a bill was eventually passed in January 1555 confirming that if Mary died Philip would have the guardianship of their child; of a daughter until she was fifteen, and of a son until he was eighteen. Furthermore, during that period of guardianship he would also be invested with the administration of the kingdom, although he would still be bound by the terms of the marriage treaty.<sup>361</sup> This bill is significant not only for its confirmation of Philip’s status upon Mary’s death, but also because it also raised questions over the extent of Philip’s authority. The length of time taken for the bill to be passed, and that modifications were deemed necessary to its original form, are testimony to the problematic nature of any questions around Philip’s authority in England. Reporting the bill’s slow progress through Parliament in December, Renard informed the Emperor that the lower house had rejected the original draft as they suspected that the bill had been devised with the intention of overturning the terms of the marriage treaty, although clearly these concerns were not universal as he reports that some members proposed that in the event of the queen’s death without issue, Philip should “remain absolute sovereign for life.”<sup>362</sup> As with Paget’s opinion as to who was best placed to govern the realm, clearly for some, a male monarch, even if he was a foreign Catholic, was preferable to the rule of an unmarried woman, namely the queen’s sister, Elizabeth, who, according to the terms of Henry VIII’s will, would succeed to the crown if Mary died childless.

---

<sup>360</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.88-89

<sup>361</sup> *CSP Domestic, Mary I*, p.75

<sup>362</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.125

The divisions that emerged during the debate over the regency were symptomatic of the tensions between conjugal and political power that existed following Mary's marriage. In many ways Mary appeared to conform to traditionally accepted gender roles, deferring to her husband's perceived superior authority and accepting his guidance in matters of government. Other evidence however, points to Mary continuing to exercise her monarchical authority as an autonomous queen. It was clear that Mary was unhappy at Philip's extended absence, as her numerous letters requesting his return testify, but she was kept "occupied with public business" throughout his absence.<sup>363</sup> And although suffering from ill health, Cardinal Pole affirmed that this did not prevent her from "transacting business" at a particularly difficult time following the death of the Chancellor, Stephen Gardiner, in November 1555.<sup>364</sup> Such an opinion of Mary confirms the Venetian ambassador's description in 1554 of the hard working queen, who "transacts business incessantly, until after midnight."<sup>365</sup> Mary may well have struggled with certain issues during Philip's absence, but she continued to govern without him as she had little other option. Recognising his greater political experience she sought his advice on matters when she deemed it sensible to do so. For example, as part of ongoing trade problems throughout the reign between English and Hanseatic merchants, in 1558 she consulted him over relations with the Hanseatic towns, sending a copy of a letter sent to her by the duke of Schleswig-Holstein, and asking whether Philip thought she should accept the duke's proposal concerning English merchants.<sup>366</sup> Philip may have been able to influence Mary over some decisions, but the appointment of officers remained solely in her control, as stipulated by the marriage treaty. Following Gardiner's death Mary had initially referred the matter of the vacant chancellorship to Philip, whose favoured candidate for the position was acknowledged to be Paget.<sup>367</sup> But despite Philip's attempts to influence the appointment and his push for Paget to be created Chancellor, Mary appointed her preferred candidate the archbishop of York, Nicholas Heath, to the post, whilst Paget was created lord privy seal.<sup>368</sup> Evidently the balance between conjugal and political power that existed between Philip and Mary was fluid rather than static, its fluidity a response to changes in the political and

---

<sup>363</sup> *CSP, Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), p.176

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256

<sup>365</sup> *CSP, Venetian*, Vol. V, p.532

<sup>366</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp.358-363; Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp.297, 322

<sup>367</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), pp.257, 300

<sup>368</sup> Loades, 'Philip II and the Government of England', p. 183; Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 259-260; Redworth, 'Matters Impertinent to Women', pp. 605-606

religious environment over the course of the reign. Conflicting reports of Philip's authority in England are testimony to how crucial this balance of power was to contemporaries. In his 1557 report the former Venetian Ambassador, Giovanni Michiel, placed great emphasis on Philip's authority, recording how he is treated as king,

“.. for in all the affairs of that kingdom (either public or private) of any importance, they gave him such share of all of them, submitting to him what they would were he their native English King.”

But despite this, he continues, Philip always referred matters to the queen and the Council. In behaving in this way, and necessarily being seen to abide by the terms of the marriage treaty, Philip had, Michiel concluded, “won the whole court, especially the chief nobility.”<sup>369</sup> In this context Philip was essentially ‘playing the game’ and as such was consequently able to negotiate the tensions between conjugal and political power, exercising his influence when required whilst operating within the confines of the marriage treaty.

In addition to his capacity for political influence and his role assisting Mary with the government of the realm, Philip provided an essential masculine element to Mary's queenship in other ways. Firstly he took on a leading role organising and participating in a series of tournaments at court during 1554 and 1555. These events went beyond mere entertainment. They were meaningful demonstrations of military competence and masculine agility that enabled Philip, as a knight of the Garter, to fulfil an important chivalric role, and to display his own royal prowess.<sup>370</sup> Of particular note is the Spanish juego de canas, or cane play, introduced to the court by Philip and his Spanish retinue.<sup>371</sup> According to contemporary accounts this was an impressive visual and auditory display, with both Spanish and English nobles taking part, and participants dressed in riding outfits of various colours, with canes in their hands and bearing embroidered banners, accompanied by trumpets and drums.<sup>372</sup> As a typically masculine display of martial ability, a leading role in these tournaments was suitably fitting for Philip as a male consort, and it is noteworthy that whilst tournaments and jousts had been a prominent feature during her father's reign, such events were not held at Mary's court until Philip's arrival. In one respect, they gave him the vital “ceremonial space” referred

---

<sup>369</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (II), pp. 1060-1065

<sup>370</sup> Edwards, *Mary I*, pp. 210-211; Duncan, *Mary I*, pp. 104-105; Sarah Duncan, “He to Be Intituled King”: King Philip and the Anglo-Spanish Court’, in Charles Beem and Miles Taylor eds., *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (Basingstoke, 2014), p. 64

<sup>371</sup> Similar to a joust, this was undertaken on horseback, using canes rather than lances.

<sup>372</sup> Edwards, *Mary I*, p.211; Duncan, “He to Be Intituled King”, p.65; Kelsey, *Philip of Spain*, pp.105-106

to by Constance Jordan, but on a more practical level, they also served as a method by which Philip could form crucial affinities with the English nobility in a manner that Mary, because of her gender, was unable to do.

Also of key significance whilst he was Mary's consort is Philip's role as a military commander. Indeed, military matters, and particularly the war with France from June 1557 highlight "the strengths and weaknesses of male and female monarchy."<sup>373</sup> Underpinned by the dominant model of gender, women were regarded as lacking the qualities required to lead an army into battle, hence Mary's gender meant that she could not play a role deemed essential to Renaissance kingship.<sup>374</sup> Mary may have mustered her troops during the succession crisis of 1553, but leading an army into battle was an exclusively masculine entitlement. In this context, Glynn Redworth has argued that warfare could diminish a female ruler's authority because she would by consequence of her gender have to surrender command in the field of battle.<sup>375</sup> The presence of a male consort could help finesse the contradiction between female monarchy and warfare. It was not such a pertinent issue in 1689, because of the definition of authority within the dual monarchy, but the contradiction resurfaced in the early eighteenth century, as Anne delegated military command to experienced generals such as Marlborough and Rook because her consort was no longer physically capable of military activity. Evidence of women's exclusion from this traditionally masculine sphere can be seen in the reaction of the French king, Henri II, to Mary's declaration of war. Firstly he failed to grant the English herald who was to deliver the declaration access to his presence for two days. Secondly, before a large gathering of the French court, he effectively ridiculed Mary's involvement in military matters, accusing her of picking an unfair "quarrel" with him and refusing to let the herald deliver the full declaration, adding that he acted in this manner "because the Queen is a woman."<sup>376</sup> But as warfare proved problematic for the queen, it provided crucial opportunities for Philip, as once again he fulfilled a role that his wife was unable to perform. Similar to the scope for forming affinities with the English nobility at tournaments, the declaration of war against France was, as Redworth states, an opportunity for "'male bonding' par excellence", with Philip leading an English army in active service that united a significant section of the political nation.<sup>377</sup>

---

<sup>373</sup> Redworth, ' "Matters Impertinent to Women" ', p. 611

<sup>374</sup> See Chapter One, p.28

<sup>375</sup> Redworth, ' "Matters Impertinent to Women" ', p.611

<sup>376</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp.295-296

<sup>377</sup> Redworth, ' "Matters Impertinent to Women" ', p.611

Warfare also provided opportunities both for royal patronage and for the nobility to demonstrate their loyalty to the regime. The notion of uniting against a common enemy is a powerful one, and with some enthusiasm, considerable numbers rallied to the call for troops, with a force of up to 10,000 men placed under the command of the earl of Pembroke.<sup>378</sup> The war with France gave Philip the scope to enhance his authority, both through military achievements, such as the victory at Saint Quentin in August 1557, and also politically. Loades has argued that the large force placed under the command of the earl of Pembroke had greater value to Philip politically than militarily, as it was a symbol of his authority in England.<sup>379</sup> This point was recognised by the Venetian ambassador, who, speculating on the size of Philip's army during the preparations for war, remarked how this could enhance Philip's standing.<sup>380</sup> Although the war with France was ultimately to lead to the loss of Calais in 1558, Philip's role as a military commander, combined with his political ability and gender clearly exhibited the preferred qualities for an early modern ruler.

In contrast to the mid sixteenth century, the political and religious situation in England was such that in 1689 the English political nation offered the crown of England and sole monarchical authority to a foreign, Protestant prince, William of Orange. By the latter part of the seventeenth century the desire for strong male government combined with political, religious, and military tensions in England and Europe appeared to have superseded fears of foreign domination. The Declaration of Rights proclaimed at William and Mary's accession that outlined their claim to the throne and defined their position as dual monarchs was subsequently enacted through Parliament to become the Bill of Rights. In addition to defining the limitations of the crown, and the rights of subjects and Parliament following the Glorious Revolution, the Bill of Rights legally defined the balance of power within the dual monarchy by placing the "sole and full exercise of regal power" with William but to be carried out in both their names.<sup>381</sup> Hence Mary was legally circumscribed to a subordinate role within the dual monarchy, which on the face of it would ensure that there was no question of the balance between conjugal and political power. That this legal construct of authority was problematic was to become evident however during William's plans to go to war in Ireland in 1690, when it became necessary to pass a further act of Parliament to make Mary regent in his absence.

---

<sup>378</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.611-612; Edwards, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 303-304; Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp. 279-280; Kelsey, *Philip of Spain*, p.131

<sup>379</sup> Loades, *Mary Tudor*, p.281

<sup>380</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI, II, p.1086

<sup>381</sup> An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown, in *English Historical Documents 1660 – 1714*, pp.122-128

Although the Bill's passage through the Lords was relatively uneventful, it was subject to much debate amongst the Commons.

The problems as W.A. Speck has pointed out were twofold; constitutional and political.<sup>382</sup> Constitutionally, this revolved around the issue of authority, which was complicated by the lack of precedent for a dual monarchy; whilst politically arguments were underpinned by anxieties of female rule, particularly within the context of tensions between conjugal and filial obligations. As the balance of power in the dual monarchy had been legally defined by the Bill of Rights further legislative measures now became necessary to redefine it as Mary needed to be legally enabled to govern as regent in William's absence. But this was far from a simple case of transferring the regal power from William to Mary, as to do so would have been in effect to reverse the balance of power, thus having the potential to emasculate William in favour of female authority. Indeed, members of the Commons questioned the impact on William's authority if regal power was to be placed with Mary. For example, one member queried whether this would remove all power from the king to the point that William would then have to take orders from the queen, and another member questioned whether the king would have any power at all whilst in Ireland. In this context Sir Edward Hussey believed that once the Bill was passed William's authority would be taken away and he would "take the king to be no king." Other members saw the argument more clearly, as the leading Tory spokesperson, Sir Christopher Musgrave, pointed out the issue was not to divest William of his regal power but rather to consider how to invest some of that power with the queen.<sup>383</sup> Thus an appropriate balance had to be achieved. But there was evidently still a perception that such a move could dilute William's authority, which, underpinned by concerns over national security, especially given the infancy of the regime, required a clear definition. Some members of the Commons sought historical precedents as a solution to the problem, citing, amongst others, the appointment of the duke of Cornwall as *Custos Regni* during Edward III's reign, and Catherine of Aragon's term as regent during the reign of Henry VIII. But these examples did not fit the current situation and were deemed to be as ineffective as trying to draw a map of a country that had never been seen, as the dual monarchy itself was without precedent.<sup>384</sup>

---

<sup>382</sup> W.A. Speck, 'William – and Mary?\*', in Lois G. Schworer ed. *The Revolution of 1688-1689*, p. 133

<sup>383</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. X, pp. 99, 108, 118, 122

<sup>384</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 102,105



Underpinned by anxieties over female rule, political concerns focussed on whether Mary would be able to govern the country effectively. Sir William Pulteney, the member of Parliament for Westminster, clearly had anxieties over female government as he articulated his concerns that if given regal power Mary could dissolve Parliament and raise an army, given which he foresaw “terrible consequences”; whilst the concerns of another member, Sir Edward Norris, were centred on Mary’s filial duty to her father, in that if William were to die in Ireland whilst Mary was regent, she may out of deference to James, not oppose his return to England thus jeopardising the revolutionary settlement.<sup>385</sup> Significantly however, and most likely as an attempt to counteract these concerns, a belief was also expressed that any power Mary would have would always be inferior to William’s. Certainly this was a view expressed by the lord lieutenant of Cumberland and Westmoreland, Sir John Lowther, who envisaged Mary’s regency as “Government beyond the Sea” as even as regent Mary would still be required to defer to William’s greater authority and obey his instructions. For Lowther, Mary would only be required to attend to “emergencies”, a view echoed by another member who also saw the king as still retaining overall control.<sup>386</sup> These debates exposed ambiguities and questions of authority that stemmed back to the revolutionary settlement. Significantly the question of what should happen if William was ever to leave the country on military campaigns had already been raised in the Convention Parliament when the revolutionary settlement was originally debated. For instance, Sir Thomas Clarges had anticipated the problems that would arise and referred the Convention to the legislation passed by the first Parliament of Philip and Mary. But at the time the situation was deemed to have already been provided for, and Clarges’ concerns were brushed aside.<sup>387</sup> Closer consideration however, would have proved the 1554 legislation irrelevant as this was devised to provide for Philip’s guardianship of his child should Mary die in childbirth. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the unprecedented nature of the dual monarchy ensured that the search for historical precedents proved fruitless.

The Regency Bill, when finally passed, focussed more on William’s authority than it did on Mary’s, although crucially it defined the temporary nature of any authority that she would have. As a reflection of the concerns aired in the Commons its emphasis was on William’s retention of power. Reiterating the provision of the Bill of Rights that regal power was

---

<sup>385</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 104, 108

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 104, 125, 129

<sup>387</sup> Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, Vol. IX, p. 77

invested solely in William before specifying that Mary will lawfully govern whenever he is absent from the realm, the legislation specified that:

“nothing in this Act shall be taken or construed to exclude or debar his Majestie during such his absence out of this Realme from the Exercise or Administration of any Act or Acts of Regall Power or Government within this Realme the Kingdome of Ireland or any other their Majestyes Dominions whatsoever.”

And to ensure that the temporary nature of Mary’s authority was clearly defined there was a provisory clause at the end of the Act stating that once William returns to England the sole administration of regal power is returned to him.<sup>388</sup> Hence the act, whilst empowering Mary as regent emphasises that William’s is the superior authority, thus seeking to clear up any ambiguities as to the balance of power within the dual monarchy.

That Mary II’s only opportunity to exercise monarchical power was during her regencies does not however diminish the impact of her queenship. Indeed, during the brief term of the dual monarchy, which as a construct ceased to exist upon her unexpected death in December 1694, Mary acted as regent five times during William’s absences abroad, accounting for over half of the total term of their joint reign.<sup>389</sup> Although it was William’s wish that Mary be regent, he clearly did not intend for her to govern alone and a council of nine peers, referred to as the Cabinet Council was established to advise her. Given that Mary had no experience of government, having always deferred to William on matters of state, this made sound political sense. It is debatable however as to what extent Mary was actually expected to govern. In January 1690, whilst making plans for his campaign in Ireland, William had already decided that a council must be set up to govern in his absence and that “the Queen is not to meddle.” And following the debates in the Commons over the Regency Bill in May, William elaborated further on his vision of how her regency would work, as he intended all matters that were able to be delayed “shall stay for his approbation” and furthermore Mary would not be able to give commissions or fill vacant bishoprics, although she would be able to call Parliament in case of “sudden emergency.”<sup>390</sup> A similar vision was also to be found in

---

<sup>388</sup> William and Mary, 1689: An Act for the Exercise of the Government by her Majestie during his Majestyes Absence [Chapter VI. Rot. Parl. Pt. 1. Nu. 8.], *Statutes of the Realm :volume 6: 1685-94* (1819), pp. 170. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46335> (accessed 25 February 2011)

<sup>389</sup> Mary acted as regent from June-Sept 1690, Jan-Oct 1691, Mar-Oct 1692, Mar-Oct 1693 and May-Nov 1694

<sup>390</sup> H.C. Foxcroft, *The Life and Letters of George Saville Bart, First Marquis of Halifax*, Volume 2 (London, 1888), pp. 246, 251

an official newsletter announcing that Parliament had settled the matter of the regency and that whilst regent the queen was “not to dissolve or prorogue, or change any ministers of state.”<sup>391</sup> Hence despite the legislation, Mary’s role as regent appeared to be open to a certain degree of interpretation, and whilst the Regency Act specified that she was to hold regal power in William’s absence it did not define how this was to work in practice.

For a woman with no experience of government who had always deferred to her husband, Mary’s first regency must have been for her, something of a baptism of fire. After all, this was the woman who firmly adhered to patriarchal beliefs around the role of women, expressing in her memoirs “that women should not meddle in government.”<sup>392</sup> But despite this, Mary worked hard to fulfil the role that had been temporarily assigned to her, and the Marquis of Carmarthen, one of the nine members of the Cabinet Council informed William that she:

“is very diligent at cabinet councils, and whenever anything concerns you either personally or in having your orders obeyed, she is not only active, but very strict, and lets us see that she will not be served superficially, insomuch that we shall be without all excuses, but want of money, if you are not served in your absence as you ought to be.”<sup>393</sup>

One of the biggest challenges for Mary during her first administration was the appearance of the French fleet off the English coast and the consequent English defeat at the Battle of Beachy Head on 10<sup>th</sup> July 1690. The diarist John Evelyn recorded the sense of alarm across the nation caused by these events, particularly given that the English fleet was considerably outnumbered by the French, and furthermore Evelyn thought, commanded by “debauched young men.”<sup>394</sup> Upon receiving the news that the French fleet had been sighted off the Plymouth coast, Mary summoned the Cabinet Council and issued orders for the English fleet, now joined by Dutch ships, to engage with the French. The resulting English defeat was both a severe embarrassment and a threat to national security as it left England vulnerable to French invasion. This could have been disastrous for Mary’s government had she not proved herself capable of effectively diffusing the situation. Her response was

---

<sup>391</sup> *CSP, Domestic Series, William and Mary, May 1690-October 1691* (London, 1898), p.9

<sup>392</sup> Doebner, *Memoirs of Mary Queen of England*, p. 23

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38

<sup>394</sup> *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. V, p.27

threefold. Firstly, she took advantage of popular negative opinion about English sailors and complaints against the commander of the fleet, Admiral Torrington, blaming him, either through incompetence or treachery, for the defeat at Beachy Head. Torrington was imputed for treason and committed to the Tower to await a court martial. Secondly Mary sought to placate the Dutch for the damage sustained by their fleet in the battle, sending an envoy to Holland expressing her concern at the situation, and ordering that the Dutch ships be repaired at her own cost. Such political diplomacy was to pay dividends, as in response to her overtures the Dutch were to fit out eighteen new war ships and levy for further troops to commit to the campaign.<sup>395</sup> Finally, akin to her predecessors, Mary I and Elizabeth I, she recognised the importance of her public persona, and used this to both inspire loyalty and to reassure her subjects. With the French temporarily in control of the English Channel, there were considerable anxieties about the prospect of a French invasion, and in response to rumours that the French were landing men in England, Mary ordered that all militia regiments in London be brought together, and on the 21<sup>st</sup> July 1690 she publicly reviewed the troops in Hyde Park.<sup>396</sup> This provided a visual and reassuring response to the French threat, whilst also publicly recognising the loyalty of the city of London, who had raised these troops following the defeat on 10<sup>th</sup> July. The defeat at Beachy Head placed Mary's first regency firmly within the context of the unstable military and political environment that existed at the time. Furthermore, during her first regency Mary was also faced with rebellion in Scotland, a depleted treasury, and political factions vying for power. Indeed, one writer, John Dalrymple, referring to the former king, James II, as "an exiled master" summarised the seriousness of the situation during the summer of 1690 as:

"..... a time when the army was in other countries, separated from their own, by seas of which their enemies were masters; the bulwark of the nation, the navy, put to flight or blocked up in its own harbours; the king absent; the rein of government in the hand of a woman, whose councils were distracted by two implacable factions, invasion impending, rebellion in one of the three kingdoms, and expected in the other two; and an exiled master returning with power and vengeance; the British empire shook to its centre."<sup>397</sup>

---

<sup>395</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part II, Book V, pp. 145-146; Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. II, p. 79

<sup>396</sup> Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. II, p.76

<sup>397</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part II, Book V, p. 134

But despite her lack of experience Mary had clearly proved herself capable of dealing with a significant military and political crisis. She may have portrayed herself in her memoirs as ignorant of government but her actions during the summer of 1690 indicate otherwise. Her political intuition in response to a perceived threat was demonstrated once again during her 1692 regency in the build up to the battle of La Hogue which was to repel the French attempt to invade England and restore James II. Amidst rumours of disaffection within the navy, Mary quelled public anxieties by declaring that such rumours had been perpetuated by their enemies. Her naval officers responded by sending her an address of their loyalty, asserting that “they were ready to die in her cause and their country’s,” to which Mary responded that she had always known this, but was “glad this is come to satisfy others.”<sup>398</sup> Her actions in bringing about this address had essentially been a method to calm anxieties ahead of a major naval engagement. Furthermore, and in an action which must have cleared away any ambiguities about her being torn between her conjugal and filial obligations, Mary took a decisive step with regard to her father. Rather than prohibiting a declaration by James about the invasion, in which he consented to William’s death, she ordered it to be published, so that all were aware of his intentions.<sup>399</sup> This publicly discredited James and bolstered support for her regime.

Mary’s performance during her regencies was officially recognised by separate addresses of the Lords and the Commons in the early years of her reign. In 1690 both houses praised her resolution, prudence, courage and virtue, and her ability to preserve the peace when faced with such a powerful enemy. The Commons, directly referring to the situation at Beachy Head:

“..... most humbly beg leave to express the deep Sense we have of that Goodness, Wisdom, and courage, which your Majesty did manifest in the greatest Difficulties, and most pressing Dangers, during his Majesty’s absence, at a time when a powerful enemy was upon our Coast, when the Nation was weakened in that Part, which is its proper Strength; and deprived of the Security of his Majesty’s presence: The Resolution Your Majesty shewed in Your

---

<sup>398</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. I, Part II, Book V, pp. 204-205

<sup>399</sup> *Ibid.*, p.205

Administration, gave Life to your subjects, and made them exert a Strength and Force, unknown to former Reigns.....”<sup>400</sup>

The address acknowledged Mary’s ability to reassure and inspire loyalty in her subjects in William’s absence and her ability to deal with a crisis. Likewise the parliamentary addresses of 1692 praised her administration through which the danger of invasion was prevented, and although the victory at La Hogue was predictably attributed to William, it was through Mary’s administration by which her subjects “enjoyed the blessings of Peace at Home.”<sup>401</sup> In this context the addresses define both William and Mary by traditional gendered roles; he is identified with the male sphere of warfare and celebrated for his military achievements, whilst Mary is identified with peace. Such gendered ideals about the roles of the dual monarchs during her regencies were also expressed by Gilbert Burnet, who writing after Mary’s death recalled:

“Whilst He went abroad with the Sword in His Hand, She stayed at home with the Scepter in Hers: He went as the Arbiter of Europe, to force a just, as well as a general Peace, She stayed to maintain Peace and do Justice at home.”<sup>402</sup>

Thus similarly to how Philip of Spain was positioned as the more politically capable partner within his marriage to Mary Tudor, Burnet positioned William as the enabler; the bringer of justice in Europe whilst Mary remained at home, her gender effectively barring her from participation in such a male arena.

Despite the praise of her government during her regencies, there were also criticisms of her administration, and during her first regency calls by some for William to return to England.<sup>403</sup>

---

<sup>400</sup> ‘House of Commons Journal, Volume 10, 8<sup>th</sup> October 1690’, *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 10: 1688-1693* (1802), pp.429-430. URL:<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/reprtaspx?compid=29048> Date accessed 28<sup>th</sup> June 2011; ‘House of Lords Journal, Volume 14, 7<sup>th</sup> October 1690’ *Journal of the House of Lords Volume 14: 1685-1691* (1767-1830), pp. 518-519, URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=13275> Date accessed 28<sup>th</sup> June 2011

<sup>401</sup> ‘House of Commons Journal, Volume 10, 11<sup>th</sup> November 1692’ *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 10: 1688-1693* (1802), p. 698, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=13275> (accessed 26 June 2011); ‘House of Lords Journal, Volume 15: 18<sup>th</sup> November 1692’, *Journal of the House of Lords: volume 15: 1691-1696* (1767-1830), pp. 115-118, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=11844> (accessed 26 June 2011)

<sup>402</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *An Essay on the Memory of the Late Queen* (London, 1695), p37

<sup>403</sup> Andrew Browning, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds 1632 – 1712*, Vol. 2 (Glasgow, 1944), pp. 175,177,178; Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. II, Part II, Book V, pp. 175-176

Such criticisms were centred on her constant deferral of matters to William for his advice and instructions. Indeed, Mary wrote to William almost daily during her first term as regent. Her letters contain frequent expressions of wifely devotion and concerns for his wellbeing, but they also keep him up to date of what had occurred, seek his advice on matters of state, and his approval of her actions. This was clearly frustrating to some councillors and politicians at court. In one of her letters to William in July 1690 she referred to an interview with Lord Lincoln, who despite discussing reforms in the fleet with her for an hour and a half wasn't satisfied that she would do what was required, and he had, she continued:

“..... an expression that I have often heard these few days since it is wanted, which is, that I have the power in my hand, and they wonder I will not make use of it: and why should I stay either for your return, and whether I should lose so much time as to write you word or no, is doubted .....”<sup>404</sup>

Similar criticisms of her administration were voiced in 1692, this time in Parliament. Her regency having recently ended, the Tory Member of Parliament, Sir Thomas Clarges complained that in William's absence:

“... I must say the government here has been very loose; no act done here by the Queen but must first be sent beyond the sea to have directions from foreign councils.”<sup>405</sup>

And his concerns were echoed by another member, a Mr Mordaunt, who told the house that he wished Mary “had dispatched more herself without sending abroad for orders.”<sup>406</sup> But were these criticisms actually directed at Mary herself or general frustrations at the way her administration had transpired? Certainly Thomas Clarges was an unlikely critic of the queen, as during the Convention Parliament he had argued in favour of Mary as the next hereditary heir to the throne, and as discussed above, also raised the issue of her being regent if William was absent from the kingdom on military campaigns. Furthermore, during the debate over the Regency Act he did not voice any objection to Mary as regent, instead stressing the need for the provision of the regency. And Mordaunt's remark contained no criticism of Mary's political ability, only a wish she would be a more independent governor. In referring matters to William Mary was merely conforming to her husband's vision of how her regency would

---

<sup>404</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. II, Part II, Book V, p.143

<sup>405</sup> Henry Horwitz, ed. *The Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell 1691 – 1693* (Oxford, 1972), p.242

<sup>406</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251

operate, and furthermore, that of many in the Commons, as expressed in the debate for the Regency Act and in an official newsletter. Hence she dealt with crises and emergencies, and other matters were referred to William.

Calls for William to return to England do however have an alternative interpretation; one that must be placed within the context of the anxieties and sense of fear and panic that were endemic across the nation in the summer of 1690, and made plain by Dalrymple's comment above. Given the very real threat to national security, both from invasion and rebellion, and with an inexperienced woman governing the country, it is hardly surprising that the absence of a militarily strong and politically experienced male governor was keenly felt. The significance of Mary's gender and her inexperience are evident in her letters to William. These reveal her frustrations as members of the Cabinet Council took advantage of the fact she was an inexperienced woman, either attempting to manipulate her for their own political designs or excluding her from meetings. For example, in her letter of 6<sup>th</sup> July, she had clearly felt pressurised by the duke of Bolton into letting him raise some horse volunteers for which he told her that William had promised before he left for Ireland that he should have a commission. But Mary was not going to let herself be pushed into agreeing to something that she was uncertain about, so she took advice from both Lords Marlborough and Carmarthen, before deciding to wait until she heard William's decision on the matter. On the 25<sup>th</sup> July she wrote about a more serious attempt to manipulate her when Lord Monmouth had tried to persuade her to dissolve Parliament in return for a loan of £200,000; a matter on which she gave no decision and once again referred the matter to William.<sup>407</sup> Mary's repeated referrals to William, although incurring delays enabled her to avoid political manipulation as in effect she played for time and passed the final responsibility for any decision to the king.

The Cabinet Council's failure to always keep her informed of events was a further matter that clearly frustrated her, as it effectively excluded her from government. In one early letter she complained to William of Cabinet Council meetings being held without her knowledge.<sup>408</sup> And she vented her frustrations again over an incident concerning a council meeting. Mary had enquired of the Cabinet Council whether she was required to attend, to which the

---

<sup>407</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. II, Part II, Book V, pp.124, 141,157

<sup>408</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122



president Lord Carmarthen answered that she did not, whilst the rest of the council remained silent. They later complained that she did not attend the meeting and envoys were sent requesting her presence.<sup>409</sup> Hence Mary had to negotiate behaviour amongst the Cabinet Council that it is highly unlikely would have been displayed to William. Although her letters are testimony to her political inexperience and her dedication to fulfil her role as regent, they also testify to her overriding belief that she was subject to her husband, and even as regent should still defer to his superior power. In referring matters to him and asking for advice she demonstrates her shrewd political ability at the same time as acknowledging her inexperience. Furthermore by referring matters to him she fulfils his vision of how her regencies will work in practice. As she explained in a letter of August 1690, she submitted herself to the will of God and to William's judgement as her husband.<sup>410</sup>

Anne's power, like that of William and Mary, was also defined by the Bill of Rights as the Bill essentially enabled the continuation of the Protestant succession in England. Unlike the marriage treaty of Philip and Mary which specified that Philip had no claim to the English throne upon Mary's death, the Bill of Rights made provision for either William or Mary to continue as sole monarch after the death of the other. Hence, when Mary died unexpectedly from smallpox in December 1694, William continued as king rather than the crown passing directly to Anne. But William was a crowned king, fully invested with regal power, whilst Philip, although enjoying the title of king of England during his marriage, remained essentially a consort, regal power being solely held by his wife. Upon William's death the Bill specified the crown was to pass to any heirs of Mary's body, and if there were none, to Anne, Princess of Denmark and the heirs of her body. But the legislation failed to take account of Anne's husband, Prince George of Denmark, leaving him with no legally defined role. Indirectly of course his role was to provide his wife, and the nation, with Protestant heirs but his omission from the Bill of Rights legally excluded him from any exercise of royal power.

The same legal exclusion of George from monarchical power occurred again in the 1701 Act of Settlement. This act, formally known as *an Act for the Further Limitation of the Crown and Better Securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject*, was passed as a response to the

---

<sup>409</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-137

<sup>410</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 154

death of Anne and George's only surviving child, William duke of Gloucester, in 1700. The Bill of Rights had allowed for any heirs of William's body to inherit the crown if Anne had no surviving children, but William did not remarry after Mary's death and had no children. Anne had endured seventeen pregnancies, the last of which was in 1700, but only the duke of Gloucester had survived infancy. Although it was still possible that Anne may conceive again, her poor obstetric record and the ill health of both her and George, made the birth of a healthy child an unlikely prospect. It was therefore essential for the security of the realm, and to outlaw any claims from the Catholic line of James II, that the Protestant succession was further defined. Hence the Act of Settlement which settled the succession on the Hanoverian line through Sophia, Electress of Hanover and granddaughter of James I of England, and the heirs of her body. Although, almost as an aside, the act did allow for the remote possibility of Anne and George producing a surviving heir in that the diversion to the Hanoverian line would only occur upon the "Default of Issue" of Anne and George.<sup>411</sup> Significantly at the time the act was passed Sophia had several surviving sons and her eldest son George also had children, a son and daughter; so a Protestant, male succession seemed secured. Without an heir, George lost any political significance that he may have had whilst Gloucester was alive as the child had enabled George's political status and influence as father of the future king. After his son's death and with little prospect of further surviving children, George's status as consort of England's future queen was diminished. Furthermore to have made any legal provision for a formal role for George in the Act of Settlement could have jeopardised the successful transition to the Hanoverian line, and thus endangered the Protestant succession.

The lack of legal provision for George in either piece of legislation is not entirely surprising. Unlike his brother-in-law William who had a claim to the English throne through his mother, Mary, the Princess Royal, daughter of Charles I, and sister to Charles II and James II, George of Denmark had no such claim. Furthermore, as only the younger brother of King Christian V of Denmark, who already had three children at the time of George's marriage to Anne, George was several places down the Danish line of succession and therefore had little likelihood of ever succeeding to the Danish throne. Thus as a Protestant prince with no realms of his own or any foreign interest Charles II thought he would make an ideal husband

---

<sup>411</sup> William III, 1700 & 1701, An Act for the further limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject [Chapter II. Rot. Parl. 12 & 13 Gul. III. P. 1. N. 2.], *Statutes of the Realm: volume. 7: 1695-1701* (1820), pp.636-638. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46966> (accessed 09 May 2011)

for Anne as he “would have no interest but that of the English nation at heart.”<sup>412</sup> Therefore, unlike both Philip and William, who were rulers and governors in other realms, George had no dominions or principalities of his own, nor was he an experienced governor and statesman. Indeed, George’s primary function as Anne’s husband was to bolster the succession by fathering children, particularly critical given that Charles II had no legitimate children, and his brother James only had two daughters. Thus from the negotiations for Anne and George’s marriage, to the Bill of Rights and later Act of Settlement, it was never envisaged that George should have any role other than that of a husband; supporting his wife and fathering children.

Although Anne was already married when she ascended the throne, following the legislative constructs of the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement she was to govern alone as there was no formal regal role for George. But this did not necessarily mean he was wholly excluded from her queenship. Indeed George was an essential element of Anne’s queenship, albeit operating as Charles Beem has pointed out as an informal prince consort.<sup>413</sup> George was already a noteworthy figure before Anne’s accession. He was created a Knight of the Garter in 1684, was the chief mourner at Charles II’s funeral, and in 1689 was created baron of Ockingham, earl of Kendal and duke of Cumberland, effectively making him first nobleman in England. Furthermore he was a member of the Privy Council and attended both Parliament and court regularly, remaining politically visible throughout William and Mary’s reign and after Mary’s death. In this context his sphere of operations merely reflected the role that was expected of a high profile, male, member of the royal family. However upon Anne’s accession his position became of key significance as he was able to fulfil certain public duties that either Anne’s gender effectively prevented her from doing or that were deemed more appropriate for a man to fulfil than a woman. For example, a traditionally male sphere in which George operated was as Generalissimo of all English forces on land and sea, and Lord High Admiral, to which he was appointed shortly after Anne’s accession, albeit that as a result of his being excessively overweight and his chronic ill health George was no longer physically capable of active military service. The role of Generalissimo carried no administrative duties, and although as lord High Admiral he headed a council of naval advisers, he was only a nominal head, as Marlborough’s younger brother, George Churchill,

---

<sup>412</sup> Thomas Lediard, *The Life of John, Duke of Marlborough, Prince of the Roman Empire, Illustrated with Maps, Plans of Battles, Sieges, and Medals, And a great Number of Original Letters and Papers Never Before Published* (London, 1743), p. 32; John Macky, *Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, Esq. During the Reigns of King William, Queen Anne, and King George I* (London, 1733), pp. 1-2

<sup>413</sup> Beem, *The Lioness Roared*, p. 103

effectively ran the admiralty.<sup>414</sup> It would appear therefore that George was merely a figurehead in these positions, but its significance lies in the need to provide him with a suitably masculine, authoritative role. Certainly Anne had sought a suitably prominent role for her husband, as she had pushed for him to be appointed as commander of the allied forces in Europe at the beginning of the reign. Crucially as Lord High Admiral, George had a formal position of power whether he chose to actively exercise it or not. Furthermore in this office he was essentially representing the queen in a role that because of her gender she was not able to carry out herself. A full reappraisal of George's role as Lord High Admiral is overdue but it would appear that he may have been reasonably active in this position as Luttrell records in February 1703 George meeting with his council to give orders with regard to the fleet.<sup>415</sup> Not being an experienced governor however, and with an evident lack of leadership skills and understanding of naval matters, George's tenure as Lord High Admiral was less than successful. Gilbert Burnet records the incompetence of the admiralty and the ill management of the prince's council to the extent that committees were established in 1705 to examine the complaints, but little was concluded as there was a general reluctance to criticize George.<sup>416</sup> Such reluctance to publically attack the prince was most likely because any criticism of George could also be interpreted as a criticism of Anne. Indeed, further attacks on the admiralty in 1707, although politically motivated by the Whigs against George Churchill, were deemed by both Anne and George as attacks on their authority.<sup>417</sup>

George's influence upon his wife was more subtle and potentially more successful than his attempt as Lord High Admiral. Certainly, before her accession, Anne dutifully deferred to her husband. In a letter to James II's queen, Mary of Modena, Anne cited her conjugal duty to George as a reason to justify her behaviour at the Glorious Revolution and her consequent desertion of her father. She was she alleged, "divided between Duty and Affection, to a Father and a Husband," affection for her father, but her duty lay towards her husband.<sup>418</sup> And during William and Mary's reign she consulted George over the quarrel and growing estrangement between herself and Mary, her letters to the Duchess of Marlborough revealing

---

<sup>414</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 160-161

<sup>415</sup> Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. V, p.272

<sup>416</sup> Burnet, *History of his Own Time*, pp. 156, 236-237

<sup>417</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.363-364; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.254

<sup>418</sup> Thomas Salmon, *The History of the Life and Reign of her Late Majesty Queen Anne* (London, 1740), p.13

George's support for his wife in this issue.<sup>419</sup> As consort George was not actively involved in either politics or government and did not seek political advancement. Contemporary accounts record that he "meddled little in business" and did "not much meddle with Affairs out of his Office."<sup>420</sup> However, further consideration needs to be given to the language used, as neither account specifies that George did not "meddle" at all, hence there is the implication that he did involve himself in affairs when he deemed it was necessary, or when Anne required his support. For instance during the political manoeuvring of early 1708, when Anne was under increasing pressure from the Whigs, Edward Gregg argues that she relied increasingly upon George for support.<sup>421</sup> Indeed, using the correspondence between Marlborough and the Lord Treasurer, Godolphin, he successfully demonstrates just how influential George was in supporting his wife at this time. Godolphin complained to Marlborough of the queen's intransigence, and that he believed "this humour proceeds more from her husband than from herself."<sup>422</sup> George's support later extended to interrupting a politically tense meeting between Anne and Godolphin as he thought it was dinner time.<sup>423</sup> Was this merely the unassuming, food loving consort of contemporary accounts, or an example of George diffusing a politically awkward situation, subtly supporting his wife when she was under pressure? Certainly Beem argues that the latter scenario was "entirely possible."<sup>424</sup> It is vital however not to overstate George's influence as essentially in supporting Anne he was merely fulfilling his role as her husband, not as a governor. Alluding to the paradoxical relationship between conjugal and political power, one contemporary, writing after George's death described Anne as revering him "with a Conjugal Obedience and Passionate Affection", and akin to Aylmer's views mentioned above, on the potential for a queen to blur conjugal and political power, Anne did not allow her position as queen to alter "Her conjugal Submission to her Lord's Desires." Whilst George behaved "himself as a submissive Subject, in paying all Respect due to majesty."<sup>425</sup>

---

<sup>419</sup> Sarah Churchill, *An Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough* (London, 1742), pp.83-84

<sup>420</sup> Burnet, *History of his Own Time*, p. 403; Macky, *Memoirs of the Secret Service of John Macky*, p3

<sup>421</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.260

<sup>422</sup> Henry L Snyder, ed., *The Marlborough and Godolphin Correspondence, Volume 2* (Oxford, 1975), p.957

<sup>423</sup> *Ibid.*, p.999

<sup>424</sup> Beem, *The Lioness Roared*, p. 136

<sup>425</sup> William Cockburn, *An Essay Upon the Propitious and Glorious Reign of our Gracious Sovereign Anne* (London, 1710), pp. 12-13

## Part 2 – Perceptions of Conjugal and Political Power: Representation and Iconography

The legal constructs of conjugal and political power were clearly limited in their scope to address the issues raised by the concept of regnant queenship, and in particular married regnant queenship. Perceptions of the queen however, through representation and iconography provide an equally valuable insight to contemporary understanding of regnant queenship. In his 1989 study *Tudor Royal Iconography* J.N. King recognised that Mary Tudor's marriage to Philip had "created an iconographical problem" as there was no precedent for depicting a male consort and a regnant queen.<sup>426</sup> The mixed messages embodied within the symbolic representations of Philip and Mary at their wedding and subsequent royal entry demonstrate that despite the legal definitions of Mary's power and the restrictions placed upon Philip in the marriage treaty, this lack of precedent combined with underlying fears of foreign domination and contemporary notions of gender resulted in a certain degree of confusion over how Philip was presented. For instance the ceremonial positioning employed at the wedding ceremony consistently emphasised Mary's precedence over her husband. In Winchester cathedral, on a raised platform made especially for the occasion, Mary stood on the right hand side with Philip on her left. Immediately after the ceremony the couple were sat at the altar in ceremonial chairs, Mary once again positioned on the right with Philip on the left. Likewise on leaving the cathedral, Mary is again situated on the right hand side.<sup>427</sup> In this manner Mary occupied the traditional position reserved for a king, whilst Philip on her left is positioned quite clearly as a consort; such positioning echoing the legislative definitions as she is presented as the more dominant power within the marriage. This ceremonial positioning continued at the wedding banquet as Castilian accounts record how Mary was sat in a larger chair than her husband and furthermore was served before him.<sup>428</sup>

The positioning of the couple is significant not only in the message that it delivers but also in its visibility. As at Mary's coronation, the wooden scaffold was erected specifically so that

---

<sup>426</sup> J.N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography* (New Jersey, 1989), p.215

<sup>427</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, pp.141-142,167-169; Malfatti, *Accession, Coronation and Marriage*, p.51; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, p. 120

<sup>428</sup> Alexander Samson, 'Changing Places: The Marriage and Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria, and Mary Tudor, July- August 1554', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 36,3 (2005), p. 762

the ceremony could be seen by more people. Furthermore, that such ceremonial positioning was noted and commented upon in contemporary accounts demonstrates that it was considered indicative of the balance of power upon Mary's marriage. Indeed, Alexander Samson argues that the positioning of the royal couple was essentially "a coded response" to the opposition to Mary's marriage that had arisen from anxieties over her authority once she was married.<sup>429</sup> Within this context Samson also views Philip and Mary's clothing at their wedding to be significant as he compares Philip's outfit of white cloth of gold to the traditional coronation dress of a queen consort, which he argues, serves to symbolically transform Philip into a female consort.<sup>430</sup> However, despite the undoubted importance of dress in ceremonial representation, it is problematic to correlate this instance with such a blurring of gendered identities, as the celebrations of Philip's masculine attributes in the pageantry at the royal entry are in direct opposition to this view. On 24<sup>th</sup> August Philip and Mary accompanied by lords of the Privy Council, ambassadors and both English and Spanish nobles, made their royal entry into London. Receiving a jubilant welcome, the couple processed through London on horseback, Mary once again positioned on the right hand side of her husband. The first pageant that greeted them featured two giants of British legend, Corineus Britannus and Gogmagog Albionus, holding aloft a tablet inscribed with verses welcoming Philip to England; verses that articulate a gendered perception of Philip's role as Mary's consort:

“ O noble Prince, sole hope of Caesar's side,  
By God appointed all the world to gyde”<sup>431</sup>

Philip is portrayed as being appointed by God to guide Mary, reinforcing the notion that a woman was not capable of governing and needed a husband to guide her. This sentiment was also a reflection of Catholic hopes that Philip's marriage to Mary would bring about England's reconciliation with Rome. A further pageant at Cornhill celebrated strong male governance as it compared Philip to four other illustrious historical Philips; King Philip of Macedonia, Philip the Roman emperor, Philip Bonus and Philip Audax, dukes of Burgundy. At Cheapside a pageant in the form of a mount decorated with leaves and herbs featured the figure of Orpheus playing his harp whilst men and women dressed as animals danced to the music. The Protestant writer, Foxe, viewed this pageant within the context of fears of foreign

---

<sup>429</sup> *Ibid.*, p.763

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p.765

<sup>431</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 146

domination as he saw Philip as Orpheus and the animals as the English people dancing to Philip's tune.<sup>432</sup> But this can also be interpreted in a different way, as in ancient Greek mythology Orpheus sought to deliver his wife, Eurydice, from the underworld by playing divine music. Thus Philip was also seen as a deliverer, attempting to deliver Mary and England from the threat of heresy, or considering this further, potentially delivering England from female rule. Another pageant expressed the notion that through his marriage to Mary Philip was effectively made king; at the conduit in Fleet Street a king and queen representing Philip and Mary are portrayed with the figures of *Justicia* and *Equitas* on their right, and *Veritas* and *Misericordia* on their left. The figure of Wisdom descended from the top of the pageant with a crown in each of her hands, placing one on the queen's head, and the other on the king's. Below this, verses celebrating Philip's princely qualities, read

“When that a man is jentle, just, and true,  
With virtuous giftes fulfilled plenteously,  
If Wisdome then him with hir crowne endue,  
He governe shal the whole world prosperously.  
And sith we we know thee, Philip, to be such,  
While thou shalt reigne we thinke us happy much.”<sup>433</sup>

Philip is thus wisdom's choice for Mary's husband, but also for England's king. Marriage to Mary made Philip a king, both legally and in popular perception. Samson has also considered this pageant and the version of it in an Italian account that places Mary as an enthroned virgin delivering a crown to Philip; the clear implication being that Mary upon her marriage gives the crown of England to Philip.<sup>434</sup>

Significantly the pageantry of the royal entry also sought to allay fears of foreign domination presenting Philip as an English king, rather than a Spanish prince.<sup>435</sup> Hence the pageant at the west end of Cheapside sought to reassure such anxieties with an illustration of Philip and Mary's genealogy and their mutual descent from Edward III. The pageant was in the form a

---

<sup>432</sup> John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (1570 edition) (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed:23.10.2011]

<sup>433</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, p. 151

<sup>434</sup> Samson, 'Marriage and Royal Entry', p. 767

<sup>435</sup> Alexander Samson, 'Images of Co-Monarchy in the London Entry of Philip and Mary (1554)', in M. Canova-Green, J. Andres and M. Wagner, eds., *Writing Royal Entries in Early Modern Europe* (Turnhout, 2013), p. 113. Samson asserts that the royal entry was designed to allay English fears of foreign domination



tree with the figure of an aged Edward III lying at its roots. From these roots sprung numerous branches on which were sat children representing kings, queens, princes and nobility all of whom were descended from Edward. Philip and Mary were at the top of the tree, Mary on the right hand side, Philip on the left, their regal styles written above their heads, and above that their arms were joined under a single imperial crown.<sup>436</sup> Such focus on Philip's English blood further demonstrated his eminent suitability as Mary's husband and England's king.

Some of the notions expressed in the pageantry were reflected in other media. For instance John Heywood's poem celebrating the marriage views the couple through traditional gendered ideals with Philip as a masculine eagle landing on the passive Tudor rose. And although Heywood eulogises Mary's queenship by portraying her as a crowned lion, he confines her within contemporary gendered boundaries as a feminine lion.

“But marke, this lion, so by name,  
Is properlie a lambe tassyne,  
No lion wilde, a lion tame,  
No rampant lion masculine,  
The lamblike lion feminine.”<sup>437</sup>

Furthermore, as a feminine, tame, lion Mary posed no threat to natural order as she'd conformed to contemporary expectations by placing herself under the headship of a husband, in contrast to the unmarried wild lion. And comparable to some of the sentiments expressed in the pageants of the royal entry Heywood also highlighted Philip's suitability as the queen's husband. Alluding to Charles V bestowing the kingdom of Naples to Philip upon his marriage, he reminded his readers that the marriage was a unity of crowns. Philip was therefore a king in his own right as Heywood pointed out that the couple were matched “lyke to lyke.”<sup>438</sup> A further interpretation of this poem is expressed by King, who considers the portrayal of Philip as a crowned eagle landing on the Tudor rose with the aim of building his nest in “the lions boure” to be suggestive of the double eagle of the Habsburgs imposing itself

---

<sup>436</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, pp. 149-150

<sup>437</sup> John Heywood, *A Balade specifienge partly the maner, partly the matter, in the most excellent meeting and lyke marriage between our Soueraigne Lord and our Soueraigne Lady, the Kynges and Queenes Highnes*, in Burton A. Milligan ed., *John Heywood's Works and Miscellaneous Short Poems* (Urbana, 1956), pp. 269-271

<sup>438</sup> *Ibid.*, p.270

upon the English nation.<sup>439</sup> Hence we can also see that the traditional gendered ideals expressed by Heywood could also act as a vehicle of the subtle expression of fears of domination by a foreign power.

Coins and medals were also an effective medium for representing the balance of power between Philip and Mary. And as with the pageant featuring Philip and Mary's genealogy the coins of the reign also feature the symbol of a single crown above the monarchs. Both Alexander Samson and Judith Richards have remarked upon the new coinage that appeared from September 1554 featuring Philip and Mary in profile with the image of the floating crown above them as a symbol of their 'co-monarchy.'<sup>440</sup> On initial consideration it would appear that the crown hovering above both heads as depicted on the Philip and Mary shilling and sixpence (fig. 1) contradicts the efforts to protect Mary's sole authority, as it implies that Philip has a share of Mary's authority. However, whilst the crown is above both heads, it is Mary who is situated in the dominant position on the right hand side of the image. Furthermore, as defined in the articles of the marriage treaty Philip was entitled to 'enjoy jointly' Mary's royal style, so the image of the floating crown can be seen as a reflection of Philip's status under the terms of the treaty. It is noteworthy that this imagery was to be used again on medals commemorating the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots to the French dauphin, Francois in 1558, and their accession as King and Queen of France in 1559. Both these medals portray busts of Mary Stuart and Francois facing each other, with a single floating crown above them.<sup>441</sup> The image of the busts of Philip and Mary facing each other denotes their status as a married couple and was not in itself a new idea. Facing busts had previously been used on the escudos of the Spanish monarchs, Isabel of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon.<sup>442</sup> Not all new coins from 1554 bore the joint image of the couple however, as the groat, half groat and silver penny bore the bust of Mary only, although Philip's presence as king was acknowledged in the legend on the groat.<sup>443</sup> So whilst the coinage offered a representation of a co-monarchy, it also continued to represent Mary as she was legally defined, a regnant queen whose political authority was not shared with her husband.

---

<sup>439</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p.216; Heywood, *Balade specifienge partly the maner*, p.269

<sup>440</sup> Samson, 'Marriage and Royal Entry', p.782; Richards, 'Mary Tudor as Sole Quene?', pp.915-916

<sup>441</sup> *Medallic Illustrations* Vol. I, pp. 91,95; Plate VI, No. 10

<sup>442</sup> H.W.A. Linecar, *British Coin Designs and Designers* (London, 1977), p.33

<sup>443</sup> *Ibid*, p.32; C.H.V. Sutherland, *English Coinage 600-1900* (London, 1973), p. 148, Plates 65-67



Fig. 1, Philip and Mary sixpence, 1554

In contrast to coinage, the medals cast during the reign of Philip and Mary offer no sense of co-monarchy as the couple are portrayed separately. A 1555 medal based on contemporary portraits of the monarchs features the half length figure of Mary on the obverse with that of Philip on the reverse; the individual legends referring to Mary as queen of England, France and Ireland, and Philip as Prince of Spain.<sup>444</sup> Other medals focus on Mary's queenship without featuring Philip at all. For instance, a further medal of 1555 on the State of England, cast on Philip's orders to compliment Mary on her government of the realm features the same half length image of Mary as on the medal above, and on the reverse Mary is portrayed as Peace applying a lit torch to a pile of arms whilst in her other hand she holds out palm and olive branches to a group of supplicants who are enduring floods and storms. Above this scene the sun's rays shine through clouds and the legend reads "CECIS VISVS TIMIDIS .QVIES"; "Sight to the blind, Peace to the timid."<sup>445</sup> Clearly this medal has religious overtones, as it alludes to the restoration of the Catholic faith in England, but it is significant to this work in that it shows Mary, as a married woman, exercising her own independent authority as queen. Other medals of the same year do allude however to Mary's marriage,

<sup>444</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. I, p.71, Plate IV. No. 15

<sup>445</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.72-73; Plate V. No. 2

although still not including Philip. One uses a design originally used for the marriage in 1548 of Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, to Mary daughter of Charles V. The obverse shows a priestess of Vesta keeping the sacred flame alight upon the altar and the legend is “CASTE ET SVPLICITER”, “Chastely and suppliantly.”<sup>446</sup> Although this image having previously been used does not relate specifically to Mary it does however allude to her status as wife and to her duty to both her husband and God. Another also resurrects a previously used image; of peace holding a nuptial torch between two olive branches with the legend “CONSOCIATO RERVM DOMINA”, “Union, the mistress of affairs”, to which the editor of *Medallic Illustrations* speculates may refer to Mary’s marriage uniting England and Spain.<sup>447</sup>

Recent historiography has argued that symbolic representations of Philip and Mary appear to show a shift in the perception of the balance of power as the reign progressed. Whereas at the marriage ceremony and royal entry, ceremonial positioning of Mary on the right hand side of her husband emphasised her political precedence, Judith Richards has considered the illuminations on Plea Rolls throughout the reign to argue that there was a distinct shift in how the couple’s royal authority was represented. For instance the illumination on the 1554 Plea Roll indicates Mary’s precedence over Philip as she is sat on Philip’s right hand side, but by Michaelmas 1556 the positions are reversed and Philip is depicted on the right hand side with Mary on his left.<sup>448</sup> This could be an indication during the course of the reign Philip was considered as having political ascendancy over his wife. This needs to be considered within the wider context of other representations of the couple throughout the reign, such as that in their royal entry, and in the new coinage and medals. Furthermore the problematic nature of their joint iconography resulted in sometimes conflicting images. For example, the Great Seal of Philip and Mary (fig. 2), dating from their marriage, presents two contrasting images. On one side of the double sided seal Philip and Mary are sat enthroned under a canopy with the single crown floating above them, each of them resting a hand on the orb which is positioned between them. However unlike other symbolic imagery from early in the reign, Philip is sat on the right hand side holding the sword of state whilst Mary is on his left holding the sceptre. The representation on the reverse of the seal however reveals a different

---

<sup>446</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74; Plate V. No. 3

<sup>447</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74; Plate V. No. 4

<sup>448</sup> Richards, ‘Mary Tudor as Sole Quene?’, pp.916-919

representation of their authority, as the couple are shown on horseback, with Mary on the right hand side, her horse slightly ahead of Philip's, implying that she is leading him.



Fig. 2, Great seal of Philip and Mary, illustration to John Speed's *History of Great Britain* (1632)

Perceptions of the balance of power between Philip and Mary were therefore underscored by conflicting notions of authority, and as King has asserted, the lack of precedent for a male consort.

Popular perceptions of Mary II's queenship and her exercise of government are found in pamphlets, poems and newspapers, and also the medals cast both to celebrate her regencies and other key events of the reign. Her capability during her regencies was reflected in the publication of a number of works celebrating female government. In 1691 William Walsh's *Dialogue Concerning Women* praised women's abilities as leaders and governors, concluding by focussing on famous English female rulers including Boudicca and Elizabeth. Walsh placed Mary as equal to these historical examples, and praised her queenship whilst acknowledging the often critical nature of the English public:

“we have in our own Time, and our own Countrey, a Princess who has Govern'd to their general satisfaction, a People the most curious to pry into the faults of their Governours, of any People under the Sun.”<sup>449</sup>

Walsh's work was followed in 1692 by Nahum Tate's praise of female rule, *A Present for the Ladies*, which was later republished in 1693. After citing numerous examples of “female worth” Tate queried whether it was still possible for women's capability as governors to be questioned.<sup>450</sup> As with Walsh's work Mary was again compared to other illustrious female rulers, including Zenobia, Tomyris, Deborah, Boudicca and Elizabeth before Tate cited her as the focus of Europe during her regencies.

“All Europe have lately turn'd their Eyes upon Great Britain, and there beheld upon the Throne, a Female Regent adminstring in the absence of her Royal Heroe, and every day affording just Occasions for Admiration and Astonishment.”<sup>451</sup>

The comparison of Mary to Elizabeth was a popular one and was a feature of newspaper articles during her first regency. The *Mercurius Reformatus* or *The New Observator* made a

---

<sup>449</sup> William Walsh, *A Dialogue Concerning Women, Being a Defence of the Sex* (London, 1691), pp. 129-130

<sup>450</sup> Nahum Tate, *A Present for the Ladies* (London, 1692), p.96

<sup>451</sup> *Ibid.*, p.100

lengthy comparison of the difficulties faced by Mary to those of Elizabeth during the Armada crisis, and the conduct of both queens in response to the relative threats, concluding that Mary's situation during the summer of 1690 was far more precarious than Elizabeth's had been in 1558 due to factors including the infancy of the regime and the lack of an effective intelligence network. Both queens were praised as "equally good, and equally the Darlings of all good Men" but the article essentially found that "the Management of Q. Mary, yields nothing to that of Q. Elizabeth."<sup>452</sup> Similarly her former chaplain, Edward Fowler, in a pamphlet published shortly after her death also advocated Mary as a "Second Q. Elizabeth", praising her achievements during her regencies and almost blurring her gender by citing her "Manly Behaviour" when the French fleet was sighted off the English coast, and comparing her conduct during the crisis to both David at Ziklag and Elizabeth at Tilbury.<sup>453</sup>

Mary's capabilities were also praised in poetry. In his verse to the Queen celebrating William's victory in Ireland, Matthew Morgan portrayed Mary as Calphurnia to William's Caesar. Recognising their dual success, Caesar had defeated the Irish, but it was Calphurnia who had driven the French off the English coast.<sup>454</sup> Tate's poem marking her 1691 regency also referred to the French threat and praised her ability to manage in William's absence.

"Her Constancy can all Extreame support;  
Secure she treads the Labyrinths of State,  
Nor servilely on Fortunes Smiles does wait,  
But Present to her Self, Commands her Fate.  
Our Eagle Absent, she protects her Seat,  
Her Subject Brood from Gallick Vultures Threat;  
So Pallas can far-warring Mars supply,  
So Juno, Jove Absenting, Rules the Sky."<sup>455</sup>

---

<sup>452</sup> *Mercurius Reformatus or the New Observer*, 1 August 1690

<sup>453</sup> Edward Fowler, *Memoirs on the Life and Death of our Late Most Gracious Queen Mary* (London, 1712), pp. 4,12,20,21

<sup>454</sup> Matthew Morgan, *A Poem to the Queen Upon the King's Victory in Ireland and his Voyage to Holland* (London, 1691), p. 1

<sup>455</sup> Nahum Tate, *A Poem Occasioned by His Majesty's Voyage to Holland, the Congress at the Hague and the Present Siege of Mons* (London, 1691), p.13

In William's absence Mary had ensured the security of the throne, and using maternal imagery Tate presented her subjects, as her 'brood' whom Mary protected from the French. His comparison of her to Pallas Athena alluded to her wisdom and the courage she showed as regent, whilst as Juno she was represented as part of the triad of ancient Roman Gods who dominated Roman mythology. Significantly though, whilst these and other works praised her abilities as regent, they also effectively highlighted the temporary nature of Mary's authority. For example, Walsh compared Mary to aged Roman generals who temporarily came out of retirement to serve in the army when required, being content to relinquish their command once victory had been achieved.<sup>456</sup> Likewise, a poem of 1690 although praising Mary's regency, placed greater emphasis on its temporary nature and her relinquishment of power on William's return to England:

"How skilfully she wears a crown!  
How unconcerned she lays it down!"<sup>457</sup>

And Tate's 1691 poem also emphasised this point by reminding readers that whilst Mary can be constructed as Juno; Juno only ruled the skies during Jove's absence, as Mary only governed during the Eagle's absence. Hence, although these works celebrate Mary's queenship and her ability as regent they also sought to represent that power was still effectively located within William. In this context these works can also be interpreted as celebrations of the return to the normality of stable, male government, as abiding by the terms of the Regency Bill, Mary relinquished her authority upon William's return. Hence William's authority was perceived to be far superior to that of his wife.

The notion of William's power being superior to Mary's was visibly expressed in the medals cast to commemorate her regencies and other key events. For instance, the medal of 1690 portrays Mary as the moon amidst clouds and stars (fig. 3). The legend reads "VELVT . INTER . IGNES . LVNA . MINORES."; "As the moon amid the lesser lights." The lesser lights are represented by the stars, of which there are nine, alluding to the nine members of the cabinet council.<sup>458</sup> But more significant is the image of the moon; as the moon obtains its

---

<sup>456</sup> Walsh, *Dialogue Concerning Women*, pp.132-133

<sup>457</sup> *A Letter to Mr. Sheppard* (1690), in William J. Cameron ed. *PoAS*. Vol. 5 (London, 1971), p.109

<sup>458</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. I, pp. 704-705; Plate LXXVII. Nos. 6-8



light from the sun, so Mary obtained her light, namely her power, from William. And as the sun, William's light is more powerful than hers.



Fig. 3, Mary II Regency Medal, 1690

Similar imagery was adopted for a regency medal in 1693 which shows a globe illuminated by the sun on one side and the moon on the other, which again provides a clear message that Mary's power has come directly from William.<sup>459</sup> Another theme shown in medals reflects Burnet's comments above on her regencies; that Mary was an enabler of William's achievements in that she managed at home whilst he engaged as the arbiter of European affairs. Similarly a medal of 1692 commemorating the reuniting of Ireland shows William leading the figure of Hibernia by the hand towards figures of Anglia and Scotia who are standing by an empty chair, with the legend "REX AUGET REGINA TENET"; "The king

---

<sup>459</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, p.89; Plate XCIV. No.5

augments, the queen holds.”<sup>460</sup> This implies that it is William who has achieved this whilst Mary has held things together at home. Other medals portray her as preserving England in William’s absence. For instance a further regency medal of 1693 shows Mary holding a palm branch in one hand whilst her other hand rests on a rudder. The legend reads “HILARIS CLEMENTIA . CAVA POTESTAS.”; “Cheerful clemency and prudent government.”<sup>461</sup> Hence Mary is portrayed as prudently steering the ship of English government during William’s absence. The regency medal of 1691 however drew upon maternal imagery portraying Mary as a lioness with three cubs as a lion, namely William departs. The legend reads “TE ABSENTE TUEBOR.”; “I will protect them in your absence.”<sup>462</sup> The three cubs represent the three kingdoms and the imagery could not be clearer, placing Mary as the protective mother of her subjects. But a medal cast in 1691 to commemorate the pacification of Ireland constructs the balance of power between the dual monarchs in much more personal manner. Featuring two lions, the male in the foreground trampling on a prostrate hydra, the lioness behind him, half shielded from view, with a lap dog lying submissively before her; the legend relates to the pacification of Ireland but around the edge is inscribed “ET . REGNARE PARES, ET MIRE SE . INTER AMARE”; “Equal in governing and in the exceeding love they bear to each other.”<sup>463</sup> William is the male lion whilst Mary is almost shielded from view, and no longer regent, is now occupied by suitable feminine pastimes with her lapdog. Although the remark regarding their equality in government is clearly a fiction, the comment relating to their conjugal relationship presents an image that both William and Mary consistently promoted during their reign.

Perceptions of George’s role in Anne’s queenship provide mixed messages indicating that in the early eighteenth century there was still an element of uncertainty as to the position of a male consort of a regnant queen. Verses, tracts, and the condolatory poems and sermons marking George’s death in October 1708, exhibit three common areas for consideration. Building upon his role as Generalissimo and Lord High Admiral they place George in the traditionally masculine sphere of a military hero, praising him for his military achievements as a young man and in later life victories that he was not physically involved in. Secondly they also focus on his role as a husband, and celebrate his virtues as husband and consort. Finally there is a distinct focus on his royal blood and lineage. Contemporary accounts of

---

<sup>460</sup> *Ibid.*, p.50 Plate LXXXVIII. No. 9

<sup>461</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81

<sup>462</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2; Plate LXXXII. Nos., 1-3

<sup>463</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39; Plate LXXXVII. No. 4

Anne's reign and works published following George's death record his various military achievements in the Danish army in 1670's against the Swedes, and his later service with William in Ireland at the Battle of the Boyne.<sup>464</sup> Other writers expand this theme further. John Tribbechov in his *Funeral Sermon on the Death of his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark*, using the Second Book of Samuel as his text, compares George to Abner, cousin of Saul and commander in chief of Saul's army. Both Abner and George were princes from noble families; Abner was the Captain General of Israel whilst George was Generalissimo of all Anne's forces at land and sea; Abner was a successful military leader, and George had also demonstrated some military success as a young man.<sup>465</sup> But Abner had been an actively successful commander in chief, unlike George's roles as Generalissimo and Lord High Admiral. Hence a fiction emerges of George as a military hero that places him on a par with the leading military figures of the period.

During Anne's reign it was military and naval leaders such as Marlborough, Ormond and Rook who led campaigns and won great victories, but a fiction was perpetuated that also accredited George with a role in such ventures. Thus her reign was characterised by leading male figures; distinguished generals such as the duke of Marlborough, and key members of her administration such as Robert Harley and Sidney Godolphin. But George also had a key role, one that his position as Generalissimo and Lord High Admiral allowed him to achieve, and that is directly alluded to in a tract from early in Anne's reign, Joseph Gander's *The Glory of her Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, in the Royal Navy, and her Absolute Sovereignty as Empress of the Sea, Asserted and Vindicated*. Charles Beem has cited this work as evidence of the perception of Anne as an autonomous sovereign queen and indeed the title of the work certainly alludes to that conclusion.<sup>466</sup> However a closer examination of the tract, in particular the dedicatory epistles and congratulatory poem for the victory at Vigo Bay, offer a different interpretation and reveal George's centrality to his wife's sovereignty. Despite her 'sacred majesty' Gander's Anne is portrayed essentially within the boundaries of her

---

<sup>464</sup> D Sturmy, *A Sermon Preach'd, &c. October 31<sup>st</sup> 1708 on the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince* (London, 1708), p.11; *An Epitaph on the Same*, in *Poetical Reflexions, moral, comical, satirical, &c. on the vices and follies of the age* (London, 1708), p.19; Cockburn, *An Essay Upon the Propitious and Glorious Reign of our Gracious Sovereign Anne*, p. 13

<sup>465</sup> John Tribbechov, *A Funeral Sermon on the Death of his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark* (London, 1709), pp.12-13

<sup>466</sup> Beem, *Lioness Roared* pp. 129,230

gendered body rather than her sovereign body politic. Hence, in the dedicatory epistle to George Anne's role is that of wife whilst George is responsible for the defence of the realm.

“To you Great prince, the Muse must next apply,  
Joy of Her Soul, and Pleasure of Her Eye,  
Peerless in all Capacities of Life,  
The Best of Husbands to the Tender'st Wife  
Our Hopes at Sea, and our Defence at Land,  
Secur'd in both since you in both Command.”<sup>467</sup>

Acknowledging his authority as Generalissimo and Lord High Admiral George is accredited with upholding the security of the nation, whilst Anne as 'a tender wife' has no participation in this element of her queenship.<sup>468</sup> The notion of George as a commander further reinforces contemporary notions of conjugal power as the husband was deemed to command his wife. Gander then alludes to Anne's hereditary right as queen and continues "I'll sing her Claim, and Leave that Claim with you," so that George despite having no crown himself is the protector of her title, and thus implicitly of her 'Sacred Majesty'.<sup>469</sup> Gander repeated these themes in his congratulatory poem where he placed George as equal to his wife as they are both co-deliverers of the nation; Anne through her Stuart blood and George through the fiction of his military prowess.

“Till Providence had all our Wrongs in view,  
Saw our Deliverers rise in Her and You .....

“..... As on the Stuart's Throne a Stuart Sate,  
And Royalty Possess'd a Royal State”

Of course, it was the military prowess of Rook and Ormond that actually achieved the victory at Vigo Bay and the poem tacitly acknowledges this, but places Rook as merely George's "vicegerent" in that essentially he was exercising George's authority.<sup>470</sup> Hence Rook's

---

<sup>467</sup> Joseph Gander, *The Glory of her Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, in the Royal Navy and her Absolute Sovereignty as Empress at Sea* (London, 1703)

<sup>468</sup> The portrayal of George as a defender of the realm and of Anne's cause was also found in the poems celebrating Anne and George's visit to Oxford in 1702 and published in a pamphlet of verses, *The Queen's Famous Progress* (London, 1702), *London Gazette*, 27 August 1702, Issue 3840, and *Post Boy*, 17 September 1702, Issue 1147

<sup>469</sup> Gander, *The Glory of her Sacred Majesty Queen Anne*

<sup>470</sup> *Ibid.*; A *Congratulatory Poem Humbly Address'd to his Royal Highness Prince George Hereditary Prince of Denmark, Lord High Admiral of England, &c. On the Glorious Success of Her Majesty's Arms at Vigo*

military ability was transferred to George. The prince continues to feature prominently in the poem whilst Anne is hardly visible. Hence it is George who enabled the military victories of the reign, and as such engenders the fiction of the prince as a military hero. Furthermore, this places George within a suitably masculine sphere; an arena in which he cannot be eclipsed by his wife's sovereignty.

Gander's work also pointed to George's status as the queen's husband, a role that was the particular focus of the many sermons following his death in 1708. These sermons celebrated George as "the best of husbands," citing him as an example to the nation and praising him for his conjugal fidelity to the Queen.<sup>471</sup> Such sentiments very much echo those expressed in other contemporary accounts that comment upon Anne and George's marital relationship. But they also reflect the uniqueness of George's position as male consort by setting him apart as an exception to the rule. Furthermore they reflect the duality of Anne and George as their model of marriage is held up as an example not just to Anne's subjects but also to other rulers and their subjects.

"That there never did a happier Pair come together, who gave so good an example to all Her Majesties Subject, and to all other Princes and their Subjects in the World."<sup>472</sup>

But this praise of George's fidelity also demonstrates a blurring of gendered boundaries, as in contrast to his masculine portrayal as a military figure, the focus is transposed to the traditional feminine virtue of chastity. The sermons praise George for the traditional virtues of a consort, but of a female consort. Hence he is venerated for his "Sweetness of Disposition", his "mild and sweet Temper", and his virtue and piety.<sup>473</sup> His role as consort has undergone an element of emasculation that is suggestive of a shift in gendered perspectives.

---

<sup>471</sup> Sturmy, *A Sermon Preach'd*, p. 12; Giles Dent, *A Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of his Royal Highness prince George of Denmark* (London, 1708), p. 13; Thomas Knaggs, *The Excellency of a Good Name* (London, 1708), p.16; Tribbechov, *Funeral Sermon on the Death of his Royal Highness*, p.25; William Nicholls, *Afflictions, the lot of God's children* (London, 1709), p.15

<sup>472</sup> Tribbechov, *Funeral Sermon on the Death of his Royal Highness* p.25

<sup>473</sup> *Ibid.*, p.23; Knaggs, *The Excellency of a Good Name*, p.16

An area not defined by gender is George's blood. In an attempt to define George's status as informal consort and to accredit his position with an element of formality that set him apart from that of a mere subject the funeral sermons and condolatory poems stress his noble birth, emphasising his royal status. One sermon reminds its audience and readers of George's hereditary status as second son of Frederick III of Denmark, brother of Christian V and Uncle to Frederick IV, and that fitting his position he was given a princely education, whilst Tribbechov also citing his high birth described him as being "surrounded on all sides with Crowns", as a king's son, a king's brother and uncle to three living kings, in addition to being cousin to the Elector of Hanover, a king's son-in-law, a queen's husband, and crucially, if Gloucester had survived, the father of a king.<sup>474</sup> Ironically he was surrounded by crowns but did not have one of his own. This emphasis on his royal blood attempted to compensate for his lack of a crown and is a counter argument to his position as merely a subject. Indeed one poem published shortly after his death whilst stating George was a willing subject to the queen and England, also argued that he was "qualify'd to reign."<sup>475</sup> As with Philip of Spain in the mid sixteenth century, both George's royal blood and his gender made him eminently suitable as a ruler. Reflecting George's public persona, the same poem called for public grief as George's death was a very much a public loss.<sup>476</sup> This perception of George as a public figure was crucial in constructing him as an integral part of Anne's queenship. George was Anne's subject, but he was clearly perceived as something more.

### Part 3 – A Crown for the Queen's Husband?

The question of a male consort without a crown was something contemporaries struggled to negotiate, particularly for Philip of Spain, and to a lesser degree also for George of Denmark. Indeed, after Mary's marriage to Philip, and Anne's accession, there were some expectations that both men would be crowned, although these were much more evident for Philip than for George. Certainly the opinion in Europe and particularly amongst the Habsburgs was that Philip would be crowned, and the ambassadorial correspondence reveals that the Habsburgs

---

<sup>474</sup> Sturmy, *A Sermon Preach'd*, p.11; Tribbechov, *Funeral Sermon on the Death of his Royal Highness*, pp. 21-22

<sup>475</sup> *A Funeral Poem, Sacred to the Immortal Memory of his Royal Highness, Prince George of Denmark*, in *Poetical Reflexions, Moral, Comical, Satyrical, &c. On the Vices and Follies of the Age* (London, 1708), p.18

<sup>476</sup> *Ibid.*, p.16

and their allies clearly did not view the marriage treaty as a significant obstacle to this objective. After all the marriage treaty had already ensured that Philip had the title of king, so it would seem natural to expect a coronation to confirm this. Immediately after the wedding Renard wrote to Charles V regarding when Philip would leave England on business abroad; whether this should be before or after his coronation. And in September 1554 count Giovan Tommaso Langosco di Stroppiana confidently informed the Bishop of Arras that the matter of Philip's coronation was under consideration.<sup>477</sup> Likewise the correspondence between the Venetian ambassadors and the Doge and senate also reveals expectations of a coronation which they anticipated would be after Parliament had met in October.<sup>478</sup> Such assumptions were also evident in the pageantry at Philip and Mary's royal entry, particularly in the pageant depicting the figure of Wisdom bestowing a crown on Philip's head as well as Mary's.<sup>479</sup> Similarly, initial expectations occurred after Anne's accession with regard to George. In March 1702 in a letter to Sir John Verney concerning William's death and the queen's accession, Lady Gardiner referring to Anne's desire for George to be made commander of the allied forces in Europe, reported rumours that George would be crowned.

“... now tis said Princ Gorg will goe Generall but that he must first be Crown'd because the confederate Princis will not be governed by any but a crowned head.”<sup>480</sup>

George was not the only candidate for this post and other candidates included crowned heads of state, such as the King of Prussia, so Anne's proposition of George faced considerable competition from monarchs and military leaders. But crucially, Lady Gardiner's comments demonstrate that there was evidently talk in some circles of the prospect of a coronation for George. Foreign courts certainly envisaged that George would be crowned, as Lediard reports that at the Hague and in the German states, particularly Hanover, there was already a belief that Anne intended to propose to Parliament that George be crowned. And evidently there was some support for such a move in England as he attributes such a plan to the Tory party.<sup>481</sup> There is little other evidence for this Tory support, but the rumours and expectations were accompanied by the publication of a pamphlet in 1702, that cited contemporary notions

---

<sup>477</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp.4,52

<sup>478</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. V, p.564

<sup>479</sup> *Chronicle of Queen Jane*, pp.150-151

<sup>480</sup> Margaret Maria, Lady Verney, ed., *Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century from the MSS at Claydon House*, Vol. I (London, 1930), p.105

<sup>481</sup> Lediard, *Life of John, Duke of Marlborough*, p.136

about a wife's subjection to her husband to call for George to be crowned. The pamphlet argued that the nation was obliged to George for his services to England and the Protestant religion; ironically turning down the crown of Poland in his support of Protestantism, and now being without a crown in England. Therefore, the pamphlet demanded that "some Provision of Honour and Revenue" be made to George, also citing hopes of Anne's fecundity that George will once more be the father of the future king.<sup>482</sup> Despite his complaint that at Anne's accession "this Kingdom to see the Husband a Subject to his Wife", the author of the pamphlet was clearly aware of the balance between conjugal and political power in the case of a regnant queen and her male consort as he calls for George to be formally made an honorary king.

"That his Royal Highness may by Act of Parliament, be invested with the Honorary Title of King of England, &c. In Conjunction with her Majesty, your present Queen; Yet that the Administration of the Regal Power may be solely in her Majesty."

Looking back at precedents for married regnant queens and their husbands, he continued to propose more power and status for George. In addition to a call for financial settlement on the Prince, his "Third Motion" advocated that "the Administration of the Government to be in his Royal Highness, during his Life" should Anne die before him. This echoed the terms of the Bill of Rights that enabled William's continued kingship after Mary's death, and the call of some in the Parliament of November 1554 that if Mary I died without issue Philip should govern the realm as 'absolute sovereign'.<sup>483</sup>

The question of crowning a male consort was also manifested in considerable doubts and anxieties, particularly concerning Philip. Despite his initial optimism, Renard began to express doubts to the Emperor about the prospect of Philip's coronation as he reported English anxieties and complaints about foreigners, and a rumour that Mary planned to have Philip crowned by force if need be and deprive Elizabeth of her right of succession. Furthermore he now questioned whether the English would even allow Philip's coronation, "which is by no means certain", as they would argue that they have a crowned queen already,

---

<sup>482</sup> Anon., *A Letter to a Member of Parliament in Reference to his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark* (London, 1702), pp.1-3

<sup>483</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3



although significantly he adds that the situation would be different if Mary was pregnant.<sup>484</sup> And in October 1554 a Spanish gentleman who had accompanied Philip to England reported somewhat indignantly that the English “refuse to Crown our Prince” because they don’t recognise him as their king, instead seeing him as “one who has come to act as governor of the realm and get the queen with child.”<sup>485</sup> These comments can be viewed within the context of the terms of the marriage treaty, that Philip was to aid Mary with her task of governing the realm, which in addition to producing a Catholic heir, were the main reasons for the marriage. But the production of that heir also impacted upon the matter of Philip’s coronation. Philip’s status would have been significantly enhanced had he been father to the heir to the throne, and this is evident given the debates in Parliament over the matter of a regency if Mary died, as contemporaries believed that fathering a child would effectively remove any obstacles to a coronation. Hence once it was known that Mary was pregnant Renard’s correspondence with the Emperor was once again marked by eager anticipation for Philip’s coronation, as he reports that Mary was in agreement with his suggestion that she raise a proposal to have Philip crowned in the forthcoming Parliament, and later reporting that this was to be brought forward.<sup>486</sup> Certainly critics of Mary’s regime recognised the significance of the queen’s pregnancy, fearing that through a child, the crown could be transferred to the father.<sup>487</sup> Thus Mary’s pregnancy also increased anxieties over this issue.

English anxieties surrounding the possibility of a coronation for Philip are complex and are underscored by the insecurities caused by female rule and fears of foreign domination and tyranny. There was no precedent in England for the male consort of a regnant queen and as Mortimer Levine has argued it was felt that a coronation would alter Philip’s position significantly, to the extent that it would reconstruct him as an anointed king.<sup>488</sup> Charles V certainly recognised this alteration of position as he thought it would enable his son “to manage affairs in England with greater authority.” And Renard also considered “the prestige” Philip would derive from it, as he referred to the belief in England that “the coronation stands for a true and lawful confirmation of title, and much more here than in other realms.”<sup>489</sup> Consequently such a transformation presented the prospect that Philip could effectively

---

<sup>484</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp.49-51

<sup>485</sup> *Ibid.*, p.60-61

<sup>486</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 84

<sup>487</sup> *Certain Questions*, fol. Bii.r

<sup>488</sup> Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems*, p. 95

<sup>489</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp.95, 102

negate the terms of the marriage treaty and exercise power without reference to his wife. Placing this scenario directly within the context of fears over the foreign domination discussed above, there were concerns that he would place Habsburg interests before those of England, to the detriment of the realm. As the radical Protestant, Christopher Goodman, pointed out in his attack on Mary's regime:

“For do you think that Philip will be crowned kinge of England, and retheyne in honor Englishe counsellors?”<sup>490</sup>

The implication was clear, that if crowned, Philip would have the authority to flout the marriage treaty, as by replacing English councillors with Spaniards he would not only be appointing foreigners to office but also changing the laws and customs of the realm. Furthermore it was also believed that if Philip was crowned, he could continue to rule England after Mary's death, as expressed in the rumours noted above, effectively depriving Elizabeth of her rightful accession as queen.

The anonymous author of *Certayne Questions Demanded and Asked by the Noble Realm of Englande, of her True Naturall Chylidren and Subjects of the Same* portrayed Philip as a foreign tyrant who would stop at nothing to obtain the crown of England.<sup>491</sup> But to establish whether, and to what extent, Philip actually pushed for his coronation is problematic due to a lack of direct evidence, and as Judith Richards has pointed out the matter was debated mainly through “rumour and allegation.”<sup>492</sup> Anticipation and anxieties over the matter of his coronation continued after it became evident by the summer of 1555 that Mary was not pregnant. Indeed, the issue continued to be topical throughout 1555 and 1556. In November 1555 the Venetian ambassador reported that he'd been assured by “a person of quality” of Charles V's belief that Philip would soon be returning to England for a few weeks to satisfy Mary's request and “perhaps his coronation.” And in December reporting that “there are many persons of quality” who supported a coronation for Philip, but as with his earlier report this was not first-hand information, although he does state his source was “an Englishman”.<sup>493</sup> Rumours and unconfirmed reports continued with particular anxieties expressed amongst the Protestant, Marian exiles. For example a 1556 a letter to the reformer Henry Bullinger reported:

---

<sup>490</sup> Christopher Goodman, *How Superior Powers Oght to be Obey'd* (1558), p. 100

<sup>491</sup> *Certayne Questions*, fol.Bii. v-r

<sup>492</sup> Richards, ‘Mary Tudor as Sole Quene?’, p.919

<sup>493</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), pp. 253, 281

“... that the queen with some of the nobles of her party are using all their influence and endeavours to aggrandize Philip with the hereditary right of government, the royal crown, and other distinctions.”<sup>494</sup>

And it is considerably likely that *Certain Questions* was published as a direct result of these anxieties.

Such vociferously articulated anxieties were conspicuously absent with regard to George, although Lediard reports some considerable unease in Hanover over the report that Anne was planning to propose George's coronation to Parliament.<sup>495</sup> Such unease at the Hanoverian court was understandable given that the 1701 Act of Settlement had settled the succession upon the Hanoverian line in the event of Anne's death without heirs. Given the notion that a crown would transform a male consort into an anointed king, Hanoverian anxieties reflected those of English Protestants under Philip and Mary, as they clearly felt that such a move would enable George to rule as monarch after Anne's death, indeed, as William III as an anointed and crowned king had done after his wife's death. Clearly the notion that a coronation could transform a male consort's authority was still extant at the beginning of the eighteenth century. There is however, no evidence of any other anxieties concerning the issue of a coronation for George. Certainly fears of foreign domination were no longer considered pertinent. Unlike Philip, George's lack of foreign interest, having no kingdom of his own, confirmed Charles II's view of him as an eminently suitable male consort. Furthermore his adherence to the Protestant religion, as opposed to Philip's hard line Catholicism, a crowned George evidently did not pose such a substantial threat as to produce the anxieties that were extant in the mid sixteenth century.

Despite the expectations of coronations for Philip and George, they were not crowned. Their coronations did not materialise because neither Mary nor Anne raised the matter in Parliament, although both queens evidently considered the issue early in their reigns. A number of contributory factors lie behind the decision to not push for their consorts' coronations. For Mary Tudor fears of foreign domination and the changing political climate

---

<sup>494</sup> Robert Horn and Richard Chambers to Henry Bullinger, dated Frankfurt 1556, in H. Robinson, ed. *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Written During the Reigns of King Henry VII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary Chiefly From the Archives of Zurich* (Cambridge, 1846-1847), p.133

<sup>495</sup> Lediard, *Life of John, Duke of Marlborough*, p.136

were crucial. The optimism of her early reign had been superseded by her very public failure to produce an heir, religious persecution, and the growing threat of war with France. Certainly as Jennifer Loach has proposed, it is entirely credible that the concerns raised in Parliament during the debate over regency arrangements may have convinced Mary of the opposition to any move to grant Philip more power, and that any attempt to do so could jeopardise her own position.<sup>496</sup> In December 1555 the Venetian ambassador reported that if Mary had Philip crowned she would be fearful it would trigger a rebellion.<sup>497</sup> Certainly the discovery of Dudley's Conspiracy in 1556, which, with French help, aimed to depose Mary and replace her with Elizabeth, may be seen as a consequence of anxieties about the possibility of Philip's coronation.<sup>498</sup> Thus by not seeking to have Philip crowned Mary sought to avoid the risk of rebellion and maintain order within her realm. Furthermore there was no constitutional requirement to have a consort crowned. Mary's father, Henry VIII, only had the first two of his six wives crowned, whilst Mary's grandfather, Henry VII, only had his queen, Elizabeth of York, crowned after she had given birth to their first son, Arthur. Crucially, Philip had not provided Mary with an heir. For Anne there is little direct evidence as to why she did not have the issue raised in Parliament, although Gilbert Burnet records that:

“... it was not thought advisable to move for an act, that should take Prince George into a consortship of the regal dignity.”<sup>499</sup>

But Burnet gives no reasons for this decision, and we are left to conjecture. Unlike Philip, George had provided Anne and the nation with the much desired Protestant heir, although their only child to survive beyond infancy, the duke of Gloucester, had died before Anne's accession to the throne. On Gloucester's death George lost the political influence and position he would have had as father to the heir to the throne. Although fears of foreign domination were no longer the critical issue they had been in the mid sixteenth century, George was still a foreigner. But he had been formally naturalized in 1689. Another potential reason may have been his chronic ill health. Gregg, considering the Tory plan to have George crowned attributes the collapse of this plan to his illness and lack of physical stamina.<sup>500</sup> This may have been the case, but George's condition as a virtual invalid did not prevent him from

---

<sup>496</sup> Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, p. 172

<sup>497</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), p.281

<sup>498</sup> Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems*, pp. 95-96; Loades, *Mary Tudor* pp. 261-262

<sup>499</sup> Burnet, *History of his own Time*, p.125

<sup>500</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.162

being appointed as Generalissimo and Lord High Admiral. The most likely reason that George was not crowned lies in the terms of the Act of Settlement, as for Anne to have George crowned, or for her to have the matter raised in Parliament, essentially risked jeopardising the Hanoverian, Protestant succession.

For George, the lack of a crown did not present any significant difficulties. His lack of political ambition and his constant support for his wife contributed to his successful role as an unofficial consort. However Anne's push for certain offices and financial settlements for George indicate that his lack of royal dignity may have been problematic for her. In addition to his military and naval appointments, in December 1702 Anne pushed for a bill in Parliament to grant George an annual allowance of £100,000 if she died before him. Such a settlement in itself was not unusual, but the value of the settlement caused considerable comment as it was double the jointure awarded to any previous consort.<sup>501</sup> Was Anne attempting to compensate George for his lack of a crown? Gilbert Burnet saw her push for the settlement in this light, as he stated "it became her, as a good wife, to have the act passed."<sup>502</sup> His lack of a crown may have also caused some confusion amongst contemporaries over how George should be portrayed, and as seen in the eulogies and funeral sermons discussed above, attempts were made to compensate for his lack of royal dignity. This can even be seen as having been officially endorsed as the poet laureate, Nahum Tate, writing on George's death constructed George as not having needed a material crown, as he was instead "with ANNA's Love is crow'd."<sup>503</sup> For Philip and Mary, Philip's lack of a coronation was far more problematic and clearly caused elements of tension between the couple. This is most clearly seen during Philip's absence from England and Mary's requests for him to return, when both king and queen used the prospect of his coronation as a bargaining tool for their own political objectives. Indeed, David Loades has argued that during 1555 and 1556 Philip exerted particular pressure upon Mary to have him crowned.<sup>504</sup> Understandably, as an independent ruler in his own dominions Philip clearly felt frustrated by the constraints placed on him in England. In October 1555 the Venetian ambassador recorded a letter Philip has sent to Mary expressing these frustrations at his position:

---

<sup>501</sup> *Ibid.*, p.166, *Verney Letters*, p.121, Burnet, *History of his own Time*, pp.124-125

<sup>502</sup> Burnet, *History of his own Time*, p.125

<sup>503</sup> Nahum Tate, *A Congratulatory Poem to his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark Lord High Admiral of Great Britain Upon the Successes at Sea* (London, 1708), p.7

<sup>504</sup> Loades, 'Philip II and the Government of England', p. 180

“... 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, though with her counsel and that of her councillors; he instancing the following particular, that as in Spain, and at present here, he has ruled absolutely in all things, it would seem strange for him to go back without sharing the government of England with her.”<sup>505</sup>

Given Philip’s frustrations, and Imperial hopes of his coronation, it appears that Mary used the prospect of a coronation as a strategy in her attempts to persuade Philip to return to England. As discussed above, Philip’s absence presented Mary with particular problems associated with female government. Furthermore without a husband by her side she could no longer define herself as a dutiful wife, and crucially without Philip there was no prospect of her conceiving a child and providing England with the Catholic heir she longed for. As with Anne in 1702 the balance between conjugal and political power required her to present herself as a loving and dutiful wife. Any failure to maintain this representation would leave her, and consequently her queenship, liable to criticism. As was the case in March 1556 when a member of Philip’s council arguing that his master had little reason to gratify Mary’s request to return to England as the queen has “shown but little conjugal affection for him, and that little can be hoped from her.”<sup>506</sup> In this context for contemporaries, the matter of having Philip crowned becomes intrinsically bound up with Mary’s conjugal duty to her husband. Thus by not having Philip crowned, or for that matter having a successful pregnancy, Mary can no longer be viewed as the loving and dutiful wife she presented herself as. To negotiate this negative perception and also to avoid the very real risk of a rebellion Mary had to achieve a fine balance. Consequently she neither emphatically ruled out his coronation, but neither did she actively seek to pursue it.

#### **Part 4 – Failed Maternity: The Quest for an Heir**

Mary Tudor experienced two unsuccessful ‘pregnancies’ during her reign: in 1554-1555, and 1558, although given her age and the failure of the first pregnancy, little credence was given

---

<sup>505</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI, (I) p. 212

<sup>506</sup> *Ibid.*, p.376

to Mary's belief in 1558 that she had indeed conceived. In 1554 however, the situation was considerably different, with the arrival of the heir eagerly anticipated, and the outcome of the pregnancy crucial for Mary's queenship, and on a more personal level, for Mary as a woman. Following much speculation and rumour, by November 1554, Mary believed that she was pregnant.<sup>507</sup> This pregnancy was highly significant for a number of reasons. A child would secure the succession, and in addition, the future of the Catholic Church in England. In this context it would have been seen as a sign that Mary's marriage had been sanctioned by God for the benefit of the realm, a point envisaged by Pole, who, in his speech to Parliament in November 1554 stated:

“.. as it was a singular fauour of God to conioyn them in maryage: so it is not to be doubted that he shall send them issue, for the comfort and surety of thys common welth.”<sup>508</sup>

The notion that the queen's pregnancy justified her marriage to Philip was readily taken up by contemporaries. Addressed to a popular audience, the anonymous author of a broadside ballad celebrating the pregnancy expressed this view quite clearly:

“Our doutes be dyssolued, our fansies contented,  
The marriage is ioyfull that many lamented;  
And suche as enuied, like foles haue repented  
The Errours & Terrours that they have inuented.”<sup>509</sup>

For the Marian regime, continuation of the Catholic succession was crucial. The pregnancy engendered a sense of optimism amongst the regime's supporters, that the expected heir would resolve the dynastic and religious tensions that had existed in England. Philip's confidant, Ruy Gomez de Silva, asserted that the pregnancy would “put a stop to every difficulty,” whilst Renard was more direct, stating that it would settle disputes and put an end to “the thorny question of the succession.”<sup>510</sup> The matter of the succession was also referred to in the ballad mentioned above, as the author pointed to the anxiety felt by many over the uncertainties of the situation in recent years:

---

<sup>507</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp. 51, 65

<sup>508</sup> Foxe, *Acts and Monuments [...]* (1576 Edition), [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield). Available from <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>. [Accessed: 23.07.08]

<sup>509</sup> Anon., *Nowe singe, nowe springe, oure care is exil'd, Oure virtuous Quene is quickened with child*, in Rollins, ed. *Old English Ballads 1553-1625*, pp.21

<sup>510</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp. 60,65

“Howe manie good people were longe in dispaire  
That this letel england shold lacke a right heire”<sup>511</sup>

Indeed Mary and Philip’s child would be the ‘right heire’ in many respects. Firstly, there should be no doubts over the child’s legitimacy, secondly, the child would be the right religion, and thirdly, the right gender, as the ballad concludes by expressing hopes of the birth of a prince.<sup>512</sup> In addition to these expectations, the pregnancy was of further significance because it indicated a restoration of traditional gendered roles, with Mary’s natural, female body fulfilling its deemed biological function of pregnancy and childbirth. Carole Levin goes so far as to speculate that this restoration of gender order was more important than securing the Catholic succession in England.<sup>513</sup>

At Easter 1555, Mary withdrew to her apartments at Hampton Court to await the birth of her child which was expected early May. But as time went on there was no sign of her going into labour. Anticipation grew and rumours began to be circulated, including a false alarm at the end of April that Mary had given birth to a son. The reaction to this news is testament to just how important the birth of Mary’s child was to the nation. There were scenes of great rejoicing in London, Te Deums were sung, bells were rung and bonfires lit across the city.<sup>514</sup> But there was no child, and the ‘pregnancy’ continued with speculation over when the baby was due. By the end of May and into June doubts began to be expressed over whether Mary was indeed pregnant. At the end of May the Venetian ambassador commented that there was still no sign of the child, and on the 8th June Ruy Gomez de Silva recorded that he doubted whether Mary was pregnant.<sup>515</sup> The Imperial ambassador, Renard, was keen to refute such doubts, pointing to Mary’s expanded stomach and the “state of her breasts”, but even he had to admit by July that doubts existed.<sup>516</sup>

The delay of the child’s arrival and the uncertainties surrounding it were substantially unsettling. The Venetian ambassador astutely noted that the prolonged pregnancy was causing much comment, with the matter being interpreted differently depending on individual

---

<sup>511</sup> *Nowe singe, nowe springe, oure care is exil’d*, p. 20

<sup>512</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22

<sup>513</sup> Carole Levin, ‘Queens and Claimants: Political Insecurity in Sixteenth Century England’, in Janet Sharistanian ed. *Gender, Ideology and Action: Historical Perspectives on Women’s Public Lives* (London, 1986), p.52

<sup>514</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.169; *Diary of Henry Machyn*, p.86

<sup>515</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI, (1), p.84; *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.222

<sup>516</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, pp.226,236



allegiances.<sup>517</sup> Typically, Protestant opponents of the regime exploited the situation, making slanderous allegations and spreading rumours, in particular that Mary was not pregnant at all and was instead planning to impose a suppositious child upon the nation.<sup>518</sup> Foxe fanned the flames of this allegation, recording that a woman named Isobel Malt, who had given birth to a son at this time, claimed that she was approached by two lords requesting that she gave up her son to them; the implication being that this child would be passed off as Mary's own.<sup>519</sup> Equally worrying were the rumours alleging Edward VI was still alive. At the end of May the Venetian ambassador reported two cases of young men claiming to be Edward, one of whom was given enough credence by some that he succeeded in raising "a tumult amongst the populace".<sup>520</sup> It is difficult to quantify the extent to which to which these imposters were actually believed to be the late king, but their very existence is testimony to the anxieties caused by the uncertainties of Mary's prolonged pregnancy and the rumours that she may not even be pregnant. More seriously, as Levin has argued, the belief that Edward was alive was a direct challenge to Mary's legitimacy, as if this was the case then Mary could not claim to be queen.<sup>521</sup>

By the end of July it was clear to all there was no child, and on 3<sup>rd</sup> August Philip and Mary left Hampton Court for the smaller residence of Oatlands. There was no official announcement regarding the failure of the pregnancy, but the move subtly ensured the dismissal of nurses and ladies who had attended the queen at Hampton Court, as there was no room for such a large retinue at Oatlands. It also ended the many processions and prayers for the queen's safe delivery. The subtlety of this move was noted by the Venetian ambassador who saw it as a method of communicating the failure of the pregnancy "without any scandal."<sup>522</sup> The failure of her pregnancy was deeply painful and humiliating for Mary and affected her as both woman and queen. John Edwards points to the desperate sadness she felt at her inability conceive; the survival of her prayer book with the pages containing a prayer for the safe delivery of women in childbirth, stained and worn, is testimony to this.<sup>523</sup> It appears that Mary may have suffered from a phantom pregnancy or pseudocyesis, or an underlying medical condition such as a tumour of the pituitary gland, but as Edwards notes, it

---

<sup>517</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), p.120

<sup>518</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.224

<sup>519</sup> Foxe, *Acts and Monuments [...]* (1583 edition) [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield). Available from: <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe>. [Accessed]

<sup>520</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), p.85

<sup>521</sup> Levin, 'Queens and Claimants in Sixteenth Century England', p.51

<sup>522</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI (I), p.147

<sup>523</sup> Edwards, *Mary Tudor*, p.266; Whitelock, *Mary Tudor*, p.258

is difficult to form a diagnosis from sixteenth century accounts of symptoms.<sup>524</sup> The failure of a pregnancy was not unique to Mary and it is noteworthy that there were other instances of supposed pseudocyesis amongst high profile women in this period, including Anne Boleyn in 1534, and Lady Lisle, wife of the governor of Calais, in 1536 and 1538. Indeed, Sir John Dewhurst has argued that contemporary notions that women's primary function was to procreate, combined with superstition and ignorance surrounding pregnancy and childbirth, made phantom pregnancies relatively common. Certainly for queens, the intense political and dynastic pressure to provide an heir might have caused pseudocyesis.<sup>525</sup> By January 1558 Mary once again believed she was pregnant, but this was given little credence at home, or abroad. In March 1558, Count Feria informed Philip that Mary was clearly deluded about this 'pregnancy', "making herself believe that she is with child, although she does not own up to it."<sup>526</sup> And by April, even Mary had to admit that she was not pregnant.

The failure of her natural body to fulfil its maternal function had consequences for Mary's queenship. Following August 1555 there appears to have been a shift in perceptions of Mary's authority. Indeed, Glyn Redworth has asserted that the queen's failure to have a child ensured that Mary was seen as less capable of imposing her will.<sup>527</sup> The most obvious underlying factor was the issue of the succession. Unquestionably Mary's failure to have a child strengthened Elizabeth's position as heiress presumptive, placing a greater focus on her at home and abroad. As early as September 1555 an emissary of the King of the Romans noted:

"As there is no hope of fruit from the English marriage, discussions are going on everywhere about the consort to be given to Elizabeth, who is and will continue to be lawful heir unless the King and Queen have issue."<sup>528</sup>

This understandable focus on Elizabeth continued and in the spring of 1558 an incident occurred that also suggests Mary's authority had been diminished. The ambassador of the King of Sweden arrived in England to negotiate a marriage between Elizabeth and the Prince of Sweden. Rather than requesting an audience with the queen to discuss the matter first, the ambassador went straight to Elizabeth with his letters.<sup>529</sup> A further noteworthy indicator is the

---

<sup>524</sup> Edwards, *Mary Tudor*, pp.268-269; Sir John Dewhurst, 'Royal Pseudocyesis', *History of Medicine*, 8 (1980), p.12

<sup>525</sup> Dewhurst, 'Royal Pseudocyesis', pp.12,17; Richards, *Mary Tudor*, p.178

<sup>526</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.367; Edwards, *Mary Tudor*, pp.319-320

<sup>527</sup> Redworth, 'Matters Impertinent to Women', p.603

<sup>528</sup> *CSP Spanish*, Vol. XIII, p.251

<sup>529</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 379; Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, p. 518

reversal of Philip and Mary's authority as depicted in Plea Rolls of the reign.<sup>530</sup> The first instance of Philip appearing in the dominant position on Mary's right hand side occurred after her failed pregnancy. Furthermore, in 1557, the former Venetian ambassador also asserted that Mary's authority had been diminished as a result of her failure to bear a child.

Commenting on Mary's distress that nobody believed she was able to conceive he continued:

“.. so that day by day she sees her authority and the respect induced by it diminish, nor is to be told how much hurt that vain pregnancy (quella vana gravidansa) did her.”<sup>531</sup>

In addition to the impact of her failed fecundity upon her personal monarchical authority, Mary's failure to have a child clearly threatened the future of the Catholic Church in England, as the 'Protestant' Elizabeth was unlikely to continue with the Marian regime's religious policy. Furthermore, it placed additional strain on her marriage to Philip, which was already subject to tensions regarding the prospect of Philip's coronation. The failure of Mary's pregnancy was first and foremost a failure of her natural, female body, but if considered within the context of the king's two bodies, it had considerable impact upon the body politic.

The situation was significantly different for Mary II and Anne. Neither of these queens experienced pregnancy during their reigns. Mary II's only pregnancies occurred eleven years before her accession to the English throne. Aged 15 when she married William in November 1677, Mary was pregnant by early 1678 but suffered a miscarriage in April which was attributed to a lengthy and uncomfortable coach journey from The Hague to Breda. The nature of the miscarriage combined with a lack of skilled physicians at Breda ensured a slow recovery.<sup>532</sup> Despite this setback Mary was pregnant again later that year. Writing to her friend, Frances Apsley, on 9<sup>th</sup> August, and begging that Frances kept her news a secret, she disclosed that she was 6 or 7 weeks pregnant.<sup>533</sup> By the end of September the pregnancy was common knowledge and her father wrote to her expressing his hopes that she would go full term, advising her to look after herself and not stand too much as it was not good for pregnant women.<sup>534</sup> Preparations were going ahead for the birth, but the child that was expected in

---

<sup>530</sup> See Chapter 3, p. 137

<sup>531</sup> *CSP Venetian*, Vol. VI, (II), p.1060

<sup>532</sup> Elizabeth Hamilton, *William's Mary* (London, 1972), pp.37-68; Hester, W. Chapman, *Mary II: Queen of England* (London, 1953), p.92; Waller, *Ungrateful Daughters*, p.105

<sup>533</sup> Benjamin Bathurst, ed. *Letters of Two Queens* (London, 1924), pp. 91-92

<sup>534</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. II, pp.201-202

spring 1679 failed to materialise. It is not clear whether Mary had suffered another miscarriage or a phantom pregnancy. Elizabeth Hamilton speculates that an illness Mary suffered in the autumn of 1678 may have been a miscarriage, or produced the symptoms of pregnancy, but concludes that the severity of her earlier miscarriage at Breda had permanently damaged Mary's reproductive health, whilst Dewhurst considers this may have been an episode of pseudocyesis.<sup>535</sup>

Once Mary became queen in 1689 a number of ballads and poems expressed hopes of her fecundity, indicating some level of optimism amongst the general populace, but Mary did not conceive again.<sup>536</sup> In striking contrast to the situation in Mary Tudor's reign, Mary II's lack of fecundity did not present a major problem for the regime. The 1689 Bill of Rights that defined William and Mary's position as dual monarchs, also provided for the Protestant succession by bestowing the crown on Anne and the heirs of her body, failing issue of William and Mary.<sup>537</sup> And Anne was pregnant at William and Mary's accession, giving birth to her son, William, duke of Gloucester later that year. Thus Mary's childlessness was to a great extent compensated for by Anne's very obvious fecundity. Indeed, Gloucester was the result of Anne's seventh pregnancy and she continued to conceive regularly until her last pregnancy in 1700. Considering this impressive level of fertility, Toni Bowers points to Anne's maternal body representing the hopes of Protestant England.<sup>538</sup> The repeated pregnancies were certainly noteworthy amongst contemporaries, as one account referred to her as "the teeming princess of Denmark."<sup>539</sup>

Ironically, despite all these pregnancies Anne ascended the throne childless. Throughout the course of her marriage she endured 17 pregnancies. Shortly after the marriage she gave birth to a stillborn daughter. Two other daughters were born in 1685 and 1686 but both died of smallpox in 1687, and Anne then suffered three miscarriages before the birth of Gloucester in 1689. Following this were a daughter and son who both died within a day of their birth, and then eight further pregnancies, none of which resulted in a living child.<sup>540</sup> In a marked

---

<sup>535</sup> Hamilton, *William's Mary*, pp.81-82; Dewhurst, 'Royal Pseudocyesis', p.14; John Van der Kiste, *William and Mary* (Stroud, 2003), pp.58-59

<sup>536</sup> See Chapter 4, pp. 215-218

<sup>537</sup> An act declaring the rights and liberties of the subject and settling the succession of the crown, in *English Historical Documents*, Vol. VIII, p.124

<sup>538</sup> Toni Bowers, *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture 1680-1760* (Cambridge, 1996), p.44

<sup>539</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45

<sup>540</sup> H.E. Emson, 'For the Want of an Heir: The Obstetrical History of Queen Anne', *British Medical Journal*, 304, (1992), p. 1365

similarity to both Mary Tudor and Mary II it also appears that one of these pregnancies, in 1695, was instead, a case of pseudocyesis. The diarist, John Evelyn, noted that “after greater expectation”, Anne was not pregnant after all.<sup>541</sup> Gloucester’s death and Anne’s final unsuccessful pregnancy in 1700 ensured that she ascended the throne childless. As with Mary II though, hopes of Anne’s fecundity were expressed at her accession in 1702. One celebratory poem optimistically anticipates “a goodly Race of Kings” and a “Royal Boy” for the nation.<sup>542</sup> In 1702 the earl of Marchmont wrote to Anne praying that she would soon have a son, and the House of Commons also expressed their hopes that the queen would soon be blessed with “royal issue.”<sup>543</sup> Aged 37 at her accession, and considering her obstetric record and poor health, such hopes of Anne’s natural womanly body appear to be nothing more than wishful thinking, but nonetheless they are revealing. Although the Protestant succession had already been provided for by the 1701 Act of Settlement, a child of Anne’s body would have further ruled out the claims of her half-brother, who had been acknowledged as James III by Louis XIV of France following James II’s death. George’s death in October 1708 once again raised the issue of Anne’s potential fecundity, as in 1709, Parliament petitioned the still grieving queen not to rule out the prospect of a second marriage.<sup>544</sup> Yet closer consideration of the political situation reveals Parliament’s address to be a strategy to deter political factions favourable to inviting Sophia of Hanover or her son, the electoral prince, to England rather than realistic hopes that Anne would indeed consider remarriage.<sup>545</sup> Anne did not remarry and the Act of Settlement ensured the accession of the male, and Protestant, George I, in 1714. Hence legislation rather than Anne’s womb ensured the accession of England’s next Protestant monarch.

In 1554 the phenomenon of a female ruler with a male consort was without precedent in England. Furthermore, given contemporary beliefs that a wife should be in subjection to her husband, it was a phenomenon that was strange and unsettling. Not only did this represent an inversion of traditional gendered roles, it also provoked considerable anxieties about foreign domination and tyranny. By 1702 fears of foreign domination amongst the English political

---

<sup>541</sup> *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. V, p.213; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.106; Somerset, *Queen Anne*, pp. 150-151

<sup>542</sup> Anon., *The Church of England’s Joy on the Happy Accession of her most Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, to the Throne* (London, 1702), pp.7-8

<sup>543</sup> Bowers, *Politics of Motherhood*, p.39

<sup>544</sup> ‘House of Lords Journal Volume 18: 27 January 1709’, *Journal of the House of Lords: volume 18: 1705-1709* (1767-1830), pp. 619-621. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=29701> Date accessed: 19 April 2011

<sup>545</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.285; Bowers, *Politics of Motherhood*, pp.39-40

nation had been superseded by the need to ensure the continuation of Protestant government. There was however, still an underlying belief that for a married woman to exercise headship over her husband was unusual and unnatural. Legislative attempts to negotiate the issues presented by married regnant queens and their consorts were not always successful in achieving the desired objectives, and in some cases created further problems. In 1554 the act for the Queen's Regal Power and the articles of the marriage treaty sought to define Mary Tudor's sovereign authority and protect England from the perceived threat of tyranny and domination by a foreign power. But although seeking to constrain Philip's influence in England the marriage treaty made his position even more ambiguous as it constructed him in name, as a king. Furthermore by legally giving Philip the right to assist Mary with her task of government, the treaty provided him with an opportunity for political influence. The legislative measures of 1689 defined male and female power, but in placing administrative power solely in William the Bill of Rights created a problem when he was required to leave England. The 1690 Regency Bill thus once again brought gendered issues to the forefront of political debate with the need to reconcile William's superior power with Mary's exercise of monarchical power as regent.

The problematic nature of a regnant queen and a male consort is most evident amongst contemporary perceptions of the balance between conjugal and political power. Hence the mixed messages in the ceremonial representations of Philip and Mary are reflected in the reports of divided loyalties, of factions supporting either the king or the queen, and the perceived preference of strong male government. Philip also fulfilled crucial masculine roles that Mary was excluded from because of her gender, in particular his military role in the war against France, and his introduction and participation in tournaments displaying his royal prowess. Such roles enhanced contemporary perceptions of Philip's authority. During Mary II's regencies, despite contemporary acknowledgment of her skilful handling of major crises, she was perceived as less powerful than William. In addition, the notion that her power was only temporary and her relinquishment of government on William's return to England ensured she was no threat to the culturally dominant notion of patriarchy. Perceptions of Anne and George, although different from Philip and Mary, do however exhibit some similarities, particularly in the belief of George as enabling Anne's queenship. For example Pole recognised Philip's role in enabling the restoration of England to Rome, whilst George was perceived as a conduit for Anne's power, effectively bringing about military and naval successes. Although in George's case, as a virtual invalid, this was clearly a fiction it

remained a necessary one. In the early eighteenth century there was still a perceived need for a male consort to be presented as the enabler of his wife's power.

Further problems existed for Mary Tudor and Anne as both had to negotiate the tensions between their representation as loving and dutiful wives versus ruling queens. Mary Tudor was faced with Philip's absences abroad and the expectations that she would have him crowned. Similarly for Anne, this was also manifested in the in the question of a coronation, and her push for offices and financial settlements upon George. Failed maternity presented its own range of issues. Whilst all three queens died childless, the consequences of this infertility for their reigns differed. Mary Tudor's inability to produce an heir was of far greater significance than it was for her successor queens as it diminished her authority and jeopardised the Catholic succession in England. By the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the changed religious climate – especially the establishment of a Protestant succession – and changes to the political landscape signalled by the emergence of party politics significantly reduced the impact of Mary II's lack of fecundity and Anne's failure to provide a surviving heir upon the body politic.

Queenship and the office of a regnant queen had evolved since Mary Tudor's accession in 1553. But as we have seen the balance between conjugal and political power remained eminently problematic and required negotiation according to the discrete political circumstances of each queen and her husband.

## 4

# Representation and the Manipulation of Identity

---

“Huzza to the King and his delicate mate!  
She was a most lovely princess of late,  
But now a contemptible object of state  
A dainty fine Queen indeed.  
O’ th’ father’s side she had honor we grant,  
But duty to parents she sadly doth want,  
Which makes her fiend instead of a saint.  
A dainty, &c.....  
If fraud and ambition, lust, falsehood, and pride  
And a swarm of unnatural vices beside  
Be sanctified in the offspring of Hyde,  
A dainty, &c.”<sup>546</sup>

For Ralph Gray, the author of a popular Jacobite ballad attacking the new regime of William and Mary in 1689, issues around filial duty, unnatural behaviour and genealogy were central to his criticism of the queen. The same key themes appeared repeatedly in Jacobite polemic early in the dual monarchs’ reign and were also employed to criticise Mary’s younger sister, the future queen Anne. Indeed both the very nature of Mary’s accession and the prevailing patriarchal beliefs of the period ensured that supporters of the deposed James II had plentiful material for polemical publications, an issue already anticipated during the debates of the Convention Parliament following the Glorious Revolution.<sup>547</sup> For critics of the new regime,

---

<sup>546</sup> Ralph Gray, *The Coronation Ballad, 11<sup>th</sup> April 1689*, in *PoAS*, Vol. 5, pp. 44-45. According to Narcissus Luttrell’s account, in November 1689, Gray was convicted of writing and publishing “a most villainous libel upon the king and queen and their government” and was sentenced to stand in the pillory and fined; Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, Vol. I, p. 606

<sup>547</sup> *Reasons humbly offer’d for placing his Highness the Prince of Orange singly, in the Throne, during Life*, in *CSP, Domestic Series, James II, Vol.III*, p. 391. The author of this pamphlet argued that making Mary a consort



Mary, having taken her father's throne whilst he was still alive, had broken the fifth commandment and violated patriarchal beliefs, betraying her father and lawful king. As a result they considered her to be an unnatural daughter. This allowed critics such as Gray to construct her as an ungodly "fiend" as opposed to the saintly, pious queen that the Williamite regime portrayed her as. However, the concept of a regnant queen's unnaturalness was not solely the preserve of Jacobite polemics. During the sixteenth century radical Protestants, including John Knox and Christopher Goodman, had based their attacks on Mary Tudor on beliefs that female rule was itself both unnatural and ungodly, and that furthermore, Mary was a Catholic tyrant who, through her marriage to Philip of Spain had effectively delivered her realm into the hands of a foreign power. Similarly, critics of the Marian regime also utilised notions about hereditary blood right to reinforce their argument that Mary's rule was both unnatural and unlawful. Indeed, as argued in an earlier chapter, blood was used as a key mechanism to achieve the political and religious objectives of both supporters and opponents of regimes. The first part of this chapter will analyse how critics of Mary I and Mary II used notions of unnaturalness and tainted blood to manipulate the identities of these queens, constructing them as unnatural, unlawful, ungodly and monstrous in attempts to undermine their queenship. It will also consider that by Anne's accession in 1702, although such notions of the queen's unnaturalness had diminished, notions of hereditary blood right and legitimacy were still extant and used by opponents of her regime to question her right to the throne.

Whilst opponents of these queens manipulated their monarchical identities in order to undermine their queenship, supporters of the regimes, and indeed the queens themselves, chose traditional gendered models to represent their authority and to respond to opponents' polemic. As discussed in Chapter One, following Mary Tudor's accession in 1553, three key themes emerged early in the reign that have been identified as a tool of reassurance given Mary's unprecedented position as England's first regnant queen.<sup>548</sup> Firstly, and in direct opposition to critics of female rule, Mary was portrayed as a restorer of good order. Secondly there was a distinct focus on the divine nature of her queenship, which was reinforced by the third theme of Mary's traditional feminine qualities of piety and chastity. These themes developed in various ways during Mary's reign in response to the changing political situation, and directly related to the queen's marital status. For example, representations of Mary as a

---

as opposed to a queen regnant would protect her from Catholic accusations that she has usurped her father's throne.

<sup>548</sup> See Chapter 1, p. 28

virgin were particularly relevant and popular prior to her marriage, but following her wedding in July 1554 their relevance diminished. Although by 1689 female rule was no longer the unprecedented phenomenon it had been in 1553, similar themes can be found in the representations of Mary II, with particular emphasis placed upon contemporary notions of femininity, piety, wifely duty and maternal imagery. Likewise in the early eighteenth century, notions of femininity and motherhood were central to representations of Anne. The second part of this chapter will analyse these positive representations of queenly identities and consider how they developed across the period in response to the changing political environment. It will also consider how comparisons of Mary Tudor, Mary II and Anne to Biblical governors, historical queens, and classical figures enabled the construction of a Godly archetype of queenship that was in stark contrast to the ungodly and unnatural portrayals presented by radical Protestants and Jacobites.

Central to any consideration of how early modern regnant queenship was represented is the development and expansion of the political nation across the period. In the mid-sixteenth century the radical Protestant polemics that attacked Mary Tudor were essentially the preserve of an educated political and religious elite, whereas by the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, a far greater popular political consciousness prevailed. Major contributory factors in this expansion of the public sphere were the significant political events and upheavals of the seventeenth century, including the political lobbying and mass petitioning of the 1640s, the Civil War, the Interregnum, Restoration, the Exclusion Crisis and the Glorious Revolution. Indeed, in their reassessment of the public sphere, Lake and Pincus argue this period was crucial to the development of the public sphere in England, as the rapid growth and circulation of printed polemic and propaganda ensured that debates that had previously been restricted to educated elites moved into the public domain.<sup>549</sup> Greatly enabled by ineffective licensing laws, this process continued during the Glorious Revolution, with the publication of vast numbers of affordable, popular pamphlets, broadsides and satires that engendered a heightened sense of public political debate.<sup>550</sup> Greater public engagement with political events and the establishment of annual parliaments from 1689 resulted in a shift away from the court as a centre of political focus. And by Anne's reign popular political

---

<sup>549</sup> Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 2 (2006), pp.279-280; Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 418-419

<sup>550</sup> Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy 1685-1720* (London, 2006), pp. 313-314; Lois Schwoerer, 'Propaganda in the revolution of 1688-1689', *American Historical Review*, 82, 4 (1977), pp. 857-858; Lake and Pincus, 'Rethinking the public Sphere', pp. 282-284

engagement was a marked feature of the extended public sphere.<sup>551</sup> The rise in political consciousness across the seventeenth and into the eighteenth centuries is reflected in the vast array of pamphlet literature and ballads from this period that were used as a medium for the manipulation and representation of queenly identities.

## **Part 1 - Unnatural, Unlawful, Ungodly and Monstrous: The Manipulation of Queenly Identities**

As demonstrated in Chapter One, in the sixteenth century, female rule was perceived by many as being against both divine and natural law. Mary Tudor's accession in 1553 set in motion a substantial debate over the issue of gynaecocracy that continued throughout the sixteenth century, and was voiced most vociferously by radical Protestant reformers in their attacks on Mary and her Catholic regime.<sup>552</sup> One of the most well known of these critics was the Scottish reformer, John Knox, whose *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* was central to the gynaecocracy debate. Written during Mary's reign, and reinforcing his case with Biblical and Aristotelian examples, Knox argued that female rule was ungodly and unnatural, a reversal of natural order:

“To promote a woman to beare rule, superioritie, dominion or empire above any realme, nation, or citie, is repugnant to nature, contumelie to God, a thing most contrarious to his reuled will and approued ordinance, and finallie it is the subuersion of good order, of all equitie and justice.”<sup>553</sup>

In accordance with the creation, and reconfirmed by the teachings of St Paul, women were subject to men; they should remain silent in the congregation and not “usurp authoritie above man.”<sup>554</sup> Furthermore, being naturally weaker than men, women were unsuitable as governors. Aristotle had held that women were essentially imperfect men, deformities of

---

<sup>551</sup> Somerset, *Queen Anne*, pp.198-199; Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed*, pp. 317-318

<sup>552</sup> An comprehensive overview of the gynaecocracy debate in the sixteenth century is provided by Amanda Shephard, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth Century England* (Keele, 1994): Constance Jordan, ‘Women’s Rule in Sixteenth Century Political Thought’ in *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40, 3 (Autumn, 1987), pp. 421-451; Patricia-Ann Lee, ‘A Bodye Politique to Gouverne: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship’, in *The Historian*, 52 (1990), pp. 242-261

<sup>553</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.11

<sup>554</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14-17

nature and therefore ‘monstrous’.<sup>555</sup> Therefore, to Knox, it followed that something that was so against natural and divine order must also be monstrous, and within this context he developed his argument against female rule. Reminding his readers that in God’s appointed order the head should occupy the uppermost position in the body of a man, above the remaining limbs and organs; so a body without a head in this position is a “monstre”, and likewise the body of the commonwealth that is governed by a woman is also “monstruous”.<sup>556</sup> Such views were echoed by another radical Protestant, Christopher Goodman, also considered the rule of a woman to be “that monster in nature and disordre amongst men.”<sup>557</sup> Turning specifically to Mary writers of Protestant polemic, including Knox and Goodman, utilised such notions to personally attack the queen. Knox constructed Mary as a monster, who was the very embodiment of ungodliness. Appropriating the commonly held dichotomy of good women versus bad women he compared Mary to the Old Testament queens, Jezebel and Athalia. He drew a sharp contrast between these two ungodly tyrants who oppressed their people and the prophetesses Deborah and Huldah whom he defined as “matrons” who possessed traditionally godly female characteristics such as piety, mercy, truthfulness, and humility.<sup>558</sup> Hence he referred to Mary as “that cursed Jezebel” and “that horrible monstre Jezebel of England.”<sup>559</sup> But Knox’s use of Deborah and Huldah is to some extent problematic because, as Robert Healey points out, their authority was “purely prophetic”, its function being only to proclaim the word of God.<sup>560</sup> This was distinctly different from that of Mary, and later her sister Elizabeth, who claimed their thrones by right of inheritance. Knox was unable to reconcile this crucial point of difference, even on the accession of the Protestant Elizabeth in 1559, who unsurprisingly, did not acquiesce to his demands that she renounce her hereditary right and become another Deborah.<sup>561</sup> Given her sustained devotion to the Catholic faith and her determination to see its reinstatement in England, Mary was never going to be a Deborah. Thus he constructed her as the ungodly and monstrous Jezebel whose reign represented a subversion of good order. The notion of Mary as monstrous was also expressed by the administrator and reformer, John Hales. Writing during the first year of Elizabeth’s reign Hales drew a sharp contrast between “Malicious Mary” and “virtuous Elizabeth” as he

---

<sup>555</sup> Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, p. 13; Allen, *The Concept of Woman*, pp. 93-95

<sup>556</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.27

<sup>557</sup> Christopher Goodman, *Superior Powers*, p.52

<sup>558</sup> Wiesner, *Women and Gender*, p.14; Eales, *Women in Early Modern England*, p.23

<sup>559</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, pp. 30,52

<sup>560</sup> Robert M. Healey, ‘Waiting for Deborah: John Knox and Four Ruling Queens’, in *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25, 2 (Summer, 1994), p.377

<sup>561</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.380-381; Shephard, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth Century England*, p. 15, points out that the issue of a woman’s right to inherit office was central to what she terms the “Knox debate.”

highlighted Mary's cruelty and tyranny, comparing her to Biblical and ancient Roman tyrants including Herod, Caligula, and Nero, and asserting that her cruel behaviour during her reign was evidence that she was an:

“unnatural Woman, (No, no Woman, but a Monster, and the Devil of Hell covered with the Shape of a Woman).....”<sup>562</sup>

Hales' Mary was so unnatural that she ceased to be human to the extent that he asserted she was the Devil himself in the shape of a woman. The notion that Mary was the Devil disguised as a woman enabled Hales to develop a further line of attack against her as he drew attention to Mary's self-representation as a virgin sent by God, an analogy that was particularly symbolic and useful at her accession, and prior to her marriage. Far from being a godly virgin Hales firmly placed her as a “Viragin” or virago; an unnatural woman who behaved like a man, and was by consequence unable to procreate.<sup>563</sup> Certainly, Mary's failure to produce a child would have conveniently confirmed Hales' argument, carrying weight across the political and religious divide, as God's will was seen to be revealed in her lack of fecundity.

In addition to the underlying anxieties about female rule, portrayals of Mary as unnatural, monstrous and ungodly were grounded in two key issues. The most obvious is her restoration of Catholicism in England and her persecution of Protestants, but of crucial significance is her marriage to Philip of Spain. Not only was Philip a committed Catholic, but given the belief that women should be subject to their husbands, contemporaries feared that he would have both conjugal and political authority over his wife. Despite the terms of the marriage treaty, which aimed to protect Mary's authority, the queen's marriage caused considerable anxieties, and was a catalyst for many of the attacks on her queenship. Indeed, one of Knox's main arguments against Mary was that through her marriage, she had effectively placed her realm in the control of a foreign, Catholic power, exactly as the Scottish queen, Mary Queen of Scots, had done by marrying the French Dauphin. To reinforce this point, Knox emphasised the disparity between the two queens and the biblical Deborah:

---

<sup>562</sup> John Hales, *An Oration of John Hales to the Queen's Majesty, And deliver'd to Her by a certain Nobleman at Her first Entrance to her Reign*, in S. Johnson, *A Second Five Year's Struggle Against Popery and Tyranny* (London, 1689), pp.69,71,72

<sup>563</sup> *Ibid.*, p.72; Thomas Laquer, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (London, 1992), p.52

“..... howe unlike our mischevuous Maryes be unto Deborah, under whome were strangers chased out of Israel.....”<sup>564</sup>

Both Deborah and Huldah had delivered the people of Israel from idolatry and the rule of foreigners, whilst Mary, he asserted, had oppressed her people and imposed idolatry on the realm by reinstating Catholicism. Furthermore, through her marriage to Philip, she had effectively handed her realm to the Spanish.<sup>565</sup> This point was taken up by another Protestant, Anthony Gilby, who argued that Mary and Mary Queen of Scots had oppressed the people of both realms. Under their queenships the fruits of the land had been devoured by strangers, and foreigners rose above native Englishmen and Scotsmen in position and status to the extent that the foreigner became “the head” and the native Englishmen and Scotsmen “the taile.”<sup>566</sup> In this context radical Protestants viewed Mary’s marriage as a betrayal, and Christopher Goodman accused her directly, citing her marriage as evidence of her abhorrence of the English nation.<sup>567</sup> Similarly John Ponet argued that Mary had given power to Philip and had thus acted contrary to her coronation oath, diminishing the rights of the crown and the liberties of her people.<sup>568</sup> Considering the marriage further, he viewed it as a punishment from God, pointing out that during Edward VI’s reign preachers had foretold of a range of “miseries and plagues” that would occur, including the “subversion” of the state of the realm and the rule of a foreign king, if people did not repent of their wickedness.<sup>569</sup> And if further proof were needed, Ponet cited a variety of omens purporting to indicate that such prophecies had indeed come to fruition. These included recent eclipses, comets, and, reflecting the monstrous nature of Mary’s queenship, a number of monstrous births: children born with two heads, missing limbs, “evil shaped” and other major deformities.<sup>570</sup>

Protestant reformers also used Mary’s marriage as a vehicle through which to focus on her unnatural desires. Although in sixteenth century society it was considered natural for a woman to marry and place herself under the headship of a husband, critics manipulated Mary’s motives for marriage arguing it was a consequence of her unnatural and excessive

---

<sup>564</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.39

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36-40, 44-45

<sup>566</sup> Anthony Gilby, *An Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to Repentance* (1558)

<sup>567</sup> Goodman, *Superior Powers*, p.100

<sup>568</sup> Ponet, John, *A Short Treatise on Political Power, and of the true obedience which subjects our to kings and other civil governors, with an Exhortation to all true and natural English men* (1556), p. 18, available at <http://www.constitution.org/cmt/ponet/polpower.htm>

<sup>569</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40

<sup>570</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.41-42

lust. For example Knox considered the marriage and consequent betrayal of the realm to be a result of what he deemed Mary's "inordinate appetites."<sup>571</sup> This notion of excessive lust was also picked up by Ponet who drew parallels between the queen and other ungodly women with uncontrollable lusts including Jezebel, Athalia, and the fourteenth century Joan of Naples, whom he described as "a woman of much lust." Notoriously, Joan was implicated in the murder of her husband and then proceeded to indulge her lusts in a series of "private marriages." Ponet reminded his readers that these women had paid the price for their ungodly behaviour; the Neapolitan queen was later found hanged, murdered in a similar manner to her husband; Jezebel was thrown out of a window and her body eaten by dogs; and Athalia, who had ordered the murder of her own family, was also killed.<sup>572</sup> In addition, Mary's desires were portrayed as abnormal; Hales for example referred to the queen's "mad Affections."<sup>573</sup> For Goodman Mary's desires were not only unnatural; they were ungodly and threatened the commonwealth by perverting men who should be godly advisers. Forced to "satisfie the ungodly lusts of their ungodly and unlawful Governesse, wicked Jezabel" her councillors betrayed both the realm and Christ.<sup>574</sup> Drawing upon anxieties about female rule, and implying that Mary was irrepressible, he continued, arguing that they had willingly become "bondmen to the lustes of a most impotent and unbrydled woman."<sup>575</sup> Knox took the notion of lust a step further. By constructing Mary as Jezebel he had portrayed her as an ungodly tyrant, but he also used the image of Jezebel to draw attention to the queen's unnatural lusts and her capacity for sinful behaviour, as Knox's Jezebel was guilty of both "fornication and hoordome."<sup>576</sup> Thus by implication, Mary can be viewed as certainly capable of, if not already guilty, of similar behaviour. The focus on Mary's supposed unnatural and excessive desires and the suggestion that she was "unbridled" was to a great extent enabled by commonly held beliefs around women's weaker, naturally sinful and lustful nature.<sup>577</sup> As such it was a powerful tool with which to convict Mary of ungodly rule as the themes used would have been readily understood by contemporaries.

---

<sup>571</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.45

<sup>572</sup> Ponet, *A Short Treatise*, pp. 15,18

<sup>573</sup> Hales, *Oration*, p.74

<sup>574</sup> Goodman, *Superior Powers*, p.34

<sup>575</sup> *Ibid.*, p.97

<sup>576</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.37

<sup>577</sup> Eales, *Women in Early Modern England*, p.30; Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, pp. 61-62; Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London, 1995), pp.71-76

Mary's gender also contributed to the popular notion that she had been manipulated by her councillors and Catholic bishops. Ponet asserted that Mary was in the thrall of Edmund Bonner, the Bishop of London, who had, he claimed, "enchanted" the queen, and persuaded her to give power to Philip.<sup>578</sup> Gilby focussed on Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Mary's chancellor. Describing England as a vineyard, beset by "venomous locusts" of Catholic priests and bishops, he asserted that Mary was Gardiner's instrument in the re-establishment of the Catholic Church. Furthermore he sought almost to sexualise the nature of the relationship between the queen and her chancellor, describing her as Gardiner's "maid Marie" and "his maistress," a relationship which he argued had caused havoc within the realm as together with Gardiner Mary had "broken the hedges of the same vineyard."<sup>579</sup> Initially it would appear that the focus of these polemics was indeed Bonner and Gardiner rather than Mary and that the queen was a victim of such manipulation. Certainly contemporary beliefs about women's weaker nature would have contributed to the view that a woman was more susceptible to such manipulation than a man would have been. Indeed, writing early in Elizabeth's reign, John Aylmer, also argued that Mary had been manipulated by her bishops, comparing her to the Biblical queen Alexandra who ruled Judea after her husband's death. According to Aylmer, although Alexandra, for the most part, had been an effective governor, she had been manipulated by priests to pursue persecutions, as had Mary, whom Aylmer absolved of ultimate responsibility for the religious persecutions of heretics during her reign, as she had been "bewitched" by Cardinal Pole and her Catholic bishops.<sup>580</sup> Rather than present her as ungodly, Aylmer, referred to her gentle female nature, arguing that her "woman's hart" would not have made her capable of such atrocities.<sup>581</sup> But to her critics this was more than merely symptomatic of a woman's weaker nature as they portrayed her as a willing participant in such manipulation. In this manner the anonymous author of *A Supplicacyon to the Quene's Majestie* constructed Mary as a latter day Jezebel. Jezebel had been willingly influenced by false prophets in her persecution of God's prophets; likewise Mary had allowed herself to be influenced by "false bysshoppes."<sup>582</sup> Such assertions were clearly underpinned by religious grievances but their significance lies in their reinforcement of the notion that Mary was an ungodly tyrant who had betrayed her realm.

---

<sup>578</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18

<sup>579</sup> Gilby, *An Admonition to England and Scotland*,

<sup>580</sup> John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes*, D.4

<sup>581</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>582</sup> Anon., *A Supplicacyon to the Quene's Majestie* (London, Strasbourg, 1555), p.5



A further medium used to challenge Mary's monarchical authority was her blood, which critics alleged was tainted and unnatural. Drawing on English xenophobia they alleged Mary's blood was not entirely English, as not only had she married a Spaniard, but her mother, Katherine of Aragon, was also Spanish. In this context Goodman compared Mary to Elizabeth, whom he asserted, was "voyde of all Spanishe pride, and strange bloude."<sup>583</sup> Mary's "stange bloude" was inherited from her mother and despite her father being an English king, for some, her mother's foreign blood was highly problematic. This view was expressed by the anonymous author of *The Lamentation of England* who stated that Mary "toke the most part of here blud and stomake off her Spanish mother."<sup>584</sup> And following his 1557 seizure of Scarborough Castle, Thomas Stafford, who had a distant claim to the English throne, justified his actions in a proclamation that stated that Mary was "naturallye borne haulfe Spanyshe and haulfe Englyshe" but had proved to be "a whole Spanyarde, and no Englyshe woman."<sup>585</sup> Clearly Mary's part Spanish lineage provided critics with an opportunity to further undermine her queenship, but there was a further highly significant facet to the scrutiny of the queen's blood, as it was held to be tainted by illegitimacy.<sup>586</sup> The question of Mary's legitimacy had been a key issue at her accession, when the duke of Northumberland, through Edward VI's *Device for the Succession* and the relevant *Letters Patent*, sought to control the succession by excluding Mary and Elizabeth from the throne on grounds of illegitimacy, and diverting the succession through the Suffolk line to Lady Jane Grey. So crucial were notions of blood and legitimacy that although already perceived by many as the rightful heir to the throne, Mary manoeuvred to negate any further accusations by having her parents' marriage declared valid during her first Parliament. But this legislative action failed to deter some radical Protestants. For instance, the author of *Certayne Questions* highlighted the issue of illegitimacy, questioning whether it was indeed possible, once one had been declared a "bastarde", to have this reversed.<sup>587</sup> Both Goodman and Knox held that Mary was illegitimate. Goodman referred to the queen as "a woman begotten in adultrie a bastard by birthe" and "in verie dede, a bastarde, and unlawfully begotten," and in the preface to his *First Blast* Knox also asserted she was a "bastard", although unlike Goodman he did

---

<sup>583</sup> Goodman, *Superior Powers*, p.53

<sup>584</sup> Anon., *The Lame[n]tacion of England* (Germany, 1557) sig. Aiii(v), quoted in Sarah Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen* (New York, 2012), p. 115

<sup>585</sup> Duncan, *Mary I*, p.115

<sup>586</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.115-116; Duncan argues that this emphasis on Mary's Spanish blood enabled Mary to be perceived as a "foreign usurper", outing her on a par with Philip.

<sup>587</sup> *Certayne Questions*, Aii (r)

not develop this line of attack further in the main body of his work.<sup>588</sup> Goodman however sought to further undermine Mary's queenship by focussing on the nature of her illegitimacy. She was, he argued, the product of ungodliness, through the "adulterous incest" and ungodly behaviour of her father, Henry VIII, who married his brother's widow in order to satisfy his own "carnall luste". And in doing so, Goodman continued, Henry had "begate this ungodly serpent Marie, the chief instrument of all this present miserie in Englande."<sup>589</sup> His portrayal of Mary as a serpent referred to the serpent that tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden, and was a distinct reminder of women's sinful nature and uncontrollable desires. Similarly the author of *A Supplicacyon to the Quene's Majestie* also drew attention to Mary's illegitimacy by stating that the marriage of Henry and Katherine had been proved to be unlawful on grounds of incest.<sup>590</sup> Although not as vociferously expressed as Goodman, the author's implication is clear; Mary was a bastard, the product of an ungodly and unlawful union.

Critics of the queen also argued that her marriage to Philip was, like that of her parents, adulterous and unlawful. In a veiled reference to Philip's 1553-54 negotiations regarding a possible marriage with the Portuguese infanta, Maria, Duchess of Visceu, Goodman asserted that Philip, like Henry VIII, was also "adulterous."<sup>591</sup> Although these negotiations were unsuccessful, and no contract was finalised, Philip's interest in the infanta was common knowledge at Mary's court to the extent that, as David Loades points out, not only was it not immediately clear that Philip would be free to consider marriage with Mary, but also Mary herself gave the impression that she thought he was actually pre-contracted to the infanta.<sup>592</sup> Any pre-contract, had it existed, would have validated Goodman's claims that Philip was indeed "adulterous" and essentially his marriage to Mary would be unlawful and ungodly. Furthermore, such an allegation implied that any children of the marriage would be illegitimate. This point was also noted by the author of *Certayne Questions*, who also claimed that Mary was living in adultery with Philip because of his alleged betrothal to the Portuguese

---

<sup>588</sup> Goodman, *Superior Powers*, pp.53, 97-98; Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.3

<sup>589</sup> *Ibid.*, p.98

<sup>590</sup> *A Supplicacyon to the Quene's Majestie*, p.6

<sup>591</sup> Goodman, *Superior Powers*, p.100; Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life*, pp. 201-202; Carolly Erickson, *Bloody Mary: The Life of Mary Tudor*, p.331; Duncan, *Mary I: Gender, Power and Ceremony*, pp.61-62

<sup>592</sup> Loades, *Mary Tudor*, pp.201-202; Erickson, *Bloody Mary*, pp.201-202, argues that Mary pretended that Philip was already married to the infanta as part of a political strategy, as although she wanted to marry Philip, Charles V was keeping the options of either a Portuguese or an English marriage for Philip, open as long as possible

infanta.<sup>593</sup> In this manner Mary was portrayed as being grounded in sin, through the sinful relationship of her father and of her own relationship with her husband. Furthermore, such strategies to attack Mary situated her queenship firmly within the boundaries of her male familial relationships and thus conformed to contemporary beliefs of gender identities, in which women were essentially “defined” by their relationships with men.<sup>594</sup>

Situating queenship within a queen’s relationship to her father and husband was a strategy that was to resurface towards the end of the seventeenth century as a particularly crucial element of the attacks by Jacobites on Mary II. Through the very nature of her accession to the throne in 1689, they deemed her to have betrayed her father, James II, and with her husband, William, usurped James’ crown. Given the dominant patriarchal model of later seventeenth century society and heightened public political consciousness, such a perceived betrayal enabled critics of the new regime to portray Mary in pamphlets, satires and other media as an unnatural daughter who had subverted patriarchal order in her lust for power; a convenient fiction which to a great extent bypassed the belief that as a married woman her loyalty lay predominantly with her husband. The notion of her betrayal of her father was highlighted by the Jacobite conspirator, James Montgomery, who ironically, had initially supported the new regime, but became discontented with William’s government. Montgomery argued that James had been “violently forced away by a surprising Defection of his Children, Servants, Subjects and Soldiers.”<sup>595</sup> Although recognising that others had neglected their duty to the king during the Glorious Revolution, crucially Montgomery pointed to the culpability of Mary and her younger sister Anne, by expressing his astonishment that the “natural Affection which was due from Children to their Parents was quite forgotten.”<sup>596</sup> And although not naming Mary and Anne directly, the implication that they had forgotten their Christian duty to their father can hardly be made more explicit. This same sense of moral outrage was expressed by many as Mary’s familial relationships became ripe for inclusion in the satirical works of the period. For instance Ralph Gray accused Mary of lacking in “duty to parents” which he considered to be so unnatural that it made her “a fiend” with “unnatural vices.”<sup>597</sup>

---

<sup>593</sup> *Certain Questions*, Aiv (v)

<sup>594</sup> Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p.66

<sup>595</sup> Montgomery, James, *Great Britain’s Just Complaint* (1692), p.2; Following his disaffection with William’s government Montgomery became a Jacobite propagandist and conspirator

<sup>596</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6

<sup>597</sup> Gray, *The Coronation Ballad*, 11<sup>th</sup> April 1689, p.45

And in an epitaph following her death in 1694, an anonymous Jacobite author directly accused her of deposing her father, claiming she had been “the undutiful child of the kindest of princes”, and recognising the paradox of Mary’s position as both daughter and wife, asserted that she had been “too bad a daughter, and too good a wife.”<sup>598</sup> Indeed, some argued that she had forgotten her duty to her father to such an extent that she sought to expunge him from official memory to hide her shame that she had usurped his throne. One writer, referring to the regime’s attempts to secure dynastic legitimacy through frequent allusions to Charles II, accused her of denying her own father:

“Your royal uncle you are pleased to own  
But your royal father, it should seem, you have none.  
A dainty mushroom, without flesh or bone,  
We dare not call you, for it seems you are  
Great Charles’ niece, O’ the royal character -  
Great James’s daughter too, we thought you were.  
That you a father had, you have forgot,  
Or would have people think that he was not;  
The very sound of Royal James’s name  
As living king, adds to his daughter’s shame.  
The princess Mary would not have it known,  
That she can sit upon King James’s throne.”<sup>599</sup>

Similar to Gray’s assertion that Mary was a “fiend”, the author implied that through her callous disregard for her father Mary was inhuman, having neither flesh nor bone, a potentially poisonous fungus. Echoing Hales’ portrayal of Mary Tudor as a devil and a virago, these assertions reinforced the notion that she was unnatural and called into question the nature of her queenship.

Similar to the sixteenth century comparisons of Mary Tudor with Jezebel and Athalia, Jacobites also sought relevant female archetypes with whom to draw parallels to Mary. But whereas the detractors of Mary Tudor drew heavily upon Biblical archetypes, Jacobites seized

---

<sup>598</sup> Anonymous Jacobite epitaph on Mary II from Coles MS collections, Vol.XXI, p.65, quoted in Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England, From the Norman Conquest*, Vol. V (London, 1892), p.130

<sup>599</sup> Selected abstract from Sir Robert Strange’s MSS quoted in Strickland, *Queens of England*, Vol. VI, p.15  
Strickland comments on the repeated allusions in state documents to the reign of Charles II

upon two particularly relevant examples of royal women from ancient Roman history and Shakespearean drama; namely Tullia, the daughter of the Roman king Tullius, and Goneril, the daughter of Shakespeare’s King Lear. Governed by her ruthless ambition Tullia had ordered the murder of her father so that she and her husband Tarquin could seize his throne. She had also, it was alleged, purposefully driven her chariot over the king’s corpse. Parallels could easily be drawn, and Jacobites were quick to exploit the imagery on the official coronation medals of 1689 (fig. 4), the reverse of which portrayed Jove throwing a thunderbolt at Phaethon who is seen falling from his chariot to the flames below.



Fig. 4: Official coronation medal of William and Mary, 1689

Phaethon was intended to symbolise James, who had been displaced by Jove to avoid the destruction of the realm.<sup>600</sup> But Jacobites interpreted the symbolism quite differently, arguing that the chariot was Tullia’s and that the figure of Phaethon represented William and Mary assuming the reins of James’ chariot. The crucial point of difference was that whilst Phaethon had obtained permission to take his father’s chariot, William and Mary had taken James’ kingdom by force, and Jove’s thunderbolt was a sign of God’s judgment for such an “unnatural Usurpation.”<sup>601</sup>

<sup>600</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, pp.662-663

<sup>601</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, pp.662-663; *A Letter from a Gentlemen in the Country to his Correspondent in the City concerning the Coronation Medal, distributed April 11. 1689* (1689)

The identification of Mary with Tullia was a particularly popular theme in Jacobite polemic, and as W. J. Cameron has stated was a frequent feature of satires written at this time.<sup>602</sup> For example, Arthur Mainwaring's poem, *Tarquin and Tullia*, tells the story of the usurping couple through a rewriting of the events of the Glorious Revolution with clear allusions to William and Mary, and key members of their court, including Bishop Gilbert Burnet, John and Sarah Churchill, and the Princess Anne. Mainwaring accused Anne of being directly involved in her father's deposition and cites her as "the younger Tullia", whilst similar to sixteenth century polemic that focussed on Mary Tudor's Catholic bishops, Bonner and Gardiner, Mainwaring portrayed the Protestant Gilbert Burnet as a "pagan priest", a "sycophant" and furthermore, a "lustful saint."<sup>603</sup> Essentially the work is underpinned by the key themes of the desire for power and how this corrupts natural and familial order, as the poem opens:

"In times when Princes cancelled nature's law  
And declarations (which themselves did draw)  
When children used their parents to dethrone  
And gnawed their way like vipers to a crown."<sup>604</sup>

As Tarquin and Tullia William and Mary are portrayed as serpent like in their ungodly lust for power and consequent violation of familial order in their seizure of Tullius's throne. Alluding to the Convention Parliament's decision that the throne was officially vacant once James II had fled his kingdom, and that William, as Tarquin, had filled that vacant position, Mainwaring focuses on Mary and her ambiguous status as a regnant queen without administrative authority as he pointed out she was endowed with an "empty name."<sup>605</sup> Alluding to Tullia driving her chariot over her father's corpse, Mainwaring stated that she had crushed her father and her king, and was such an unnatural daughter that she appeared to have no compunction for her actions. Instead she revelled in her new position as queen, feasting "on rapine" and planning a weekly ball to commemorate the event.<sup>606</sup> Such a portrayal of the new queen as frivolously glorifying in her new position adeptly reflected the account of the diarist, John Evelyn, who recorded Mary's joyful demeanour on her arrival in London in

---

<sup>602</sup> Cameron, *PoAS*. Vol. 5, p.46

<sup>603</sup> *Ibid.*, p.48

<sup>604</sup> Arthur Mainwaring, *Tarquin and Tullia*, in *PoAS*. Vol. 5, pp. 47, 51

<sup>605</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52

<sup>606</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52

1689, which was perceived by many as insensitive and inappropriate.<sup>607</sup> But Mainwaring concluded that Tullia did suffer for her treatment of her father. By way of a warning to Mary, he highlighted how her “Debauched good nature” was eventually overcome with guilt and remorse.<sup>608</sup>

Unlike Tullia however, Mary had not actually killed her father, but her perceived violation of patriarchal expectations was considered by Jacobites to be commensurate with the crime of parricide. Indeed, Melinda Zook argues that for critics, Mary readily evoked images of “regicide and parricide.”<sup>609</sup> One anonymous Jacobite poem, *The Duchess of York’s Ghost*, featured the ghost of Mary’s mother, Anne Hyde, Duchess of York, appearing to her daughter late at night and warning that Heaven will “punish unrepenting parricides.”<sup>610</sup> Indeed, the poet situated Mary’s perceived usurpation of her father’s throne as far worse than parricide, as referring to the Convention Parliament’s decision that James had effectively abdicated the ghost continued:

“The world was bantered with an “abdicate”;  
Had he been murdered, it had been mercy shown,  
‘Tis less to kill a King, than to dethrone.”<sup>611</sup>

Viewed within the context of the belief around the king’s two bodies, James’ physical body still existed, but his monarchical body had been forcibly eradicated, effectively leaving him in a state of limbo.<sup>612</sup> Lamenting that James had been brought so low, the poet made clear Mary’s culpability as the ghost pointed out that it was James’ own children who struck “the fatal blow.”<sup>613</sup> Another satirical poem, *The Female Parricide*, was equally direct in its accusation that Mary had effectively killed her father. Portraying the queen as both Tullia and Goneril the anonymous poet used Goneril’s cruel treatment of Lear as a benchmark by which to judge Mary’s actions, asserting that Mary’s behaviour towards her father exceeded that of Goneril. Goneril had exploited Lear to gain control of his kingdom, but Mary had not only

---

<sup>607</sup> *Diary of John Evelyn*, Vol. IV, pp. 624-625

<sup>608</sup> Mainwaring, *Tarquin and Tullia*, p. 52

<sup>609</sup> Zook, ‘History’s Mary’, p.173

<sup>610</sup> Anon., *The Duchess of York’s Ghost* (1691), in *PoAS*. Vol. 5, p. 299

<sup>611</sup> *Ibid.*, p.299

<sup>612</sup> Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies*, p.7

<sup>613</sup> *The Duchess of York’s Ghost*, p.299

usurped her father' crown, she had also manipulated perceptions of his kingship in an attempt to justify her own actions:

“But worse than cruel lustful Goneril, thou!  
She took what her father did allow;  
But thou, more impious, robb’st they father’s brow.  
Him both of power and glory you disarm,  
Make him, by lies, the people’s hate and scorn,  
Then turn him forth to perish in a storm.”<sup>614</sup>

Such seizure of James’ monarchical power served as a representation of the eradication of his body politic, which was exacerbated by the author’s allegation that if James had been dead, like Tullia, Mary would have driven her chariot over his corpse.<sup>615</sup>

Other satirical writers developed the parricide motif by focussing on Mary’s unnatural intentions towards her father. In *The Four Children* she is accused, along with William, Anne and George, of violating “Humane and Divine” laws and seeking her father’s death during the military campaign in Ireland in 1690.<sup>616</sup> Reinforcing his point the author asserted that the two sisters and their husbands have James’ blood on their hands and that their “crimes” stink like “sulphurous vapour.”<sup>617</sup> Likewise in *The Dutiful Son and Daughter*, Mary was again presented as seeking her father’s blood, as the dual monarchs are shown justifying such a course of action as a necessity for the safety of the realm.<sup>618</sup> Although Mary had not actually killed her father and there is no evidence to support Jacobite allegations that she sought his death, the nature of her accession as queen presented her political opponents with an eminently useful mechanism with which to represent her as a parricide. And crucially, such a portrayal served to emphasise her unnatural and ungodly nature.

---

<sup>614</sup> Anon., *The Female Parricide* (1689) in *PoAS*. Vol. 5, p157

<sup>615</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 157

<sup>616</sup> Anon., *The Four Children*, in *A Collection of Loyal Poems Satyrs and Lampoons* (Osborn MS b 111 (Yo11)), p.373

<sup>617</sup> *Ibid.*, p.374

<sup>618</sup> Anon., *The Dutiful Son and Daughter*, in *A Collection of Loyal Poems Satyrs and Lampoons* (Osborn MS b 111 (Yo11)), p.375



The meaning behind the identification of Mary with Tullia and Goneril was one that was readily understood by contemporaries. Drama was a popular diversion in this period and Strickland has highlighted how some of Shakespeare's works were viewed with suspicion by the regime, in particular, *King Lear* and *Richard III*. The subject matter of *King Lear* was clearly politically sensitive, whilst there were concerns that the death of Henry VI in *Richard III* could serve as a reminder of James II.<sup>619</sup> However it does not appear that performances of *King Lear* were formally banned during the Dual Monarchs' reign, as has previously been asserted, and a revised version of the play, rewritten by Nahum Tate was performed from 1681 onwards.<sup>620</sup> An incident surrounding the performance of another dramatic work provides further evidence that popular audiences were fully aware of the political sensitivity of certain subject matter. In May 1689 Mary had attended a performance of Dryden's *The Spanish Friar*. Originally banned in James' reign because of its anti-Catholic content, the play focuses on the usurpation of her father's throne by the queen of Aragon, and the imprisonment of the deposed king Sancho. A letter written by Daniel Finch, the Earl of Nottingham, noted that Mary, in her royal box, suffered considerable discomfort, attempting to hide her face behind her fan and her hood as the audience in the pit turned to stare at her at certain points in the play where the dialogue clearly enabled a dual interpretation.<sup>621</sup> One piece of dialogue in particular recorded by Nottingham must have caused her considerable embarrassment, in its direct referral to tyranny and usurpation:

“ ‘tis said, Who is that, that can flatter a court like this? Can I sooth tyranny, seem pleas'd to see my royal master murdered; his crown usurped; a distsaff in the throne: and what title has this queen but lawless force; and force must pull her down.”<sup>622</sup>

Crucially this section of dialogue also questioned the Queen of Aragon's title to the throne, as opponents of the new regime questioned William and Mary's right to the crown of England.

---

<sup>619</sup> Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, Vol. VI, pp.19-20

<sup>620</sup> Mullin, Emily, 'Macready's Triumph: The Restoration of *King Lear* to the British Stage', in *Penn History Review*, 18, 1 (2010), pp. 1-3, Tate's revised version of the play was in common with many other alterations of Shakespeare's plays during the Restoration. Tate's interpretation lost the original tragic ending; Schwoerer states that the idea of parricide upset Mary sufficiently for the government to ban plays such as *King Lear*, *Images of Mary II*, p. 735, but the only official ban of *King Lear* was 1810-1820, when depictions of Lear's madness were considered too politically sensitive due to George III's mental health, Mullin, 'Macready's Triumph', p.5

<sup>621</sup> Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*, pp. 18-19; John Loftus, *The Politics of Drama in Augustan England* (Oxford, 1963), p.22; *Letter written soon after the Revolution by Daniel Finch, earl of Nottingham*, in Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. 2, Part II, Appendix, p. 78

<sup>622</sup> *Letter written soon after the Revolution*, in Dalrymple, p.79

As an unnatural daughter, Mary's critics argued that she lusted after power. Indeed, for Ralph Gray, Mary was the embodiment of "a swarm of unnatural Vices", which he noted, included lust.<sup>623</sup> But Mary had not only lusted after power, as the notion of lust also had a sexual interpretation. As Melinda Zook has pointed out, Mary's marriage to William gave her a sexual identity which was readily exploited by Jacobites.<sup>624</sup> In sharp contrast to official representations of Mary as a dutiful wife, Jacobites manipulated the nature of her conjugal relationship with William, and portrayed her as a woman sexually neglected by her husband who they accused of impotency and homosexuality. For instance, Gray's William is an "unnatural beast" both in his treatment of his father-in-law and his sexual neglect of Mary. Portrayed as "not qualified for his wife" and "without e'er a pintle" where she was concerned, William preferred a homosexual relationship with one his Dutch courtiers, Hans Willem Bentinck, the Earl of Portland.<sup>625</sup> Consequently in *The Duchess of York's Ghost* Mary was described as a "longing, wishing, Queen", alone in her bed thinking about "gallant youths" to "feed her warm desire."<sup>626</sup>

Other satirical works were more direct and crude in their attack on the queen. In *The Reflection*, in which William is also portrayed as homosexual, Mary sought sexual satisfaction with other men, including Charles Talbot, the Earl of Shrewsbury, William Cavendish, the Earl of Devon, and whilst she was still in Holland, even Bishop Gilbert Burnet acted as "her stallion."<sup>627</sup> Furthermore, the author cited Mary's motivation for her relationship with Devon as being with the aim of conceiving and providing the nation with an heir; securing "the entail that the line may not fail."<sup>628</sup> Such alleged behaviour enabled the popular portrayal of Mary as a moll; a popular term for a whore or woman of loose morals. Hence Gray's Mary was "Queen Moll" whilst in a satire on her regency she was a "Majestic" moll, and other satirical works referred to the dual monarchs in a wholly derogatory manner as Will and Moll or Billy

---

<sup>623</sup> Gray, *The Coronation Ballad*, p.45

<sup>624</sup> Zook, 'History's Mary', p.172

<sup>625</sup> Gray, *The Coronation Ballad*, pp. 41,42,43; the term 'pintle' referred to a penis

<sup>626</sup> Anon., *The Duchess of York's Ghost*

<sup>627</sup> Anon., *The Reflection*, in *PoAS*. Vol. 5, pp.60-61

<sup>628</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61

and Molly.<sup>629</sup> Melinda Zook points to this representation as depicting Mary as lusting for sexual gratification in the same way as she had lusted for power, and uses the example of Defoe's *Moll Flanders*, where the heroine was both a whore and a thief.<sup>630</sup> Although *Moll Flanders* was not published until 1722, the meaning of the word moll was still very clear, and for Jacobites relevant, as Mary had stolen her father's crown in her lust for power. Whilst claims of William's sexual preferences and Mary's extra marital relationships were far-fetched and it is doubtful to what extent they were actually believed, they did convey a number of important messages to the popular reader. Firstly, they serve to further emphasise the unnatural and sinful behaviour of both William and Mary. Indeed, Zook convincingly argues that these satirical depictions of William and Mary's conjugal relationship carried political force as portrayals of an abnormal body politic and that William's inappropriate use of his wife's body represented the corruption of England by a foreign nation.<sup>631</sup> Thus if William and Mary's conjugal relationship can be constructed as unnatural and sinful it can be viewed as a reflection of the state of the body politic itself. Furthermore, Mary's supposed extramarital relationships exposed the political nation to the possibility of illegitimate offspring. This effectively positioned Mary as a sinful hypocrite as her alleged extramarital sexual activity provided evidence that she was clearly prepared to deceive the nation in a similar manner by which her own regime's supporters alleged James II and Mary of Modena had attempted to in 1688, by the imposition of a suppositious child upon the realm to ensure the succession. Finally, constructing Mary as a woman with excessive and uncontrollable lusts firmly placed her as a dangerous threat to the patriarchal order of society, and undermined her queenship by questioning her suitability for government.

Notions of legitimate, illegitimate, and tainted blood were as crucially significant in the last decades of the seventeenth century as they had been in the mid sixteenth century. Indeed, Mary's royal Stuart blood had been cited by William as justification for his invasion of England in 1688, to defend his wife's hereditary blood right as heiress presumptive. But Jacobites presented Mary's blood in a very different manner. They did not question her legitimacy but instead drew upon extant notions of superior and inferior blood, by focussing

---

<sup>629</sup> Gray, *The Coronation Ballad*, p. 44; *The Female Regency; Upon the Pictures of Will and Moll; Interest Outvying Honesty*, in *A Collection of Loyal Poems Satyrs and Lampoons* (Osborn MS b 111 (Yo11)), pp.410, 438

<sup>630</sup> Zook, 'History's Mary', p.173

<sup>631</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.173-174

on the queen's Hyde ancestry.<sup>632</sup> Mary, they argued, was not wholly royal as her mother had been a commoner. One satire of 1690, *On the Two Sisters*, openly drew comparison between James II's royal blood and that of Mary and Anne at his daughters' expense:

“In vain the Bourbon and Plantagenet  
Great bloods are in your Royal father met;  
To be but half a Hyde is a disgrace,  
From which no Noble Seed can purge it's Race:  
Mix'd with such Mud the clearest Streams must be  
Like Jordan's Sacred Flood lost in the Sodom-Sea.  
Ambition, Folly Insolence, and Pride,  
Prove you are no Changelings from the surer Side:  
But yet not infamous enough to be  
Your poisoning Mother's doubtful Progeny.”<sup>633</sup>

The contrast between James' pure royal blood and that of his daughters is clearly evident. After all, James' pure royal blood qualified him as fit to rule, with an undisputed title of hereditary right, whilst Mary's title, along with that of William, and from 1702 that of Anne was intrinsically parliamentary.<sup>634</sup> For Carol Barash, the satire portrays Mary and Anne as “dirty, muddy, fluidly dangerous, and impure.”<sup>635</sup> Their impure and polluted blood effectively made them “dangerous”, because it imbued them with the sinful characteristics of “Ambition, Folly, Insolence, and Pride”, all of which could be argued to have underpinned their role in the Glorious Revolution, as Jacobites sought to portray Mary as ambitious and lusting for power. Evidently Ralph Gray was of the same opinion, as in similar vein to the author of *On the Two Sisters* he also cited Mary's ambition and pride along with other “unnatural vices” as being the result of her Hyde blood.<sup>636</sup> Hence, as W. J. Cameron has claimed, the satirists sought to blame Mary's Hyde blood for her iniquities.<sup>637</sup> As Mary Tudor's tainted blood was a contributory factor in her being an ungodly tyrant, so Mary Stuart's blood was held by her critics to have been responsible for her violation of familial expectations and her unnatural

---

<sup>632</sup> Mary's mother, Anne Hyde was a commoner, the daughter of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and one of Charles II's ministers. She had married James, Duke of York, whilst in an advanced state of pregnancy with their first child.

<sup>633</sup> *On the Two Sisters* (1690), quoted in Carol Barash, *English Women's Poetry. 1649-1714* (Oxford, 1996), p.212

<sup>634</sup> Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1967), pp.186-187

<sup>635</sup> Barash, *English Women's Poetry*, p.212

<sup>636</sup> Gray, *The Coronation Ballad*, p.45

<sup>637</sup> Cameron, *PoAS*, p. 156

betrayal of her father. Furthermore *On the Two Sisters* implied that Mary and Anne's blood was tainted by something so impure that it cannot be rectified and will taint the whole royal line. Thus any children the sisters may bear will also be tainted, which given the line of succession as defined in the 1689 Bill of Rights, effectively threatened to pollute the entire body politic. In this context a clear link can be perceived between notions of female monarchical authority and a polluted body politic across the period, as John Knox, writing about female rule in 1558, had asserted "that frome a corrupt and venomed fountain can spring no holosome water."<sup>638</sup> In the same manner that radical Protestants had asserted that Mary Tudor's blood had been tainted by her mother's Spanish blood, it was implied that Mary II was tainted by Anne Hyde's unwholesome blood. Although Mary II could not be placed as the offspring of an incestuous union, her Hyde blood could still be viewed as having been tainted by sin through the immoral behaviour of her mother, who was in an advanced state of pregnancy at her marriage to James; and this notion of sin was reinforced by the poet's reference to the Old Testament city of Sodom. The reference to Sodom also served as warning to Mary of the consequences of her own immoral and ungodly actions, as the two cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by God for the sinful behaviour of their inhabitants.

Critics of Mary Tudor and Mary II successfully drew upon notions of natural, biblical and familial order to construct these queens as unnatural and ungodly; in Mary Tudor's case as a monstrous tyrant, whilst Mary II and her sister Anne were unnatural daughters who betrayed their father. As John Knox asserted in 1558 that Mary Tudor's rule was a subversion of good order, a little over a century and a quarter later, Jacobites took advantage of the extended public sphere to construct Mary II's queenship as a subversion of familial order and a violation of patriarchal expectations. By Anne's accession in 1702, the political climate was considerably different to that of the mid sixteenth century. Defined by the 1689 Bill of Rights, Anne's title to the throne was parliamentary, or contractual, rather than hereditary as Mary Tudor's had been.<sup>639</sup> William and Mary were also parliamentary monarchs, but by 1702 the parliamentary system of political parties, the Whigs and the Tories, was far more developed than it had been in 1689. Indeed the development of parliamentary politics can be seen to have been facilitated to some extent by Anne's gender, as Geoffrey Holmes points out in her reliance upon political "managers", namely the key men of the reign, Marlborough,

---

<sup>638</sup> Knox, *First Blast of the Trumpet*, p.48

<sup>639</sup> Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed*, p. 317

Godolphin and Harley, in her dealings with Parliament.<sup>640</sup> The development of the political nation during the course of the seventeenth century ensured that Anne continued to be a focus of popular political discourse, but the death of James II in September 1701 meant portrayals of Anne as an unnatural daughter no longer held the significant political resonance that they had in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, when Anne had been castigated along with Mary for her betrayal of her father. Portrayed in satires written shortly after the Revolution as the younger Tullia who had played an active role in her father's deposition, Anne was presented as Nancy to Mary's Moll, and both sisters were portrayed as gluttons. Mary was a "jolly glutton" who grew fat whilst feasting "on rapine", whilst Anne was an "all-eating Nancy, of more stomach than fancy."<sup>641</sup> Whilst Mary did gain weight once she became queen, Anne's excessive weight has been well documented by her biographers and was clearly a topic ripe for inclusion in satirical works. As Robert Bucholz has pointed out in his recent work on perceptions of Anne's body, although repeated pregnancies probably contributed to her excessive weight, Jacobites saw it as a result of excessive appetite, which implied a lack of self-control. Hence Mary and Anne's greed where food was concerned was a reflection of their greed and unnatural lust for power.<sup>642</sup>

As Mary Tudor's "inordinate appetites" and "lusts" were perceived by radical Protestants to have corrupted the government of the realm in the sixteenth century, Jacobites argued that Mary II's lust for power, and sex with men other than her husband, and Anne's greed for food and power, had corrupted the political nation in 1689; and in Mary II's case had the potential to corrupt the entire body politic if she conceived a child as a result of her supposed extramarital affairs. Their lusts had led both Stuart sisters to betray their father and effectively overturn the existing body politic to bring about a new, parliamentary and Protestant monarchy, whilst Mary Tudor's lusts had led her to betray her realm to Spain and attempt to overturn existing religious policy by seeking to return England to the Catholic Church. Clearly, fears over "unbrydled" female rulers were still as evident in the latter part of the seventeenth century as they had been in the mid sixteenth century, as was the belief that such

---

<sup>640</sup> Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, pp. 187-189, 193. Holmes points out that William had also used managers in his dealings with parliament but this was by choice, whereas Anne's gender and poor health, along with Holmes argues "her inferior abilities" ensured that she used the managers as a necessity.

<sup>641</sup> *Tarquin and Tullia; The Reflection*, pp. 51,52,61;

<sup>642</sup> Robert Bucholz, 'The "Stomach of a Queen" or Size Matters: Gender, Body Image and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne', in Levin, Carole and Bucholz, Robert, eds., *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England* (London, 2009), pp. 250-252

rulers would face divine punishment for their unnatural and ungodly behaviour. John Ponet had warned in 1556 that female governors with excessive lusts would eventually face the consequences of their actions by citing the violent deaths of Jezebel, Athalia, and Joan of Naples, whilst in 1689 Arthur Mainwaring pointed to Tullia being overcome with guilt and remorse as the price for her treatment of her father, and in 1691 the author of *The Duchess of York's Ghost* warned that “unrepenting parricides” would be punished by God. Hence Jacobites saw the death of Anne’s young son, William the duke of Gloucester, in 1700 as a “Just Judgement” for her role in the Glorious Revolution.<sup>643</sup> But following James’ death in 1701 the political significance around notions of unnatural daughters diminished and ceased to be a key feature of Jacobite polemic. Indeed James’ death combined with Anne’s accession as parliamentary queen and her overall popularity, made it problematic for satirists to criticize her, and although she still appeared in some satires, Bucholz has pointed out that Anne ceased to be a key subject in the satirical verse of the period.<sup>644</sup>

Notions of blood and hereditary blood right however, did continue to be prominent across the period, and were used in attempts to undermine Anne’s queenship as they had been to undermine that of Mary Tudor and Mary II. As a result of Henry VIII’s matrimonial policy and his desire for a legitimate male heir, both his daughters faced allegations of illegitimacy. Mary was deemed illegitimate by radical Protestants such as Christopher Goodman and those who supported Henry’s divorce from Katherine of Aragon, whilst her younger sister, Elizabeth, was considered to be illegitimate by the majority of Catholic Europe. Although the legitimacy of Mary II and Anne was not questioned, legitimate royal blood and the supposed violation of Mary’s hereditary blood rights as heiress presumptive had underpinned the Glorious Revolution, and both Mary II’s and Anne’s blood was scrutinised by political opponents as Mary Tudor’s blood was scrutinised by radical Protestants. Beliefs around hereditary succession resurfaced in Anne’s reign as a feature of party politics and at times of political crisis. Although the Bill of Rights legally defined Anne’s claim to the throne, the acknowledgment of her half-brother as James III of England by the French King, Louis XIV, in 1701 created an apparatus that could be used to remind the queen that her claim to the

---

<sup>643</sup> Letter from Lady Gardiner to Sir J. Verney, 5<sup>th</sup> August 1700 in *Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century*, p.81

<sup>644</sup> Robert Bucholz, “Queen Anne: Victim of her virtues?”, in Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed. *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837* (Manchester, 2002), pp.98-99; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.150

throne was not by blood right. For example, in 1704 when the Tories became increasingly frustrated with Anne's stance over the Spanish War of Succession, one satire reminded her that her own title to the throne was not unanimously accepted:

“And Whilst You would a Settled Prince Dethrone,  
And durst Dispute a Title to a Crown,  
The World enquires by what You hold Your own.”<sup>645</sup>

Given the circumstances of her father's deposition the irony of Anne's intent in this issue would not have been lost to her critics. The matter of hereditary blood right and legitimacy appeared again in the final years of her reign when the prospect of the Hanoverian succession raised anxieties as Jacobites and some Tories sought to prove the legitimacy of James Francis Edward's claim, and rumours circulated that the queen intended to divert the succession from the house of Hanover to her half-brother.<sup>646</sup> Anne was portrayed by one poet as having “Qualms of Conscience” for excluding her brother from the succession, the poet asserting that

“She knows she has no Right the crown to wear,  
And fain would leave it to the Lawful Heir.”<sup>647</sup>

Hence notions about blood, whether legitimate or illegitimate, tainted or pure, continued to be an extant theme and were as prominent at Anne's death in 1714 as they had been at Mary Tudor's accession in 1553.

Early modern notions of women's weaker nature and the belief that this made them unsuitable for governing a realm enabled the portrayal of queens as being manipulated and controlled by others. This was clear during Mary Tudor's reign when some critics, rather than accuse the queen directly of wrongdoings, instead attributed such events to the influence of her councillors and Catholic bishops. Both John Ponet and Anthony Gilby held that Mary had been manipulated by her Catholic officials. One implication of this line of argument is the expression of the belief that Mary was weak and not in control of the realm, and that policy

---

<sup>645</sup> Anon, *On the King of Spain's Voyage to Portugal*, in F.H. Ellis ed., *PoAS*, Vol. 6 (London, 1970), p.611

<sup>646</sup> A comprehensive analysis of the succession crisis of 1713-1714 is provided by Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 363-395

<sup>647</sup> Anon, *The British Embassadress's Speech to the French King* (1713), in F. H. Ellis ed., *PoAS*. Vol. 7 (London, 1975) pp. 592-594



was decided by those around her. A similar theme emerged during Anne's reign, when the queen was perceived as either being manipulated or influenced by her political managers or by bedchamber favourites.<sup>648</sup> Whilst Anne was no longer a central feature of satirical works during her reign, the distinct shift to attacks on certain key political and bedchamber figures, although merely a reflection of the changed political environment and position of the monarch in relation to the two main political parties, offers a valuable insight into perceptions of Anne's queenship. For example in 1708 one ballad attacking her bedchamber woman, Abigail Masham, was explicitly clear that it was Abigail and not Anne that controlled the nation.<sup>649</sup> Similarly in an unpublished Tory work of 1710 that expressed anger at Whig influence over queen, the author, writing about Anne's speech proroguing Parliament on 5<sup>th</sup> April, which was written for her by her Whig ministers, accused her of being little more than "a mimick Queen" an "artificial thing", and "passive Timber" who merely uttered the words that had been chosen for her.<sup>650</sup> And in 1713 during the succession crisis, a satire that questioned her right to the throne referred to her as "the present reigning Thing" arguing that it was Harley, the earl of Oxford who ruled the nation:

"And like a Conjurer with his Magick Wand,  
Does both the Parliament and Queen command."<sup>651</sup>

Although each of these works was written in response to specific political situations during Anne's reign, and as such need to be considered within their own individual context, along with similar works they clearly portray the queen as not being in control of the political nation. And as Bucholz has asserted, although this absolves her of any transgressions, Anne is effectively constructed as "an innocent puppet."<sup>652</sup> Such a passive interpretation of the queen's manipulation is in sharp contrast to that of Mary Tudor, who by allowing herself to be manipulated by her Catholic bishops, Bonner and Gardiner, was held to be a latter day Jezebel. Hence although beliefs about gender in the early eighteenth century evidently still enabled the construction of queens as weak rulers and susceptible to being influenced by others, the interpretation differed from that of the mid sixteenth century as the queen was no longer perceived as an ungodly threat to the natural and political order.

---

<sup>648</sup> Bucholz, 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues?', pp. 103-104

<sup>649</sup> Arthur Mainwaring, *Masham Display'd: To the Tune of the Dame of Honour*, in *PoAS*. Vol. 7, p.319

<sup>650</sup> Anon., *On the Queen's Speech* (1710), in *PoAS*. Vol. 7, p.412

<sup>651</sup> *The British Embassadress's Speech to the French King*, p. 595

<sup>652</sup> Bucholz, 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues', p.104

## Part 2 – Restorers of Order, Virtuous Femininity, Maternal and Godly Archetypes: Positive Representations of Queenly Identities

Contrary to John Knox's argument that female rule was a subversion of good order; supporters of Mary Tudor presented the queen as a restorer of order, particularly at the beginning of her reign. Indeed, as seen in Chapter One, Mary's accession as rightful queen, following Northumberland's coup in favour of Lady Jane Grey, had the capacity to cross the religious divide, being marked by both Protestants and Catholics as a restoration of good order as opposed to the discord generated by Northumberland's ambitions. Far from being a tyrant Mary was portrayed as the saviour of England by the Protestant, Richard Taverner, who drew a sharp contrast between the chaos and disorder that England would have fallen into had the plans of the "devilish" Northumberland come to fruition, and the "tranquillity" of the realm under Mary's rule.<sup>653</sup> Referring to the celebrations and general scenes of joy at her accession Taverner painted a grim picture of the realm had Mary not become queen, with England at risk of civil war and invasion, and the inevitable consequences of such events including the destruction of towns and cities, the murder of sons, rape of daughters, and the "utter decay and overthrow" of the realm.<sup>654</sup> As the legitimate heir to the throne, Taverner concluded that Mary had delivered England from great danger, and he expressed the hope that she would have a long life and "graciously reigne" over the nation "in continual prosperitie."<sup>655</sup>

Another Protestant, the lawyer Walter Haddon, represented Mary as a restorer of good order in his *Verses Congratulatory* by referring to the discord, confusion and general unrest that had resulted from Northumberland's ambition and desire for power. Haddon's Mary was "reason" and "right" in contrast to the "madness" and uncontrolled ambition of Northumberland.<sup>656</sup> Similarly, the author of in *An inuetyue against Treason* also drew attention to notions of order and disorder, pointing to the disorder and unnaturalness of Richard III's usurpation in 1483, in contrast to the Godly nature of Mary's accession and the of scenes of joy in London upon her proclamation as England's "rightful queene."<sup>657</sup> Overall responsibility for Mary's

---

<sup>653</sup> Richard Taverner, *An Oration Gratulatory* (1553), pp.3-7

<sup>654</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2-4

<sup>655</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14-15

<sup>656</sup> Walter Haddon, *Verses Congratulatory*

<sup>657</sup> Thomas Watertoune, *An inuetyue against Treason* (1553)

accession however lay with God. According to Haddon, it was God who had placed Mary on the throne of her ancestors, whilst Taverner also drew attention to God's role in her accession to further reinforce the contrast between the Godly queen Mary, and the "devilish" Northumberland. In this context Mary was constructed as the conduit through which God had seen fit to restore order to England, which also served to emphasise the Godly nature of her authority.

Another work of some note that places Mary as restoring order to the political nation is the play *Respublica*, which was performed at Mary's court during the Christmas festivities of 1553 and has been attributed to Nicholas Udall.<sup>658</sup> This is essentially a morality play which celebrates Mary's accession as a restoration of order compared to the political and religious disorder during Edward VI's short reign. Edward's councillors and advisers are presented as vices, personified by the characters of Avarice, Insolence, Oppression and Adulation who manipulate the realm, in the form of the widowed Respublica, for their own ends. In sharp contrast the other characters are the four virtues of Misericordia, Veritas, Justicia and Pax, and Nemesis, the goddess of redress and correction, who together, successfully seek to restore liberty to Respublica. In the play Mary is clearly identified with the character of Nemesis, and Udall makes a direct comparison in the prologue which leaves the audience in little doubt that Mary has been sent by God to reform the abuses of the previous reign:

“Soo for goode Englande sake this presente howre and daie  
In hope of hir restoring from hir late decaye,  
We children to youe olde folke, bothe with harte and voice  
Maie Ioyne all together to thank god and Reioyce  
That he hath sent Marye our Sovereraigne and Quene  
To reforme thabuses which hitherto hath been,  
And that yls whiche long tyme have reigned vncorrecte  
Shall nowe foreuer bee redressed with effecte.  
She is oure most wise/ and most worthie Nemesis

---

<sup>658</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p.192; W.W. Greg, ed. *Respublica. An Interlude for Christmas 1553* Attributed to Nicholas Udall (London, 1952), pp. viii-ix; Michael, A. Winkelman, *Marriage Relationships in Tudor Political Drama* (Aldershot, 2005), pp.67-68

Of whome our plaie meneth tamende that is amysse.”<sup>659</sup>

Although Nemesis does not appear until the end of the play, her rescue of *Respublica* from the devices of the Vices is central to the theme of Udall’s work, and in this context, underpins the theme of Mary’s reign as restoration of good order. However, the role of the four Virtues is also central to this theme. The characters of Misericordia, Veritas, Justicia and Pax are an allegory of the Four Daughters of God; Mercy, Truth, Justice and Peace, which had been a popular feature of literature and manuscript illustrations in the Middle Ages, and would have been immediately recognisable to an early modern audience.<sup>660</sup> But their role in *Respublica* differs distinctly from their usual depiction, as Hope Traver points to the sense of harmony between the Virtues in the play, compared to the controversy that they are usually depicted as being engaged in.<sup>661</sup> Such harmony amongst the Four Daughters of God is significant as it can be argued to be a further reflection of the harmony and order that Mary had restored to the realm. Of the four Virtues, the character of Veritas is also significant to representations of Mary. Truth, as the daughter of Time, had been used as a symbol of the religious changes during the Henrician Reformation, and as John N. King has asserted the female semblance of Truth was easily adapted by the Marian regime for representations of the queen and became a potent symbol of Mary as the restorer of Catholicism to England. Hence Time had enabled Mary’s accession so she could deliver the realm from the dangers of Protestantism. Indeed, Mary’s own awareness of the significance of Truth to the construction of her queenship is demonstrated by her adoption of the Latin, *Veritas Temporis Filia* (Truth the Daughter of Time) on her Great Seal of 1553 and in a 1555 engraving of the queen.<sup>662</sup>

The use of the analogy of Truth in this manner points to a further key feature of the construction of Mary as a restorer of order as it relates specifically to religion with supporters of the regime recognising that Mary’s accession signalled a restoration of the established Roman Catholic Church in England. Both John N. King, and more recently, Thomas Betteridge, have considered John Heywood’s 1556 poem *The Spider and the Fly* as an allegory of the Edwardian Reformation that portrayed Mary effectively sweeping away the

---

<sup>659</sup> *Respublica*, pp.2-3

<sup>660</sup> Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God: A Study of the Versions of this Allegory with Especial Reference to those in Latin, French and English* (Philadelphia, 1907), p.5

<sup>661</sup> *Ibid.*, p.141

<sup>662</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp.191-192

reformed religion in favour of Catholicism.<sup>663</sup> The religious tensions during Edward’s reign were symbolised by Protestant spiders and Catholic flies, with a Catholic fly caught in the web of a Protestant spider. Mary’s appearance as a maid with a broom who kills the spider with her foot and sweeps away the cobwebs with her broom is a clear representation of her restoration of religious order as she literally swept away the disorder of Protestantism symbolised by the spiders’ webs. Interestingly, King identifies Heywood’s use of the broom to sweep away such disorder, as a modified sword of justice.<sup>664</sup> Such identification made clear the maid’s identity as Mary as it symbolised her monarchical authority, and also further emphasised her role restoring order by the administration of justice. Other works also reflect Mary’s position as a restorer of the Catholic Church. In a 1554 treatise about the history of the Christian Church in England, George Marshall recalled the effects of the Henrician and Edwardian Reformations upon the Catholic religion in England and lauded Mary as the restorer of the true faith:

“The faith of Christ and all trewe religion  
 Wyth prayer and fasting, and eke good deuotio~  
 Was almost gone oute of euery mans harte  
 The Churche, the aulter, & Gods sacred bodye  
 They robbed & spoiled, and their faith did denie  
 Lyke desperate wretches, thus they played their parte  
 All was forlorne, tyll good Quene Mary  
 Restored them agayne to gods honor and glorye.”<sup>665</sup>

Hence Marshall’s Mary has restored Catholicism to the realm and thus restored the established religious order. Similarly, in 1554 John Proctor, constructing Mary, the realm and the Church as effectively one body, held that her reign provided the means by which those who had drifted away from the Catholic Church during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI could be returned to the true faith as he identified that “so many good and olde orders” had been “newely restored” by the queen whilst “many new erroneous nouelties” had been

---

<sup>663</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp.188-189; Thomas Betteridge, ‘Maids and Wives: Representing Female Rule during the Reign of Mary Tudor’, in Susan Doran and Thomas Freeman, eds., *Mary Tudor. Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2011), p.142

<sup>664</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, p. 189

<sup>665</sup> George Marshall, *A compendious treatise in metre declaring the firste originall of sacrifice, and of the building of aultares and churches, and of the firste receauinge of the Christen faith here in Englande by G.M.* (1554)

discarded.<sup>666</sup> For England's Catholics Mary's reign and her restoration of Catholicism offered a return to the old familiar order, and a sense of stability after the religious uncertainty experienced during the reigns of her father and younger brother.

A further facet of the construction of Mary as a restorer of good order was the identification of the queen with Godly archetypes. This also served as a tool of reassurance to overcome anxieties concerning female rule. Most popular was the comparison of Mary to Judith and Esther from the Old Testament. Crucially both Judith and Esther had delivered their respective peoples from the hands of oppressors; Judith had saved Israel from the Assyrian threat by killing the Assyrian general, Holofernes, whilst Esther had risked her life to save the Jews of Persia from the machinations of her husband's councillor, Haman. The analogy of Judith was particularly relevant given her decapitation of Holofernes, and Sydney Anglo has rightly identified the crucial relevance of comparisons of Mary to Judith in the pageantry of Mary's coronation procession, given the nature of Mary's victory over Northumberland and his subsequent execution by beheading.<sup>667</sup> But such representations were not restricted to coronation pageantry as many writers also chose to identify Mary in this manner, not only to recognise her defeat over Northumberland, but also to present her as a Godly queen. John Harpsfield's 1553 sermon in Latin is one such example. Similar to Heywood, Marshall and Proctor, Harpsfield also viewed Mary as the means by which religious order would be restored and he constructs her as the embodiment of three Biblical women: Judith, Deborah and Esther. Referring directly to the decapitation of Holofernes, he constructed Mary as blessed by God for her overthrow and execution of Northumberland, as in doing so she had revenged the "ruin" of her people by Protestantism.<sup>668</sup> And to reinforce his point that Mary had delivered her people from a powerful oppressor he points to Deborah, the Old Testament prophetess and judge, who freed Israel from the Canaanites, whilst his comparison of Mary to Esther is a clear reference to how the queen had restored order to the realm:

---

<sup>666</sup> John Proctor, *The Waie Home to Christ* (1554)

<sup>667</sup> Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy*, pp. 320-321

<sup>668</sup> John Harpsfield, *Concio quaedam admodum elegans, docta salubris, & pia magistri Iohannis Harpesfeldi* ..... (1553), A.3, trans. J. Heery, Ranulf Higden Society (2014)

“What Queen Hester showed to the Jews, this our Queen shows to us this present day, so that grief and sadness will be turned to pleasure and joy.”<sup>669</sup>

The priest and poet Leonard Stopes also portrayed Mary as Judith and Esther in his *An AVE MARIA in Commendation of our most Vertuous Queene*. Using the Catholic prayer, the *Ave Maria*, as a structural framework Stopes focused on the godly nature of Mary’s authority. His Mary was the nation’s jewel who had been sent by God to defeat Northumberland, as Holofernes, and restore righteousness to the realm.

“[2] MARIE

Marie, the mirror of mercifulnesse,  
God of his goodnesse hath lent to this lande;  
Our iewell, our iouye, our Iudith, doutlesse,  
The great Holofernes of hell to withstande.

[3] FULL

Full well I may liken and boldly compare  
Her highnesse to Hester, that virtuous Quene;  
The enuious Hamon to kyll is her care,  
And all wicked workers to wede them out clene.”<sup>670</sup>

In her defeat of Northumberland Stopes constructs her as Judith, but she is also Esther as she has rid England of corrupt councillors, and similar to Heywood’s Mary sweeping away the cobwebs of Protestant corruption, Stopes’ Mary has weeded out wickedness from the realm. As Stopes’ Mary had been sent by God to deliver the nation, George Marshall also portrayed Mary as an enabler of deliverance as he asserted she was “God’s chosen vessel.”<sup>671</sup> But rather than construct her as the equal of Judith and Esther he drew distinct comparisons between the queen and the two Godly archetypes, asserting that Mary had exceeded the godliness of both women. Marshall scrutinised Judith’s methods of delivery from oppression compared to Mary’s:

“Iudyth with wyne, & eke with fayre promise,  
Holofernes ouercame, & slewe him in his dronknesse

---

<sup>669</sup> *Ibid.*, A3. Hester is the Biblical Latin version of the name Esther.

<sup>670</sup> Leonard Stopes, (1553), *An AVE MARIA in Commendation of our Most Vertuous Queene*, in Hyder E. Rollins ed. *Old English Ballads 1553-1625* (Cambridge, 1920), p14

<sup>671</sup> Marshal, *A compendious treatise*

Whereby she ye citie of Bethulia hath preserued  
But Mary our Quene, by prayer deuoute  
Ouercame her enemies, being neuer so stoute  
Without fayre promises, or any gifte profered  
God right wel heard her chast & humble praier  
That sodenly stroke her enemies, & caused the~ retier.”<sup>672</sup>

He implied that Judith had employed somewhat questionable methods to deliver Israel from the Assyrians; playing the role of seductress and plying Holoferenes with wine before slaying him. This was in sharp contrast to Mary who overcame her enemies in a godlier manner, not resorting to devious methods, whilst Esther’s role was minimalised compared to Mary’s:

“Hester made her prayers for the Iewes onlye  
Which a man wente about by enuy to destroye  
Whose prayer god heard, & the Iues deliuered  
But Mary our Quene, prayed in generallye  
That no bloude might be shedde, of her frende or enemy  
God heard her praier, and the matter so ended  
A wonderfull miracle, euer to be remembered  
That God wrought for our Quene, he euer be praysed.”<sup>673</sup>

Marshall demonstrated that Mary had successfully overcome her enemies through prayer. Esther had also placed her faith in God through prayer, but unlike Mary, Esther’s prayers had been exclusively for her own people. In this context Esther’s victory is portrayed as limited whilst Mary’s victory, her accession, had embraced the whole of her realm and can therefore be viewed as a Godly miracle. Thus Mary’s monarchical authority was underpinned by divine authority.

The comparison of queens to biblical women and saints was not a new phenomenon, and as John N. King has pointed out this was a mechanism that had been employed for other early modern queens including Elizabeth of York, Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn, who had been compared to Martha, Sarah and Rachel, whilst the analogy of Esther had been

---

<sup>672</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>673</sup> *Ibid.*,



traditionally used for queens during the Middle Ages and was a key feature in the pageantry for Richard II's queen, Anne of Bohemia in 1392.<sup>674</sup> Indeed, Gordon Kipling asserts that Esther is a particularly "potent emblem" for queens because of her "self-effacing modesty" and of course her intercession with her husband, the king, on behalf of her people.<sup>675</sup> But the crucial difference is that unlike Elizabeth of York, Catherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn and Anne of Bohemia, who were all queens consort, Mary Tudor was a regnant queen. Such comparisons in Mary's case are therefore examples of how contemporaries used existing mechanisms but adapted them to suit the unprecedented nature of regnant queenship. Unlike Esther, who interceded with her husband, Mary was an intercessor for her people directly to God, from whom she received her authority. Comparisons of Mary Tudor to Godly archetypes were clearly successful in setting precedents for Mary's authority as analogies of Judith, Deborah and Esther were later used by defenders of Elizabeth's queenship for the same purpose.<sup>676</sup>

Traditional notions of femininity and contemporary beliefs around gender could also be used to construct Mary's queenship as natural, righteous and Godly. Focussing on a combination of key stages in women's lives, and traditional feminine characteristics, supporters of the regime presented Mary as both a pious and chaste virgin and a nurturing, caring mother. As already mentioned in an earlier chapter, Mary's piety and chastity was referred to as one strand of a mechanism employed at her accession to reassure and allay anxieties over female rule. As pious and chaste Mary could not appear threatening and ungodly, and writers celebrated her piety and virtue as England's first regnant queen. Crucially though, as Mary had ascended the throne as an unmarried woman, there was a distinct focus on her virgin status, and writers frequently referred to her as a "mayden Quene", "virgin lady" and "virtuous maiden Quene."<sup>677</sup> Indeed her virginity at her accession was deemed of such significance that Cardinal Pole saw fit to mention this in his speech to Parliament in November 1554.

"And see how miraculously God of hys goodness preserued her highness,  
contrary to the expectation of man, that when numbers conspired against her, and  
policies were deuised to disherite her, and armed power prepared to destroy her,

---

<sup>674</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.182, 196, 226; Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 325-327

<sup>675</sup> Kipling, *Enter the King*, p.326

<sup>676</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 226

<sup>677</sup> Taverner, *An Oration Gratulatory*, p.8; Haddon, *Verses Congratulatory*, Proctor, *Waie Home to Christ*

yet she being a Vyrgin, helpless, naked and vnarmed, preuayled, and had the victory of Tyrautes.....”<sup>678</sup>

Referring to the miraculous nature of her accession in 1553, overcoming those who attempted to exclude her from the throne, Pole portrayed Mary as a helpless virgin reliant on God for her delivery. Certainly his analogy of the helpless, unarmed virgin reflected Mary’s distinctly uncertain position with regard to the crown at Edward’s death. However Pole’s reference to her virginity went beyond mere reflection of Mary’s predicament in July 1553, as crucially it underpins the notion that her authority is directly from God as it invites the comparison of Mary to the Virgin Mary. Indeed this was a comparison already made by Pole in a letter to the queen shortly after her accession. Asserting that her accession was an indication of divine providence he referred to the joy Mary must be feeling at the great favour that God had shown her by intervening in her rightful accession and compared this directly to the joy felt by the Virgin Mary on being chosen for God’s purpose, and singing the canticle “Magnificat anima mea Dominum.”<sup>679</sup> Similarly John Harpsfield also identified Mary as the embodiment of the Virgin Mary as despite her illustrious ancestry she had chosen piety and holiness and was subsequently loved by God who had chosen her as the deliverer of the nation. This, he asserted entitled Mary to sing the *Magnificat*:

“Behold therefore all generations shall call me blessed since he who has power has made me great and his name is holy.”<sup>680</sup>

Such an analogy clearly placed Mary as the deliverer of her realm from Protestantism, and sought to emphasise her godly queenship by defining her authority as coming directly from God. Furthermore the Virgin Mary was queen of heaven and given the belief in the Assumption that on her death the Virgin was crowned by Christ, Mary as queen of England is indeed a godly queen. The analogy of the Virgin Mary provided a powerful metaphor for queenship that had traditionally been used for queens consort, so was a familiar type that could be adapted for regnant queenship.<sup>681</sup> Indeed the analogy of the Virgin was readily seized upon by supporters of the queen, being particularly relevant given her unmarried status

---

<sup>678</sup> John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (1570 edition) (HRI Publications, Sheffield, 2011) Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 30/10/2011]

<sup>679</sup> Cardinal Pole to Mary Tudor, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 1553, No. 766, in *CSP Venetian*, Vol. V. p.385

<sup>680</sup> Harpsfield, *Concio quaedam admodum elegans.....*,

<sup>681</sup> King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp.196-197 provides a useful overview of how the image of the Virgin Mary was used in the iconography of medieval and early modern queens consort, including Anne of Bohemia, Margaret of Anjou and Anne Boleyn.

at her accession. Stopes' reworking of the Catholic prayer, *Ave Maria*, constructed Mary as the Virgin by using the words of the prayer as the basis for each of his twenty four verses. By adapting the prayer in this manner he was able to successfully portray Mary as both "blessed" virgin and queen of England whilst also highlighting her traditional feminine characteristics. Hence his first verse reads:

"[1] HAILE  
Haile Quene of Englad, of most worthy fame  
For Vertue, for wisdom, for mercy & grace;  
Most firme in the fath, Defence of the same,  
Christ saue her and keepe her in euery place."<sup>682</sup>

Stopes' Mary was therefore both queen of England and blessed Virgin, and as discussed earlier, Judith and Esther. In this context her queenship was both righteous and divine. In a similar manner William Forrest's *A New Ballad of the Marigolde* also presented Mary as the virgin. Comparing Mary to other garden flowers Forrest portrayed her as a marigolde.

"This Marigolde Floure, mark it well,  
With Sonne dooth open, and also shut;  
Which (in a meanyng) to vs doth tell  
To Christ, God's Sonne, our willes to put,  
And by his woorde to set our futte,  
Stiffly to stande, as Champions bolde,  
From the truth to stagger nor stutte,-  
For which I praise the Marigolde."<sup>683</sup>

The marigold opening its flowers in the sun is a metaphor for the Virgin Mary, as the sun is also Christ who crowned the Virgin Queen of Heaven at her Assumption. Hence as a marigolde, Mary was the embodiment of the Virgin. And to reinforce his point, Forrest continued by making direct reference to the Virgin Mary after whom the flower was named:

"Shee may be calde Marigolde well,  
Of Marie (chiefe), Christes mother deere,

---

<sup>682</sup> Stopes, *An AVE MARIA*, p. 13

<sup>683</sup> William Forrest, *A New Ballad of the Marigolde* (1553), in Ryder Collins ed. *Old English Ballads*, p.10

That as in heaven shee dothe excel,  
And Golde in earth, to haue no peere:  
So (certainly) she shineth cleere,  
In Grace and honour double folde,  
The like was neuer earst seene here,  
Such is this floure, the Marigolde.”<sup>684</sup>

Forrest’s message is clear that as the embodiment of the Virgin, Mary had no peers on earth, her power and therefore her queenship was directly sanctioned by God. Such representations provided an effective mechanism with which to allay anxieties about female rule, whilst setting a powerful precedent for Mary’s queenship. They also refuted the allegations of Mary’s radical Protestant critics such as Knox and Goodman, as they portrayed her as a Godly queen, whose authority was directly sanctioned from God, the very opposite of an ungodly tyrant.

Equally crucial to Mary’s representation was the status of the Virgin Mary as mother of Christ as it underpinned the construction of the queen as mother of her realm. Despite her childlessness, maternal imagery was a crucial facet of Mary’s representation and had two distinct strands; firstly it can be seen to have a specific religious connotation and was used to endorse the restoration of the Catholic Church in England; and secondly as an expression of hopes of Mary’s fecundity, as the birth of a child, particularly a male child, offered the prospect of a secure male succession, and in addition, would have justified her marriage to Philip. In his 1554 call for those who had strayed from the Catholic Church to return, John Proctor placed specific emphasis on maternal imagery, as he effectively constructed Mary, the realm and the Church as one Godly entity. In this context both Mary and the Catholic Church are presented as mothers. The church is the mother who provides the only way for the faithful to access Heaven, and to whom, “Mary the mother of her countrye” calls upon her people to return.<sup>685</sup> Both Mary and the Church are portrayed as loving and nurturing mothers in stark comparison to the ungodly “flattering harlot” of the Protestant church.<sup>686</sup> The notion of the

---

<sup>684</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10

<sup>685</sup> Proctor, *The Waie Home to Christe*

<sup>686</sup> *Ibid.*,

Catholic Church as a physical female body was further developed by Proctor as he identified the comfort offered by the church to the milk of a mother's breasts:

“None canne sucke the sweete mylke of her Christe, his comfortable word, but fro her pappes, *Mater enim est, cuius vbera sunt duo testamenta*, for she is our mother, whose two brestes are the ii testaments of God.”

“Beholde your loving mothers armes are open to receiue you, her bosome vnclased, her brestes bare to feede you with the swete milke of true knowledge, although ye have vngentlie delte with her in forsaking her.”<sup>687</sup>

His use of maternal imagery and of the physical female body was specifically enabled by Mary's gender. Furthermore, identifying Mary's natural female body with the body of the church placed Mary as central to the restoration of Catholicism in England whilst also emphasising her own maternal capabilities.

The second strand of Mary's maternal imagery centred on biological motherhood as opposed to the iconographical notion of motherhood used by Proctor. By November 1554 Mary believed that she was pregnant, and a number of ballads and prayers appeared celebrating the queen's condition and praying for her safe delivery, which, considering her age must have been a major concern. The anonymous author of one broadside ballad drew upon the identification of Mary with the Virgin Mary as he referred to the queen as “the swet marigold” implying that the analogy of the Virgin was still applicable to Mary after her marriage, when her pregnancy clearly testified that she was no longer a virgin.<sup>688</sup> Prayers cited biblical precedents for older women giving birth to healthy children, in particular, Sarah, the wife of Abraham, who supposedly gave birth to Isaac when she was ninety; and also of advanced years, the reportedly barren Elizabeth, who became the mother of John the Baptist.<sup>689</sup> The significance of such examples is twofold. Firstly they were a clear attempt to offer reassurance, and secondly, they placed the queen's pregnancy as the result of divine providence, asserting that it was indeed a blessing. This was further emphasised by references

---

<sup>687</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>688</sup> Anon., *Nowe singe, nowe springe, oure care is exil'd, Oure virtuous Quene is quickened with child*, in Rollins, ed. *Old English Ballads* 1153-1625, p. 20

<sup>689</sup> John Christopherson, A prayer for the Queenes highness, very conueniente to be sayde dayle of all her faithful and louying subiects (1554); John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or *TAMO* (1570 edition) (HRI Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 29/10/2011]

to Mary's chastity, which paradoxically was clearly at odds with her physical condition. Crucially however, the notion of the chaste, yet pregnant queen was used to demonstrate that she had married for godly reasons, rather than to satisfy her unnatural and uncontrollable lusts as asserted by Knox, Goodman and Ponet, as one prayer read:

“Thou Lord that art the searcher of hartes and thoughtes, thou knowest that thy seruauent neuer lusted after man, neuer gaue her selfe to wanton company, nor made her selfe partaker with them that walke in lightnes; but she consented to take an husband with thy feare, and not with her lust. Thou knowest that thy seruauent tooke an husband, not for carnall pleasure, but onely for the desire and loue of posteritie, wherin thy name might be blessed for euer and euer.”<sup>690</sup>

Thus the prayer reinforced the construction of Mary as a godly queen whilst also refuting the allegations of the radical reformers. Furthermore it also substantiated the reasons given by Mary herself for her marriage, when she addressed the Londoners at the Guildhall during Wyatt's Rebellion; that she would rather remain a virgin but chose to marry solely in the hope of providing the realm with an heir.

Similar mechanisms were used in the representations of Mary II. Like Mary Tudor the Stuart queen was also identified with two distinct interpretations of order. But in stark contrast to Mary Tudor's accession as England's rightful queen, by both hereditary succession and the terms of Henry VIII's will, Mary II's accession was instead the result of a distortion of hereditary succession, and consequently revised interpretations of order needed to be identified. As outlined in Chapter One, in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution William had been portrayed as having delivered England from the threat of Catholicism. But Mary's well publicised devotion to the Protestant church, combined with the circumstances of her accession and English fears of Catholicism, readily enabled her identification as a restorer of religious order which became a popular feature of poems, tracts and sermons, both during her life and upon her death. For instance, a poem celebrating Mary's arrival in England in February 1689 recalled the sense of disorder during James II's reign, when England had been plunged into “Night” and “black Despair”, before asserting that Mary's accession was a

---

<sup>690</sup> John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or *TAMO* (1570 edition) (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 29/10/2011]

“healing breeze” as she restored “Harmony throughout the jangling Spheres.”<sup>691</sup> Similarly the anonymous author of *The Rising Sun or Verses upon the Queen’s Birthday* also focussed on the notion of disorder in England under James, stating that the realm had been in darkness and about to be “dissolv’d” by the threat of Catholicism.<sup>692</sup> Mary was portrayed as participating in restoring order as she had brought light to the darkness of chaos and disorder, and preceded by William she had been sent by God “to lend Assistance” to overcome the Catholic threat. Indeed the poet continued, it was her “Royal Hand” that provided the much needed “Help and Succour” to “sinking England.”<sup>693</sup> The notion of the nation sinking under the Catholic threat was also touched upon by the preacher, Jacques Abbadie, in his panegyric following Mary’s death, in which he placed her as the comforter of the Protestant church, having been called upon by God to “Save her sinking Country.”<sup>694</sup> In this context Mary was also cited as the embodiment of Biblical figures who delivered their realms from the threat of religious disorder. Both Gilbert Burnet and the rector of Balham, Joseph Powell, constructed her as a second Josiah, the Biblical king of Judah who had implemented a programme of religious reform during his reign. Significantly Burnet pointed to the gender difference and also stressed Josiah’s young age, ascending to his throne as a boy king, thus acknowledging the strand of political thought expressed in Sir Thomas Smith’s *De Republica Anglorum*, that both age and gender were potential incapacities for government.<sup>695</sup> In addition to their individual incapacities of gender and age, referring to the notion of religious disorder under James II Burnet drew parallels between Mary’s accession and Josiah acceding to the Judean throne following a period of “long and deep corruption”, and his consequent drive to “purge the Land from Idolatry.”<sup>696</sup> Likewise in a sermon delivered shortly after her death, Joseph Powell portrayed Mary as having been crucial to the Protestant religion in England, comparing her zeal for the Church with Josiah’s own zeal for religious reform.

“It would be hard to arbitrate betwixt the two Princes, Josiah and our late Queen; which of them excell’d in piety, and had the largest designs for the honour of God, and the interest of Religion; whose authority and example gave the highest

---

<sup>691</sup> Rymer, *A Poem on the Arrival of Queen Mary* (London, 1689), p.4

<sup>692</sup> Anon., *The Rising Sun: or Verses upon the Queen’s Birthday. Celebrated April 30. MDCXC* (London, 1690), p.4

<sup>693</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.4-5

<sup>694</sup> Jaques Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady Mary Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland of glorious and immortal memory who died at Kensington, on the 28<sup>th</sup> December, 1694* (London, 1694), p.15

<sup>695</sup> Burnet, *Essay on the Memory*, pp.38-39; Smith, *De Republica Anglorum*, pp.64-65

<sup>696</sup> Burnet, *Essay on the Memory*, pp.39-40

countenance to virtue, and had the best influence upon the different ages in which they liv'd....”<sup>697</sup>

This identification of Mary with the Judean king allowed her defenders to overcome the perceived incapacities that her gender presented and construct her in a similar manner as William: as England’s Protestant saviour, delivering her realm from the threat of Catholic idolatry.

Other writers avoided the potential to blur Mary’s gender and relied instead upon the traditional precedents of Biblical archetypes that had been used during Mary Tudor’s reign to construct Mary II as the saviour of Protestantism in England. A broadside ballad of 1689, *The Protestants Ave Mary on the Arrival of her most Gracious Majesty, Mary, Queen of England*, echoed Stopes’ work on Mary Tudor, *An Ave Maria in Commendation of our most Vertuous Queene*, as it took its inspiration from the Catholic prayer, but the “Hail Mary full of Grace” referred instead to Mary II as the deliverer of the realm from Catholicism. Paradoxically given the significant Catholic connotations, the queen was constructed as the Virgin Mary, as the author, citing God’s role in her accession referred to her as “Blessed art thou amongst all Womankind” as she has come “cloath’d with Innocence and Peace” to restore order to England.<sup>698</sup> In *The Rising Sun or Verses upon the Queen’s Birthday* her desire to save her country from the “raging Fire” of Catholicism that had “almost devour’d” it was so fervent that she is portrayed as the embodiment of Esther.<sup>699</sup> Similarly, using a traditional female precedent, an account of Mary written shortly after her death, and referring to the situation during her regency of 1692 constructs her as “another Deborah” relieving her “Kingdoms from Oppression.”<sup>700</sup> Certainly as Esther, Mary was an intercessor with God on behalf of her subjects, to deliver the realm from Catholicism. However, the comparison to Esther is also particularly relevant given the ambiguity of Mary’s position as the half of a dual monarchy that, with the exception of her regencies, was without monarchical authority. In this sense, Mary II could be held to adopt the role of intercessor with her husband, the traditional role of a queen consort. As discussed in Chapter Three, the comparison of Mary to Deborah, along

---

<sup>697</sup> Joseph Powell, *The Death of Good Josiah Lamented. A sermon occasioned by the death of our most gracious sovereign Queen Mary of ever blessed memory, preach’d at Basham in Cambridgeshire, March 3, 1695* (London, 1695), p.20

<sup>698</sup> Anon., *The Protestants Ave Mary, on the Arrival of her most Gracious Majesty, Mary, Queen of England* (London, 1689)

<sup>699</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.10

<sup>700</sup> Anon., *A Brief History of the Pious and glorious Life and Actions of the Most Illustrious Princess, Mary Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland* (London, 1695), p.103



with queens from antiquity including Zenobia, Boudicca and Tomyris, and the more recent example of Elizabeth I, had already been successfully employed in the depiction of Mary's exercise of monarchical authority during her regencies.<sup>701</sup>

The precedent of Elizabeth was particularly pertinent to the construction of Mary as a restorer of religious order, as not only was Elizabeth the most recent example of regnant queenship in England, crucially she had also been praised as a Protestant saviour, delivering England from the clutches of Catholicism. Comparing the two queens, the author of *The Rising Sun or Verses on the Queen's Birth-Day* drew upon this notion recalling how Elizabeth had rescued her people from "Popery."<sup>702</sup> And an even more direct comparison of Elizabeth and Mary as restorers of religious order is made in a broadside ballad published shortly after Mary's death which presents a dialogue between the two queens on Mary's accession into Heaven. In alternate verses Elizabeth and Mary draw parallels between circumstances and key events of their respective reigns, and with regard to religion both recall the Catholic threat to England at the time of their accession, each placing this event as crucial to the effective overthrow of Catholicism.

"Q. Elizabeth.

When first the Scepter in my Hand I bore,  
I found the Nation stain'd with Martyr's Gore,  
With superstitious Rome's vain Idols led,  
At my approach the airy Phantoms fled.

Q. Mary II.

Nor did the Land under less Pressures groan,  
When I did first ascend the British Throne:  
St. OMERS Tribe did all the Isle Alarm,  
But I Dissolv'd the Babylonian Charm."<sup>703</sup>

Both Elizabeth and Mary are clearly presented as Protestant saviours, who have overcome Catholicism in England. To further reinforce this construct the author returned to the theme later in the ballad, with each queen focussing on how she had nurtured English Protestantism;

---

<sup>701</sup> See Chapter 3, pp. 142-143

<sup>702</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.11

<sup>703</sup> Anon., *A Kind Congratulation between Queen Elizabeth, and the Late Queen Mary II. Of Ever Glorious Memory* (London, 1695)

Elizabeth by offering sanctuary to reformers persecuted by Rome; and Mary, who together with William had cared for and supported “the tender Vine,” of the Protestant Church in England.<sup>704</sup>

The comparison of Mary to Elizabeth also invited a further interpretation based on assertions that Mary was the superior of the two queens. This facet was already evident to some extent in works published during her regencies that compared the situation faced by Mary at that time to the Armada crisis of 1588. However the crucial point of difference was identified by the author of *The Rising Sun or Verses upon the Queens Birth-Day* who confidently asserted that Mary outshone the “pale-fac’d” Cynthia, Elizabeth, because she conformed to patriarchal expectations through her marriage to William. Citing Mary’s allegiance to “Hymen’s Bands” it is by way of her marriage that she has “Surpassed Henry’s Daughter.”<sup>705</sup> By not marrying Elizabeth challenged the natural order of a patriarchal society in way that Mary did not. And in this context Mary’s status as William’s wife also provided supporters of the regime, and Mary herself, with an eminently suitable mechanism by which to refute Jacobite allegations of her being an unnatural daughter through the construction of her as a loyal and dutiful wife.<sup>706</sup> Furthermore this also enabled the view that by complying with patriarchal expectations and being dutifully subject to her husband, Mary was to some extent restoring familial order following the upheaval of the Glorious Revolution. As already discussed, on her arrival in England in February 1689, Mary was perceived by many as a wife and consort rather than a regnant queen, despite the new concept of the dual monarchy. This does not necessarily mean however that her status as regnant queen went unacknowledged. Indeed in *The Rising Sun or Verses upon the Queens Birth-Day* her status as “a Sovereign and a Regnant Queen” was clearly recognised, but crucially the author asserts that despite her position and status, her love for her husband and her country was far more important to her than any desire for power and government.<sup>707</sup>

---

<sup>704</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>705</sup> *The Rising Sun*, pp.11,13,14; According to Greek mythology Hymen was the God of marriage and wedding ceremonies

<sup>706</sup> The position in which Mary was placed as a direct consequence of the Glorious Revolution was acknowledged by Bishop Gilbert Burnet on her death, as he compared her to the Sabine women who threw themselves and their children between the armies of their husbands and fathers; Burnet, *Essay on the Memory*, p.160

<sup>707</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.14

Mary was idealised by supporters of the Williamite regime as an exemplary wife; loving, dutiful and respectful of her husband's authority. Hence although she was a queen, she was constructed as a wife, first and foremost. As an exemplar, she was according to Burnet, "so tender and so respectful a wife" who obeyed her husband with pleasure, and whose only delight in her status as queen was that through the dual monarchy William was elevated to kingship.<sup>708</sup> Similarly her former chaplain, Edward Fowler, stated that she "was a Pattern for the Best of Wives."<sup>709</sup> Likewise Abbadie also constructed Mary as the ideal wife and a model of patriarchal submission, and similar to other writers, prioritised her position as a wife over that of her role as queen.

"Her Soul was inseparably united to that of Her August Husband. She consider'd His Glory as Her own dearest interest. She studied His Sentiments, to follow them, and His Actions, to imitate them; and set His Will before Her, as the Rule of Her Life."<sup>710</sup>

Such amplification of Mary's role as a dutiful wife was corroborated by Mary herself in her memoirs, and her numerous letters to William during her regencies, when she frequently referred matters to him for advice and awaited his instructions before making decisions herself. Indeed in one letter she directly acknowledged his political superiority in her comment "I know who is the most necessary in the world."<sup>711</sup>

Portrayals of Mary as an ideal wife placed her firmly within traditional gendered boundaries, and as a construct this was further reinforced by frequent references to her feminine characteristics including her modesty, virtue and piety. Contemporary beliefs about gender within a patriarchal society and the continued cultural dominance of the accepted gendered model ensured that a focus on traditional feminine characteristics underpinned the majority of works about the queen. Works such as Nahum Tate's *Present for the Ladies* may have praised female rule, but Tate also devoted a substantial proportion of this work to praising traditional

---

<sup>708</sup> Burnet, *Essay on the Memory*, pp.125-126

<sup>709</sup> Fowler, *Memoirs on the life and death of our late most gracious Queen Mary*, p.7

<sup>710</sup> Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady*, p.3

<sup>711</sup> Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Vol. II, Part II, Book V, p.118

feminine virtues including modesty, chastity, piety, meekness, prudence, and noteworthy because of the events of 1688-89, conjugal affection to husbands, and duty towards parents. As such Tate's work demonstrated the great value placed on these characteristics. As mentioned above, comparisons to Josiah referred directly to Mary's pious nature and many other works sought to highlight her piety and virtue. Abbadie recalled Mary's piety and her religious devotion as did the Protestant clergyman, Henry Dove, who along with Abbadie, sought to reveal the extent of her devout nature, whilst one elegy on her death equated the extent of her religious devotion with that of an abbess rather than a queen.<sup>712</sup> Her chaplain, Edward Fowler, stated that she was "Most Exemplary in Her Piety", recalling her conscientious observations of religious ceremonies, her enjoyment of preaching and sermons, and participation in regular fasting.<sup>713</sup> Her memoirs certainly corroborate the accounts of such devotional activity and provide evidence to the centrality of religion to her life, with frequent references to her devotions and composition of prayers.<sup>714</sup> Mary's piety and modesty were also highlighted in *The Rising Sun or Verses Upon the Queens Birth-Day* and the extent to which this influences the political nation as she is constructed as maintaining virtuous order over the court.

"No Scandal, no Offence within her Walls:  
Under her Care and conduct all that falls  
Admits no blemish, all things are secure  
Under her vig'lant Eye, all things pure."<sup>715</sup>

Abbadie also presented Mary in this manner, citing her court as "a Temple of Modesty", free from vanities and luxuries, and over which Mary ensured strict rules of conduct.<sup>716</sup> Both Tony Claydon and Rachel Weil have identified how important portrayals of Mary as pious and virtuous were as propaganda for the Williamite regime as they served as a defence from allegations of immorality and corruption at court. Indeed because of William's reserved and introverted style of kingship Mary can be seen as central to the construction of a Godly and

---

<sup>712</sup> Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady*, pp.14-15,19; Dove, Henry, *Albania. A poem humbly offered to the memory of our late Sovereign Lady, Mary Queen of England* (1695); Peter Gleane, *An Elegy on the Death of the Queen* (London, 1695), p.4

<sup>713</sup> Fowler, *Memoirs*, pp.13-14

<sup>714</sup> Doebner, *Memoirs of Mary Queen of England*, pp.11-14,17,19,25,27,30-32,45,50-51

<sup>715</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.6

<sup>716</sup> Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady*, p.10

virtuous court.<sup>717</sup> But such portrayals of Mary go beyond mere defence of the court's morals as they also refute the Jacobite construction of her as ungodly and unnatural by instead constructing her as a Godly queen, the embodiment of piety and modesty, who was dutifully submissive to her husband.

A further facet of this refutation was the celebration of Mary's femininity and the presentation of the queen as the embodiment of feminine virtues. An epitaph on her death acknowledged how crucial her virtue was, as it "rais'd her as far above other Queens, as her Birth had Elevated Her above ordinary Women," thus placing virtue as equally important as her royal blood as both set her apart from others.<sup>718</sup> Mary's feminine virtues were celebrated in *the Rising Sun: or Verses Upon the Queen's Birthday*, with an analogy of the traditional feminine pastime of embroidery and a rather curious reference to the Catholic, Mary Queen of Scots. The Scots Queen was known as a skilled embroiderer, and the poet refers to her portrayal of the Virtues in her embroidery work, but unlike Mary Queen of Scots, who could only embroider the virtues, Mary II is upheld as the natural embodiment of them.<sup>719</sup> Other writers referred to her feminine softness. An epitaph after her death, although asserting that "she had the strength and courage of a man", also stressed that this was combined with "the softer virtues of her own sex", describing her as "a wonderful mixture of Simplicity and Wisdom".<sup>720</sup> And, in a poem of 1690, *A Letter to Mr Sheppard*, the focus is again on her feminine softness and virtue.

"In her, the virtues of her sex are known,  
While she retains the softness of her own."<sup>721</sup>

This notion of feminine softness was also used by Matthew Morgan when comparing Mary to the Palmyrian queen, Zenobia. Morgan was keen to stress that unlike the warlike Zenobia Mary retained the "Softness of her Sex", further emphasising his point by pointing to her

---

<sup>717</sup> Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), pp.93-94; Rachel Weil, *Political Passions*, p.110

<sup>718</sup> Anon., *Emblems for the King and Queen with an Epitaph on her Majesty and a Brief Character of her Vertues* (London, 1695)

<sup>719</sup> *The Rising Sun* p. 18

<sup>720</sup> *Emblems for the King and Queen with an Epitaph on her Majesty and a Brief Character of her Vertues*

<sup>721</sup> *A Letter to Mr. Sheppard*, p.109

“Majestick Sweetness.”<sup>722</sup> This combination of majesty and sweetness was also featured in *The Rising Sun or Verses for the Queen’s Birth-Day*, and by Abbadie, who cited the uniqueness of such interplay of these characteristics.

“Never was so much Greatness and Majesty accompany’d with so much Modesty and Sweetness.”<sup>723</sup>

Abbadie’s Mary is essentially a hybrid as he praised her traditional feminine virtues whilst acknowledging other, more masculine characteristics, including her courage and strength. He asserted that she had been endowed by God with “the Perfections of both Sexes” for the benefit of the realm.<sup>724</sup> Despite this assertion however the predominant emphasis of his work is on Mary’s feminine virtues. Similarly Gilbert Burnet blurred gendered distinctions as he portrayed Mary as having masculine courage that was tempered with a more feminine “mildness” before asserting that characteristics of both sexes were found in her.

“She had in Her all the graces of Her own Sex, and all the Greatness of Ours. If she did not affect to be a Zenobia or a Boadicia, it was not because she wanted their Courage, but because She understood the decencies of her Sex better than they did.”<sup>725</sup>

Although acknowledging the interplay of masculine and feminine traits, Burnet essentially presented Mary’s queenship within the traditional gendered model as Mary’s behaviour conformed to patriarchal expectations. Crucially within this context Mary was able to exercise power as regent in William’s absence without posing a threat to patriarchal order, as recalling her regencies Burnet stated how she “maintain’d her authority with so becoming a Grace”.<sup>726</sup> Thus Burnet intrinsically linked any power she may exercise to her femininity rather than to any affirmation of masculine traits.

Maternal imagery was also a key feature of representations of Mary II and distinct strands of maternal ideals were as significant for Mary Stuart as they had been for Mary Tudor in the

---

<sup>722</sup> Morgan, *A Poem to the Queen*, pp. 31-32

<sup>723</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.7; Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady*, p.3

<sup>724</sup> Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady*, pp.3-4

<sup>725</sup> Burnet, *Essay on the Memory*, pp.69-70

<sup>726</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69

sixteenth century. Despite her remaining childless after almost twelve years of marriage, her arrival in England in 1689 was greeted with expressions of hopes of her fecundity. She was still relatively young at twenty six so such hopes were not unrealistic, and of course an heir was legally provided for in the Bill of Rights as the crown only passed to Anne on the failure of the issue of William and Mary. A Protestant male heir would certainly have gone a considerable way to justifying the events of the Glorious Revolution and crucially to secure the new Protestant regime. One ballad, *The Protestants Ave Mary*, expressed such hopes by exhorting people to pray for the queen's fecundity:

“We Wish, we Hope, we Pray, and will Pray on,  
Till we have gain'd Heaven's Favour in a SON.”<sup>727</sup>

Similarly the author of *The Rising Sun or Verses upon the Queen's Birth-Day* expressed the hope that Mary would give birth to “numerous Heros.”<sup>728</sup> Angela McShane Jones has considered the role of broadside ballads from 1689-1694 in expressing these hopes of Mary's fecundity. One ballad, *The Princess Welcome to England*, and in particular its accompanying the woodcut illustration depicting Mary with bare breasts, which along with several other similar woodcut images of this period, portray the queen with her breasts exposed, seem at odds with portrayal in the text of the her virtuous and modest nature.<sup>729</sup> Although display of breasts could be seen as lascivious it also embodied strong maternal connotations and McShane Jones concludes that in Mary's case depictions of her with her breasts exposed referred to her youth, beauty, and significantly her fecundity.<sup>730</sup> Furthermore, this visual message would have been readily understood by a popular audience. That Mary remained childless did however present a problem where maternal representation was concerned and writers sought ways to negotiate this issue.

The queen's inability to conceive was at odds with the very visible and frequent pregnancies of her sister, Anne, and one strategy was to manipulate the familial connection and position Anne's fecundity as an intrinsic element of Mary's queenship. For example, in his 1691 poem celebrating William's victory in Ireland and Mary's successful handling of the regency,

---

<sup>727</sup> Anon., *The Protestants Ave Mary*

<sup>728</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.20

<sup>729</sup> Angela McShane Jones, 'Revealing Mary', *History Today*, 54, 3, (2004), pp.41-43

<sup>730</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.44,46

Matthew Morgan attempted to interweave Anne's current pregnancy with his praise of Mary's femininity so that it enhanced Mary's queenship rather than criticize her inability to conceive, as her sister's child ensured the continuation of Mary's royal Stuart blood.<sup>731</sup> Diverting attention away from biological motherhood was another strategy. For instance the actor and writer, Colley Cibber, diverted attention away from her inability to conceive by citing her "Fruitful Soul" as opposed to her unfruitful body.<sup>732</sup> A further mechanism was to construct Mary as mother of her realm. As discussed in the previous chapter this imagery was particularly relevant during her regencies, when for example Tate had used maternal language to portray Mary as protecting her "Brood" of subjects from the French threat, and how she was depicted on the regency medal of 1691 as a lioness at the mouth of a cave protectively watching over her three cubs as the male lion leaves, with the legend "I will protect them in your absence."<sup>733</sup> Cibber certainly saw her as fulfilling a motherly role to the nation, after her death lamenting that England had lost a "Friend, a Mother and a Queen."<sup>734</sup> And similarly Abbadie described how she had been like a mother to all those who had served her, developing his argument to place her as "the Mother of all the Families in the Kingdom."<sup>735</sup> In this mothering role some popular ballads portrayed her as rescuing crying children and their mothers from poverty, a point further developed by Cibber who dedicated a whole verse of his poem lamenting her death to her rescue of infants from their starving mothers who were unable to feed them, and her consequent provision of nourishment for them through the services of a wet nurse.<sup>736</sup> In this context, despite her physical lack of children, Mary, as stated in *The Rising Sun or Verses upon the Queens Birth-Day* was "a true Nursing-Mother."<sup>737</sup> The notion of Mary providing nourishment was also used with reference to her care for the spiritual wellbeing of her subjects and her relationship with the church. For example, Abbadie used such an analogy to present Mary as providing spiritual nourishment for the realm in her appointment of Protestant bishops.

---

<sup>731</sup> Matthew Morgan,, *A Poem to the Queen upon the King's Victory in Ireland and his Voyage to Holland* (Oxford, 1691), p.32

<sup>732</sup> Colley Cibber, *A Poem on the Death of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Mary* (1695), p.4

<sup>733</sup> Nahum Tate, *A Poem Occasioned by His Majesty's Voyage to Holland*, p.13; *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, p.89, Plate XCIV, No. 5

<sup>734</sup> Cibber, *A Poem on the Death of* , p.8

<sup>735</sup> Abbadie, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady*, p.26

<sup>736</sup> McShane Jones, 'Revealing Mary', pp.45, 46; Cibber, *A Poem on the Death of*, p.6

<sup>737</sup> *The Rising Sun*, p.9



“Never did a tender and loving mother employ greater care and circumspection in the choice of fit Persons to be entrusted with the Education of her Children, than she us’d in the Choice of the Spiritual Fathers of her People.”<sup>738</sup>

In this respect Mary was portrayed as the loving and nurturing mother of her country and the Protestant church, as Mary Tudor had been similarly presented in relation to the Catholic Church, by Proctor in his *Waie Home to Christ* a hundred and forty years earlier.

Constructing the queen in this manner also circumnavigated the matter of failed biological motherhood without negating her maternal function as a woman.

By Anne’s accession in 1702 it was no longer necessary to portray the queen as a restorer of order to the realm. In sharp contrast to the accessions of Mary Tudor, and William and Mary, Anne’s accession was peaceful, having been fully anticipated and prepared for. The Protestant succession in England had been legally defined in both 1689 and 1701, and both the English Protestant Church and the post revolutionary government were sufficiently well established. Hence at Anne’s accession the emphasis was very much on a continuation of William’s policies.<sup>739</sup> There was though a distinct focus on the Queen’s English blood which was elicited by Anne herself in her first speech to Parliament when she assured both houses that “her heart was intirely English.”<sup>740</sup> Such a manoeuvre was not without controversy however, as the speech caused much debate amongst the cabinet. Anne’s uncle, the Earl of Rochester had felt it necessary that in addition to emphasising the continuation of policy, it was also vital that the new queen distinguished herself from her predecessor by stressing her English blood, but as Burnet pointed out, this was “not so well considered” as it was seen as reflecting upon the memory of William.<sup>741</sup> This served to construct William as a foreigner; a Dutch king, in direct opposition to Anne as a purely English queen. It also as Gregg asserts acted as “a slap” at Mary of Modena and her son, Anne’s half-brother, James Francis Edward Stuart, who had been brought up and educated in France, and was also essentially a foreigner.<sup>742</sup> In this context Anne’s accession provided the restoration of English blood to the throne and was a key theme of the early years of her reign. A poem celebrating her accession acclaimed her

---

<sup>738</sup> Abbadie, *A panegyric on the death of our late sovereign Lady*, p.27

<sup>739</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.151

<sup>740</sup> Burnet, *History of his own Time*, p.79

<sup>741</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp.152-153; Burnet, *History of his own Time*, p.79

<sup>742</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.153

Englishness and her Protestantism as the poet described her as a “Native Queen” who was “within our Church’s Bosom bred.”<sup>743</sup>

The medals cast to commemorate her accession also acclaimed Anne’s Englishness and drew upon her speech to Parliament by featuring her English heart. The reverse of one medal depicts a heart above a pedestal, encircled by oak and laurel branches, with a crown above; the legend reads “ENTIRELY ENGLISH.” Whilst the reverse of another medal depicts a circle of roses, each containing a heart, linked by a chain, with a crown at the top; within which is a radiating heart with the inscription “QVIS SERARABIT” (Who shall separate them?).<sup>744</sup> The notion expressed is that through her English heart, the body of the queen and the crown are essentially one entity. Similar imagery was repeated at Anne’s coronation with one commemorative medal featuring a burning heart surrounded by oak and laurel branches below a crown. The legend clearly demonstrating the significance of Anne’s royal Stuart blood as the English translation reads “From royal ancestors.”<sup>745</sup> A sermon preached at St Pauls Cathedral as part of the thanksgiving celebrations in November 1702 for the military and naval victories of the Earl of Marlborough, Duke of Ormond and Sir George Rook, also acclaimed Anne’s English heart. Using this notion to unite her with her subjects, Jonathan Trelawney, the Bishop of Exeter exclaimed “...with the hearts of all her Subjects, like her own, *entirely English*.”<sup>746</sup> In this context Anne’s Englishness placed her at one with her subjects and the body of the realm in a way that had not been possible for William as he did not have English blood. Such a distinction can also be viewed as a potential response to the James Francis Edward Stuart’s claim to the throne as James III, and in this context Anne’s English blood can be seen as retaining order by counteracting Jacobite claims. Hence in early eighteenth century England, notions of blood and Englishness could be used as an expression of nationalist beliefs and English xenophobia in a very similar manner to how they had been in the mid-sixteenth century when some radical Protestants had accused Mary Tudor of having inherited her mother’s Spanish blood, to the detriment of the realm.

Finding suitable iconographical precedents for regnant queenship was a prevailing aspect of the reigns of Mary I, Mary II, and Anne, as contemporaries sought to negotiate anxieties over

---

<sup>743</sup> Anon., *The Church of England’s Joy on the Happy Accession of her most Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, to the Throne* (London, 1702), p.2

<sup>744</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, pp.227-228; Plate CXV, Nos. 1,3

<sup>745</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, pp.230-231; Plate CXV, No.12

<sup>746</sup> Sir Jonathan Trelawney, *A Sermon preach’d before the Queen, and both Houses of Parliament at the cathedral church of St Pauls, Nov. 12. 1702* (London, 1702), p16

female rule and address the tensions between the culturally dominant gendered model and the exercise of authority. The analogy of Godly archetypes was crucial for Mary I and Mary II, as both queens were compared to Esther and Deborah, whilst Judith and the Virgin Mary were also central to constructions of Mary Tudor. However for Anne, whilst suitable analogies of worthy and notable women were still evident, there was an overall shift away from such reliance upon Biblical archetypes, with one significant exception: Deborah. Although Trelawney made a fleeting reference to Esther in his thanksgiving sermon of 1702, the Biblical archetype used by contemporaries in Anne's reign was Deborah.<sup>747</sup> Indeed, Anne was as constructed in sermons and poems as an "English Deborah."<sup>748</sup> Given the significant amount of military and naval campaigns in Europe that England was engaged in during Anne's reign, and her consequent reliance on military commanders such as Marlborough, Ormond and Rook, the analogy of Deborah and Barak held particular relevance as Barak had been the commander of Deborah's armies in the Old Testament. In this context we see John Grant's 1704 thanksgiving sermon for the victory at Blenheim acclaiming Anne and Marlborough as Deborah and Barak with the French king, Louis XIV, as Jabin, the king of Canaan. Similar to works that argued Mary Tudor's superiority over Judith and Esther, Grant asserted that Anne surpassed the Biblical Deborah. Deborah's victory was restricted to the confines of Israel, whilst Anne had not only delivered her own people from the French threat, but also rescued the German empire from the French king's enslavement.<sup>749</sup>

The overall shift of emphasis from Biblical archetypes however saw Anne compared to a range of notable female figures, including Cynthia, Augusta, Juno, Pallas, Astraea-Virgo, Britannia, and Elizabeth I. Not all these examples were unique to Anne as both Mary Tudor and Mary II had been compared to Pallas, comparisons to Astraea Virgo had been a feature of Elizabeth's reign, and Mary II had also been compared to Elizabeth I. Representations of Anne as Pallas were prominent throughout the reign. The ancient Greek goddess of wisdom, Pallas also represented courage, justice and warfare, so was a particularly suitable emblem for an early modern queen facing the significant military challenges that faced Anne. The queen was depicted as Pallas on the medals cast to commemorate her coronation, (fig. 5) where on the reverse of which she is portrayed throwing Jove's thunderbolts at a twin headed monster

---

<sup>747</sup> Trelawney, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen*, p.16

<sup>748</sup> John Grant, *Deborah and Barak the Glorious Instruments of Israel's Deliverence. A Sermon Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of Rochester on the Seventh of September, 1704.....* (London, 1704), p.19; Anon, *Deborah: A Sacred Ode* (London, 1705) – the preface to this ode refers to a poem entitled *Deborah and Barak* that had been recently published

<sup>749</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6

with snakes for lower limbs who is threateningly wielding clubs and stones; the legend reads “VICEM GERIT. ILLA TONANTIS (She is the Vice-regent of the Thunderer). The monster represents Louis XIV and the image is illustrative of Anne’s continuation of William’s military policies against Louis and French expansionism with the medal affording a clear representation of Anne defending her realm against the power of France.<sup>750</sup> The analogy of Pallas neatly fitted the military events of the reign and was used again in a 1709 poem celebrating military success in which Samuel Cobb referred to the “Thunderbolt launch’d by a *Female Hand*” and cited the queen as a “*British PALLAS.*”<sup>751</sup> Noteworthy is, that similar to Grant’s recognition of Anne’s Englishness as Deborah, Cobb also attached Anne’s nationality



Fig. 5, Anne, coronation medal, 1702

to his portrayal of her as Pallas; both writers drawing on the notion of her English blood. Edie has argued that the portrayal of Anne as Pallas to some extent diminished her personal authority as such a mythical allusion was deemed necessary to make Anne appear powerful enough to repel the threat posed by France.<sup>752</sup> But as the portrayal of Anne as Pallas drew upon existing representational precedents for regnant queenship the allusion can instead be seen as a continuation of what contemporaries deemed successful and eminently suitable imagery.

<sup>750</sup> *Medallic Illustrations*, Vol. II, pp.228-229; Plate CXV, Nos.4-11

<sup>751</sup> Samuel Cobb, *The Female Reign: An Ode* (London, 1709), pp.6,9

<sup>752</sup> Edie, ‘The Public Face of Royal Ritual’, p.326

A further significant female representation of Anne, and one that also further acclaimed her Englishness, is that of Elizabeth. From early in her reign Anne modelled herself upon Elizabeth, a strategy that included adopting the Tudor queen's motto, *Semper Eadem*, and comparisons of Anne to Elizabeth were also a re-occurring feature of sermons and poems during the reign.<sup>753</sup> For example, in his coronation sermon John Sharp, the Archbishop of York, hailed Anne as another Elizabeth, paying particular focus to Elizabeth's role in preserving Protestantism in England, whilst in an ode of 1705 Charles Johnson emphasised the military similarities of the two queens reigns, with Anne about to "awe proud France" as Elizabeth had checked "insulting Spain", and asserted that Anne had succeeded Elizabeth as "Mistress of the Ocean."<sup>754</sup> Given that Mary II was also compared to Elizabeth such comparisons for Anne are hardly surprising. And again, parallels could easily be drawn between Elizabeth's defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, and Anne's continuation of William's military action against French expansionism. Furthermore the image of Elizabeth would appear more appropriate for Anne than for her sister Mary, given that Anne reigned as sole monarch; her husband, Prince George of Denmark, only having an informal role as consort, whilst Mary, with the exception of her regencies, had no monarchical authority and dutifully deferred to her husband on all matters. Hence those writers who compared Mary to Elizabeth negotiated the paradox of Elizabeth's unmarried state and Mary's dutiful submission to patriarchal expectations by constructing Mary as the superior of the two Queens. John Watkins has argued that by modelling herself on Elizabeth Anne sought to distinguish herself from the "de-sacralized monarchy" of William and Mary, referring back to monarchy by divine right and re-introducing the ritual of touching for the King's Evil that had been practised by both Elizabeth and Mary Tudor, but abandoned by William.<sup>755</sup> For a parliamentary queen to draw so heavily upon divine right queenship could be problematic but comparisons of Anne to Elizabeth formed part of a wider utilisation of notable female archetypes that had evolved since the accession of Mary Tudor to include a range of classical, historical, and Biblical women.

---

<sup>753</sup> Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p.152; John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2002), p.206

<sup>754</sup> John Sharp, *A Sermon preach'd at the coronation of Queen Anne, in the abby-church of Westminster, April XXIII, MDCCII, by the Most Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Archbishop of York. Published by Her Majesty's Especial Command* (London, 1702), pp.15-16; Charles Johnson, *The Queen: A Pindarick Ode* (London, 1705), p.14

<sup>755</sup> Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England*, p.208; a comprehensive analysis of the representations of Elizabeth during the reigns of William and Mary and Anne and the changing perception of Elizabeth's queenship across the period is provided by Watkins, pp. 188-219

Traditional notions of femininity were of crucial significance at the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. As evident with Mary II there was also a distinct emphasis on Anne's femininity, her virtue and piety and such expressions were a frequent feature in sermons and poems of the reign. Whilst there was also some praise for traditional masculine characteristics including courage and wisdom, the focus was predominantly on Anne's softer, feminine nature. For example, in Grant's thanksgiving sermon for the victory at Blenheim, Anne is an exemplar of virtue and piety that sets her apart from others.

“for we have a QUEEN whose Glory, whose Pleasure and Delight it is to be really Pious, Virtuous, and Good; whose very Personal Graces presage some general Blessings to Her People, renders Her the glory and Ornament of Her Sex, and adds a Beauty and Lustre to the Scepter and Diadem She wears.”<sup>756</sup>

For Grant, Anne's piety and virtue were elements of her femininity that enhance the glory of her queenship, whilst it is Marlborough, as Barak and general of her armies that occupied the masculine military sphere. Charles Johnson also acclaimed Anne's piety and virtue which he claimed were as crucial to the military campaign as Marlborough was, as essentially Louis XIV would be defeated by “Female Vertue”.<sup>757</sup> Hence Johnson, in common with other writers, recognised Marlborough as a military agent, actively participating in a sphere that was effectively barred to the queen because of her gender, but paradoxically acclaims that Anne was the enabler of such victories, as power came directly from the queen. In this context Anne's piety and virtue underpin her monarchical authority and enable the military conquests of the reign. Other aspects of Anne's femininity could also be used to underpin her authority, as writers focussed on notions of feminine softness in a similar manner to that applied to Mary II. For the poet Matthew Prior, who also placed Anne as ultimately responsible for the victories of the reign, through her appointment of Marlborough, Anne was a king, but a “softer King.”<sup>758</sup> And for one of the queen's chaplains, Thomas Sherlock, her feminine softness underpinned her exercise of monarchical authority as she invited rather than commanded obedience.<sup>759</sup> Such embodiment of feminine virtues was acclaimed by Nahum Tate in a poem marking her death where he portrayed her as Eusebia, who in Greek

---

<sup>756</sup> Grant, *A Sermon*, p16

<sup>757</sup> Johnson, *The Queen: A Pindarick Ode*, pp.3.,8,10,15

<sup>758</sup> Matthew Prior, *An Ode Humbly Inscrib'd to the Queen* (1706), in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1709), pp.288,293

<sup>759</sup> Thomas Sherlock, *A Sermon preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons at St Margarets, Westminster on Monday, March 8<sup>th</sup>. 1713/14 Being the Day of Her majesty's Happy Accession to the throne* (London, 1714), p.19

mythology represented the traditional female traits of piety, duty and filial respect.<sup>760</sup> Such emphasis on feminine virtues was crucial to the positive representations of both Mary II and Anne, because it directly refuted Jacobite arguments that they were unnatural daughters who had violated patriarchal ideals and betrayed their father in their lust for power. It was also a significant attempt to fit regnant queenship into the patriarchal society that existed at the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Maternal imagery was a crucial element in the construction of early modern regnant queenship. Both Mary Tudor and Mary II were portrayed as mothers of their realms and of their respective churches, with such portrayals also serving to divert attention from their failure to produce heirs of their bodies. Significantly the same applies to Anne, who despite her numerous pregnancies, had no living children by the time she ascended the throne. Bowers considers that Anne's childlessness made maternal imagery problematic for the regime, yet the strategies adopted by Anne were similar to those used by Mary Tudor and Mary II (although Bowers questions how successful these were for Anne).<sup>761</sup> At her coronation the Archbishop of York presented Anne as a mother of her people and the church by basing his sermon on the text of Isaiah - "Kings shall be thy Nursing Fathers and their Queens thy nursing Mothers." This theme was developed throughout the body of the sermon and specifically related to the queen.<sup>762</sup> Such emphasis continued throughout the reign; for example, Matthew Prior referred to Anne as a "British Mother" in a poem of 1706 and a sermon of 1714 referred to her as "a Nursing-Mother to the Church and all Her Children."<sup>763</sup> In a poem after her death Tate referred to the maternal functions of the queen as he portrayed her subjects as orphans weeping at her tomb before comparing Anne to the pelican who fed her brood with her own blood to secure their nourishment.<sup>764</sup> Hence the symbolic presentation of her maternal function as queen effectively superseded her biological failure in a very similar manner to both her sister and Mary Tudor. Such focus on motherhood in representations of early modern regnant queenship demonstrates the importance of the queen's function as a potential bearer of heirs in the same manner that it would do for a queen

---

<sup>760</sup> Nahum Tate, *A Poem on the Death of our late most Gracious Sovereign Queen Anne* (1716), p.5

<sup>761</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.49-50; Bowers argues that the representation of Anne as a nursing mother were essentially unsuccessful due to changing perceptions of motherhood as a political agent, pp.37-89

<sup>762</sup> Sharp, *A Sermon*, pp.1-5,19,22,23

<sup>763</sup> Prior, *An Ode Humbly Inscribed to the Queen*, p.293; Sherlock, *A sermon preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons*, p.20

<sup>764</sup> Tate, *A Poem on the Death of our Late most Gracious Sovereign Queen Anne*, pp.14,17

consort. It also seeks to address the potential conflict between the traditional feminine ideal of motherhood and the exercise of monarchical authority by identifying the body of the queen with the body of the realm and the church, reinforcing the notion of the monarch's two bodies within a gendered spectrum.



# Conclusion

---

By Anne's accession in 1702, regnant queenship was no longer the unprecedented phenomenon it had been in 1553. Had the concept of gynaecocracy evolved across the period, and if so, to what extent had such evolution transformed the office of regnant queen and contemporary perceptions of regnant queenship? Certainly by the early eighteenth century there was considerably less apprehension regarding female rule than there had been in the mid sixteenth century. But to a great extent this can be attributed to the evolution of monarchy itself, from the personal monarchy of the Tudors to the constitutional monarchy of the later Stuarts, and to the development of the Parliamentary system of political parties, which was well established by the later seventeenth century. Regnant queenship was still problematical, and the considerable continuities across the period enable us to question the assertion that by the early eighteenth century regnant queenship had evolved to any significant extent.<sup>765</sup>

Focussing on early modern married regnant queens has highlighted substantial continuities regarding the reigns of Mary I, Mary II and Anne. The most obvious relate to the contested accessions of Mary Tudor and Mary II, which, against the backdrop of significant religious tensions, brought concepts of gender, blood and authority to the forefront of contemporary political thought, underpinning the accessions of both these queens. Indeed, along with religion, it was the interplay of these three key elements that enabled the dynastic manipulation that sought to exclude Mary and Elizabeth Tudor from the line of succession, and the Glorious Revolution with the deposition of James II and the consequent establishment of England's first dual monarchy of William III and Mary II. Anxieties concerning female rule were evident during the accessions of both Mary I and Mary II, but were manifested in different ways. Protestant reformers in the sixteenth century clearly enunciated the belief that female rule was unnatural and contrary to both divine and natural order, whilst the poems and ballads that acclaimed Mary I's accession sought to allay anxieties over female rule by celebrating her traditional feminine characteristics and presenting her queenship as divinely sanctioned. The pamphlet literature of the Glorious Revolution and the ensuing debate of the Convention Parliament over who should succeed James II testify to the continuing belief of

---

<sup>765</sup> Arguing for the considerable evolution of female rule, Charles Beem cites Anne's reign as "the apotheosis of English female kingship", Beem, *The Lioness Roared*, p. 102

women's unsuitability for government and the consequent unsettling dimension of regnant queenship. Indeed, the inception of the dual monarchy itself, with monarchical power invested solely in William, is an incontrovertible expression of the continued anxiety and apprehension regarding female rule.

Another marked continuity is that the reigns of both queens inaugurated unprecedented monarchical arrangements. Mary Tudor was England's first regnant queen.<sup>766</sup> Likewise Mary II's reign introduced the novel concept of a dual monarchy. This presented its own particular challenges, visible for example, in the 1690 Regency Bill that invested Mary with monarchical authority during William's absences abroad. The unprecedented nature of the queenships of Mary I and Mary II, combined with the fact that their accessions were contested, directly affected the events and rituals that explained and confirmed their power, enhancing the importance of each regime's proclamations and presenting challenges to the long established ritual of coronation. Devised and used for centuries solely for kings, the coronation ritual was of necessity re-interpreted by contemporaries as it responded to the challenges presented by regnant queenship, dual monarchy, and, with the accession of Anne in 1702, a married regnant queen crowned as sole monarch. The surprising success of such a long established ritual in responding to such unprecedented coronations is all the more marked in view of the considerable degree of uncertainty that was manifested in various ways on all these occasions: the mixed messages seen in the visual affirmations of queenship in Mary Tudor's coronation pageantry, the dilemma over whether Mary II should be crowned in the same manner as William, and finally, the exclusion of George of Denmark from Anne's coronation ritual.

The concept of a male consort was also unprecedented, and one of the most striking concerns is the continuing tension between conjugal and political power. Because it was considered natural for a woman to place herself under the headship of a husband, the dominant gendered model made a married woman's exercise of authority over her husband wholly unnatural. Thus Mary Tudor's marriage to Philip of Spain in 1554 presented the political nation with the spectre of an inversion of traditional gendered roles at the level of the crown. Yet their marriage also signalled the possibility of the 'conquest' of England by Spain should those

---

<sup>766</sup> Matilda, the daughter and heir of Henry I in the twelfth century was unsuccessful in claiming the throne. Despite a protracted civil war, she was never crowned and eventually gave up her claim in favour of her son, the future Henry II.

gendered norms hold sway. Paradoxically gendered norms could also be re-assuring, particularly when Philip was seen to fulfil the masculine elements of monarchy that Mary's queenship was unable to do, namely participation in tournaments that displayed his martial prowess, and crucially, leading an English army in the campaign against France. Despite legislative attempts to define the queen's power and Philip's role in England, contemporaries struggled to reconcile an underlying preference for strong male government with fears of foreign domination. Mixed messages in ceremonial representations of the couple and reports of factions supporting either Philip or Mary clearly testify to the failure of legislative measures to adequately address the problem – for which there was no solution, given contemporary beliefs. Nor had the position shifted by the late seventeenth century.

Although the balance of power within the dual monarchy as defined in the 1689 Bill of Rights should have ensured that such a contradiction between the exercise of power by a woman and the authority of her husband was not an issue, this was not the case. William's decision to make Mary regent in 1690, and during subsequent absences from the kingdom, brought questions of gender and authority back into the political spotlight. Anxieties abounded lest investing monarchical authority in Mary would fatally undermine William's authority. The resulting Regency Bill was a clear reflection of the underlying preference for male government as it said more about William's authority than it did about Mary's. Once again contemporaries attempted to reconcile their notions of authority with the dominant gendered model, as despite being praised for her capable handling of her regencies, Mary was also censured for her continued referral of matters to William, and her power was presented as being inferior to that of the king.

Unlike the ambiguities seen in the legislative attempts to define Philip and Mary's authority, legislative definitions of Anne and George's authority were more successful, defining Anne as sole queen and leaving George with an informal role of consort. But despite this, and despite George's evident lack of political ambition, the concept of a male consort remained problematic. Contemporaries clearly saw George as having a crucial role in Anne's queenship, and a necessary fiction emerged of George as an enabler of the queen's power. Indeed, far from being able to dispense with the role of consort, Anne acknowledged the centrality of George to her authority, advocating suitably prominent positions and honours for him. A further fiction that emerged was that of George as a military hero. Unlike Philip and William, who both undertook military campaigns, George was not a military leader.

Determined by his poor health and politically nonchalant nature his 'leadership' was restricted to his symbolic role as Lord high Admiral and Generalissimo of the queen's forces, whilst commanders such as Marlborough, Ormond and Rook demonstrated actual prowess.

An issue common to Mary I, Mary II and Anne was failed maternity as all three queens died childless. In contrast to Anne's startlingly obvious fecundity neither Mary I nor Mary II experienced a successful pregnancy. But only one of Anne's children survived beyond infancy and he died before her accession. It appears that all three queens may have experienced pseudocyesis, revealing the pressure under which they were placed to produce a surviving heir. Yet the consequences of this failure for their reigns differed. Mary Tudor's inability to produce an heir was of far greater significance than it was for the Stuart queens, as it diminished her authority and jeopardised the Catholic succession in England. By the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the changed political and religious climate, and the establishment of the Protestant succession, significantly reduced the impact of Mary II's lack of fecundity and Anne's failure to provide a surviving heir for the body politic.

A further area where continuity across the period is clearly evident is the representation of queenly identities, by both opponents and supporters of the individual queen's regimes, with broadly similar themes used across the period. Attacks on both Mary I and Mary II were underpinned by notions of gender and blood. Protestant reformers and Jacobites drew upon anxieties about female rule to portray these queens as unnatural and ungodly: Mary I as an ungodly tyrant and Mary II as an unnatural daughter. Enabled by beliefs about gender, critics manipulated the queens' sexual identities. This was more subtly expressed against Mary Tudor, as radical Protestants either hinted at her behaviour or presented her as guilty by implication - for example, Knox's comparison of the queen to Jezebel, whom he cited as a whore and fornicator. Sexual slurs against Mary II were far more direct: Jacobites accused her of having illicit sexual relationships with members of her court and openly referred to her as a 'moll'. These distinct differences are partly as a result of the extension of the public sphere across the period and the heightened sense of popular political consciousness that marked the later seventeenth century. The debates regarding queenship in the mid sixteenth century formed part of an elite discourse, whereas by the later seventeenth century this had transmuted

to a more popular audience. Critics of both queens further reinforced their attacks by drawing on extant notions of tainted and illegitimate blood as they sought to challenge the queenships of both women. Their blood was portrayed as contaminated: Mary Tudor's by the sinfulness of her parent's marriage, Mary II's by her mother's common blood. This was a powerful argument, since tainted and illegitimate blood was regarded as corrupting the entire royal line. It had been previously cited to exclude Mary I from the line of succession in 1553, and in 1688 to effectively discredit the birth of Mary II's half-brother, James Francis Edward Stuart. But blood could also be used to justify claims to queenship. After all, in 1553 Mary Tudor and her supporters successfully claimed the crown on the basis of her hereditary blood right, and in 1702, Anne placed considerable emphasis on her English royal blood, pointing to the contrast to that of her predecessor, William.

Positive representations of queenship were grounded in three key themes. As an obvious response to the dynastic upheaval surrounding their accessions, and to religious tensions, both Mary I and Mary II were portrayed as restorers of order to their kingdoms. Such a representation was also a direct refutation that their rule was unnatural and contrary to natural order. Secondly, supporters drew upon the traditional gendered model, focussing on the queens' piety, femininity and chastity, to position them as Godly queens. Finally, maternal imagery was central to the queenly identities of all three queens, placing them as mothers of their people and the Church, and seeking to compensate for their failed fecundity. These positive portrayals of queenly identities not only illustrate continuity in the representation of queenship across the period, along with the identification of godly archetypes, they also link regnant queens to queens consort, as contemporaries developed existing portrayals of queenship in their attempt to find suitable models of representation for regnant queenship. Despite this sense of continuity, representations of queenship, whether negative or positive, are characterised by the development and expansion of the public sphere. Representations of queenship in the mid sixteenth century were to a great extent the preserve of an elite, and educated, political nation, whereas by the later seventeenth century the combination of popular political engagement and the production of a vast array of pamphlet literature were an indication of a popularised political nation. Accompanying the transformation from hereditary monarchy to contractual, parliamentary monarchy was a growing popular interest in representations of monarchical office that was also marked by the increased public interest in the later Stuart coronations.

Regnant queenship in 1553 was unprecedented, unsettling, and problematical. Despite considerable political and religious changes across the period, including the evolution of monarchical office, it remained problematical in the early eighteenth century. It would, however, be erroneous to discount the evolution of female kingship totally. Some evolution had clearly occurred, particularly with regard to legislative definitions of monarchical authority. Gender is a fluid form of analysis and gendered boundaries can often be blurred, but the considerable continuities in the reigns of Mary I, Mary II and Anne, clearly demonstrate that regnant queenship continued to present significant challenges at the end of the early modern period.

# Bibliography

---

## MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

### Yale University Library, Beinecke Library:

Osborn MS b 111 (Yo11)

## ONLINE RESOURCES

17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers,

[find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk/bncn/start.do?prodId=BNWS&userGroupName=livuni](http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk/bncn/start.do?prodId=BNWS&userGroupName=livuni)

British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk>

Early English Books Online, [eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk](http://eebo.chadwyck.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk)

Eighteenth Century Collections Online,

[find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk/ecco/start.do?prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=livuni](http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liv.ac.uk/ecco/start.do?prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=livuni)

John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* [...], *The Variorum Edition* [online]. (hriOnline, Sheffield 2004). Available from: <http://www.hrionline.shef.ac.uk/foxe/>

*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), online edition,

[www.oxforddnb.com](http://www.oxforddnb.com).

*The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or TAMO (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011), <http://www.johnfoxe.org>

## PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Abbadie, Jaques, *A panegyric on our late sovereign Lady Mary Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland of glorious and immortal memory who died at Kensington, on the 28<sup>th</sup> December, 1694* (London, 1694)

*An Account of the Ceremonial of Their Most Excellent Majesties King William and Queen Mary* (London, 1689)

*An Account of the Reasons of the Nobility and Gentry's Invitation of his Highness the Prince of Orange into England Being a Memorial from the English Protestants Concerning their Grievances* (London, 1688)

Aylmer, John, *An Harborowe for Faithful and Trewe Subjectes, against the late blowne Blaste, concerning the Government of Wemen wherin be confuted all such reasons as a straunger of late made in that behalf, with a brief exhortation to obedience* (1559)

Bathurst, Benjamin, *Letters of Two Queens* (London, 1924)

Becon, Thomas, *An Humble Supplication Unto God for the Restoring of his Holy Word Unto the Church of England*, in John Ayre, ed. *Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon* (Cambridge, 1844)

Beard, Richard, *A godly psalme of Marye Queene which brought vs comfort al, through God, whom wee of dewtye prayse, that giues her foes a fal* (London, 1553)

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Concerning Famous Women*, G.A. Guarino trans. and ed. (London, 1964)

Boyer, Abel, *The History of the Reign of Queen Anne*, (London, 1703)

*A Brief History of the Pious and Glorious Life and Actions of the Most Illustrious Princess, Mary Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland* (London, 1695)

Browning, A., ed. *English Historical Documents 1660-1714* (London, 1953)

Burnet, Gilbert, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1683)

----- *An Essay on the Memory of the Late Queen* (London, 1695)

----- *A Sermon Preached at the Coronation of William III and Mary II* (London, 1689)

----- *Bishop Burnet's History of his own Time*, Vol. 5 (Edinburgh, 1753)

*Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations Between England and Spain Preserved in the Archives at Vienna, Simancas, Besancon, Brussels, Madrid and Lille*, ed. Royall Tyler (London, 1916-1954)



*Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the Reign of Mary I, 1553-1558*, ed. C.S. Knighton (London, 1998)

*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, James II, Volume III, June 1687-February 1689*, ed. E.K. Timings (London, 1972)

*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of William and Mary, May 1690 – October 1691* ed. W. J. Hardy (London, 1898)

*Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. Rawdon Brown (London, 1864-98)

Cameron, W.J. ed. *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714, Volume 5, 1688-1697* (London, 1971)

*Certayne Questions Demanded and Asked by the Noble Realme of Englande of Her True Natrual Children and Subjectes of the Same* (1555)

Christopherson, John, *A prayer for the Queenes highness, very conueniente to be sayde dayle of all her faithful and louying subjects* (1554)

*The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London, 1850)

*Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London, 1852)

*The Church of England's Joy on the Happy Accession of her Most Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, to the Throne* (London, 1702)

Churchill, Sarah, *An Account of the Conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough* (London, 1742)

Cibber, Colley, *A Poem on the Death of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Mary* (1695)

Cobb, Samuel, *The Female Reign: An Ode* (London, 1709)

Cockburn, William, *An Essay Upon the Propitious and Glorious Reign of our Gracious Sovereign Anne* (London, 1710)

*A Congratulatory Poem Humbly Address'd to his Royal Highness Prince George Hereditary Prince of Denmark, Lord high Admiral of England, &c. On the glorious Success of Her Majesty's Arms at Vigo*

*Coronation Order of King William III. and Queen Mary II*, in Leopold G. Wickham Legg, ed. *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901)

Dalrymple, John, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland from the Dissolution of the Last Parliament of Charles II Until the Sea Battle off La Hogue* (2 vols. London and Edinburgh, 1771-1773)

*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 Kingdome of England, for Preserving of the Protestant Religion, and for Restoring the Lawes and Liberties of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1688)

*The Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled at Westminster Presented to Their Highnesses the Prince and Princess of ORANGE, at White-Hall the 13<sup>th</sup> of February, 1689* (London, 1689)

*Deborah: A Sacred Ode* (London, 1705)

Defoe, Daniel, *The Education of Women* (1697), in George A. Aitken ed. *Later Stuart Tracts* (New York, 1964)

De Guaras, Antonio, *The Accession of Queen Mary*, ed. Richard Garnett (London, 1892)

Dent, Giles, *A Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of his Royal Highness prince George of Denmark* (London, 1708)

De Seyssel, Claude, *The Monarchy of France*, trans. J.H. Hexter, ed. Donald, R. Kelley (London, 1981)

*Device for the Coronation of King Henry VII*, in William Jerden ed. *Rutland Papers. Original Documents Illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII and Henry VIII, Selected from the Private Archives of His grace the Duke of Rutland* (London, 1843)

Doebner, R. ed. *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England (1585-1693) Together with her Letters and Those of Kings James II and William II to the Electress, Sophia of Hanover* (Leipzig, 1886)

Dove, Henry, *Albania. A poem humbly offered to the memory of our late Sovereign Lady, Mary Queen of England* (1695)

Ellis, Frank, H. ed. *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714, Volume 6, 1697-1704* (London, 1970)

-----, ed. *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714, Volume 7, 1704-1714* (London, 1975)

*Emblems for the King and Queen with an epitaph on her Majesty and a Brief Character of her Vertues* (1695)

Evelyn, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. de Beer (6 vols., Oxford, 1955)

Fiennes, Celia, *The Journeys of Celia Feinnes*, ed. Christopher Morris (London, 1947)

Filmer, Robert, *Patriarcha. The Naturall Power of Kinges Defended against the Unnatural Liberty of the People*, in J.P. Somerville, ed. *Patirarcha and Other Writings* (Cambridge, 1991)

Forrest, William, *A New Ballade of the Marigolde* (1553), in Hyder E. Rollins ed. *Old English Ballads 1553-1625* (Cambridge, 1920)

*Four Questions Debated* (1689)

Fowler, Edward, *Memoirs on the Life and Death of our Late Most Gracious Queen Mary* (London, 1712)

Foxcroft, H.C. ed. *A Supplement to Burnet's History of my own time derived from his original memoirs, his autobiography, his letters to Admiral Herbert and his private meditations, all hitherto unpublished* (Oxford, 1902)

Gander, Joseph, *The Glory of her Sacred Majesty Queen Anne, in the Royal Navy and her Absolute Sovereignty as Empress at Sea* (London, 1703)

Gilby, Anthony, *An Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to Repentance* (1558)

Gleane, Peter, *An Elegy on the Death of the Queen* (London, 1695)

Goodman, Christopher, *How Superior Powers Oght to be Obey'd* (1558)

Grant, John, *Deborah and Barak the glorious Instruments of Israel's Deliverence. A Sermon preach'd at the Cathedral Church of Rochester on the Seventh of September, 1704* (London, 1704)

Greg, W.W. ed. *Respublica. An Interlude for Christmas 1553 Attributed to Nicholas Udall* (London, 1952)

Grey, Anchitell, *Debates of the House of Commons From the Year 1667 to the Year 1694.* (10 vols., London, 1763)

Hales, John, *An Oration of John Hales to the Queen's Majesty, And deliver'd to Her by a certain Nobleman at Her first Entrance to her Reign*, in S.A. Johnson, *A Second Five Year's Struggle Against Popery and Tyranny* (London, 1689)

Harfsfield, John, *Concio quaedam admodum elegans, docta salubris, & pia magistri Iohannis Harfsfield* (1553)

Hawkins, Edward, Franks, Augustus, W and Greuber, Herbert, A., eds., *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the Death of George II* (2 vols., London, 1885)

Heywood, John, *A Balade specifienge partly the maner, partly the matter, in the most excellent meeting and lyke marriage between our Soueraigne Lord and our Soueraigne Lady, the Kynges and Queenes Highnes*, in Burton A. Milligan ed. *John Heywood's Works and Miscellaneous Short Poems* (Urbana, 1956)

'House of Commons Journal Volume 10: 8 October 1690', *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 10: 1688-1693* (1802), pp.429-430, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=29048> (accessed 28 June 2011)

'House of Commons Journal Volume 10: 28 October 1691', *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 10: 1688-1693* (1802), pp. 541-542, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=29131> (accessed 28 June 2011)

‘House of Commons Journal Volume 10: 11 November 1692’, *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 10: 1688-1693* (1802), p. 698, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=29236> (accessed 28 June 2011)

‘House of Lords Journal Volume 14: 7 October 1690’, *Journal of the House of Lords: volume 14: 1685-1691* (1767-1830), pp. 518-519, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=13275> (accessed 26 June 2011)

‘House of Lords Journal Volume 14: 27 October 1691’, *Journal of the House of Lords: volume 14: 1685-1691* (1767-1830), pp. 628-629, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=13350> (accessed 26 June 2011)

‘House of Lords Journal Volume 15: 18 November 1692’, *Journal of the House of Lords: volume 15:1691-1696* (1767-1830), pp.115-116, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=11844> (accessed 26 June 2011)

Hughes, Paul, L. and Larkin, James, F. eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations. Volume I the Early Tudors 1485-1553* (London, 1964)

Hughes, Paul, L. and Larkin, James, F. eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations. Volume II the Later Tudors 1553-1587* (London, 1969)

*Idem Iterum or The History of Q. Mary’s Big Belly* (London, 1688)

Johnson, Charles, *The Queen: A Pindarick Ode* (London, 1705)

*A Kind Congratulation between Queen Elizabeth and the Late Queen Mary II. Of Ever Glorious Memory* (London, 1695)

Knaggs, Thomas, *The Excellency of a Good Name* (London, 1708)

Knox, John, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (1558), Edward Arber ed. (London, 1895)

Lediard, Thomas, *The Life of John, Duke of Marlborough, Prince of the Roman Empire, Illustrated with Maps, Plans of Battles, Sieges, and Medals, And a Great Number of Original Letters and Papers Never Before Published* (London, 1743)

*A Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Correspondent in the City concerning the coronation medal, distributed April 11. 1689* (1689)

*A letter to a member of Parliament, in reference to his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark* (London, 1702)

*Liber Regalis*, in L.G. Wickham Legg ed. *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901)

*Little Device for the Coronation of Henry VII*, in L.G. Wickham Legg ed. *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901)

Locke, John, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge, 1988)

*London Gazette*, 18 February 1689, Issue 2429, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 21 February 1689, Issue 2430, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 25 February 1689, Issue 2431, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 28 February 1689, Issue 2432, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 4 April 1689, Issue 2442, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 8 April 1689, Issue 2443, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 11 April 1689, Issue 2444, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 23 April 1702, Issue 3804, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 27 August 1702, Issue 3840, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*London Gazette*, 12 October 1702, Issue 3853, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714*, (6 vols., Oxford, 1857)

Luttrell, Narcissus, *The Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell 1691-1693*, ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford, 1972)

*Lux Occidentalis: or Providence Display'd in the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary; and their Happy Accession to the crown of England* (London, 1689)

Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince* (Oxford, 2005)

Machyn, Henry, *The Diary of Henry Machyn Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London, 1848)

Macky, John, *Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, Esq. During the Reigns of King William, Queen Anne, and King George I* (London, 1733)

Malfatti, C.V. *The Accession, Coronation and Marriage of Mary Tudor as Related in Four Manuscripts of the Escorial* (Barcelona, 1956)

*The Manner of the Proclaiming of King WILLIAM, and Queen MARY, at WHITE-HALL, and in the city of LONDON, Feb. 13 1689* (London, 1689)

Marshall, George, *A compendious treatise in metre declaring the firste originall of sacrifice, and of the building of aultares and churches, and of the firste receauinge of the Christen faith here in Englande by G.M.* (1554)

*Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England (1689-1693) Together with her Letters and those of Kings James II and William III to the Electress, Sophia of Hanover*, ed. R. Doebner (Leipzig, 1886)

*Mercurius Reformatus or the New Observator*, 1 August 1690, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

Montgomery, James, *Great Britain's Just Complaint* (1692)

Morgan, Matthew, *A Poem to the Queen Upon the King's Victory in Ireland and his Voyage to Holland* (London, 1691)

Nicholls, William, *Afflictions, the lot of God's children* (London, 1709)

*An Ode on her Royal Highness the Princess of Orange* (London, 1689)

Oldmixon, John, *History of England During the Reigns of King William, Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I* (London, 1733)

Planche, J.R., *Regal Records: or a Chronicle of the Queens Regnant of England* (London, 1838)

*Poetical Reflexions, Moral, Comical, Satirical, &c. On the Vices and Follies of the Age* (London, 1708)

Pollard, A.F. *Tudor Tracts 1532-1588* (Westminster, 1903)

Ponet, John, *A Short Treatise on Political Power, and of the true obedience which subjects our to kings and other civil governors, with an Exhortation to all true and natural Englishmen* (1556), reproduced at <http://www.constitution.org/cmt/ponet/polpwer.htm>

*Post Boy*, 7 March 1702, Issue 1063, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*Post Boy*, 21 April 1702, Issue 1082, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*Post Boy*, 23 April 1702, Issue 1083, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

*Post Boy*, 17 September 1702, Issue 1147, 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> Century Burney Collection Newspapers

Powell, Joseph, *The Death of Good Josiah Lamented. A sermon occasioned by the death of our most gracious sovereign Queen Mary of ever blessed memory, preach'd at Basham in Cambridgeshire, March 3, 1695* (London, 1695)

Pior, Matthew, *An Ode Humbly Inscrib'd to the Queen*, in *Poems on Several Occasions*, in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1709)

*A Proclamation* (London, 1689)

Proctor, John, *The Waie Home to Christ* (1554)

*The Protestants Ave Mary, on the Arrival of her most Gracious Majesty, Mary, Queen of England* (London, 1689)

*The Queen's Famous Progress* (London, 1702)



*Reasons for Crowning the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen jointly, And for placing the Executive Power in the Prince alone* (Edinburgh, 1689)

*Reasons humbly offer'd for placing his Highness the Prince of orange singly, in the Throne, during Life* (1689)

*The Report concerning the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary*, in J. Wickham Legg ed. *Three Coronation Orders* (London, 1900)

*The Rising Sun: or Verses upon the Queen's Birthday. Celebrated April 30. NDCXC* (London, 1690)

Robinson, H., ed. *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Written During the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich* (Cambridge, 1846-1847)

Rollins, Hyder, E. ed. *Old English Ballads 1553-1625* (Cambridge, 1920)

Rymer, Thomas, *A Poem on the Arrival of Queen Mary. February 12<sup>th</sup> 1689* (London, 1689)

Salmon, Thomas, *The History of the Life and Reign of her Late Majesty Queen Anne* (London, 1740)

Saville, George, *The Lady's New Year's Gift*, in H.C. Foxcroft ed. *The Life and Letters of Sir George Saville, Bart. First Marquis of Halifax*, Volume II (London, 1898)

Sharp, John, *A Sermon preach'd at the coronation ceremony of Queen Anne, in the abbey-church of Westminster, April XXIII, MDCCII, by the Most Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Archbishop of York. Published by Her Majesty's Especial Command* (London, 1702)

Sherlock, Thomas, *A Sermon preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons at St Margarets, Westminster on Monday, 8<sup>th</sup> March. 1713/14 Being the Day of Her majesty's Happy Accession to the throne* (London, 1714)

Sidney, Algernon, *Discourses Concerning Government*, ed. Thomas G. West (Indianapolis, 1996)

Smith, Thomas, Sir, *De Republica Anglorum* (1583), ed. Mary Dewar (Cambridge, 1982)

Snyder, Henry, L. ed. *The Marlborough and Godolphin Correspondence, Volume 2* (Oxford, 1975)

*The State Letters of Henry Earl of Clarendon Lord Lieutenant of Ireland during the Reign of K. James the Second and his Lordship's Diary for the Years 1687, 1688, 1689 and 1690* (Oxford, 1762)

Stopes, Leonard, *An AVE MARIA in Commendation of our Most Vertuous Queene*, in Hyder E. Rollins ed. *Old English Ballads* (Cambridge, 1920)

Stowe, John, *The Annals; or General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615)

Strype, John, *Ecclesiastical Memorials Relating Chiefly to Religion and the Reformation of it and the Emergencies of the Church of England Under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary, Vol. III, Part I* (Oxford, 1822)

Sturmy, D., *A Sermon Preach'd, &c. October 31<sup>st</sup> 1708 on the Death of his Royal Highness the Prince* (London, 1708)

*A Supplicacyon to the Quene's Majestie* (Strasbourg, 1555)

Tate, Nahum, *A Present for the Ladies* (London, 1692)

----- *A Poem Occasioned by His Majesty's Voyage to Holland, the Congress at the Hague and the Present Siege of Mons* (London, 1691)

----- *A Poem on the Death of our late most Gracious Sovereign Queen Anne* (1716)

Taverner, Richard, *An Oration gratulatory made upon the joyfull proclaiming of the moste noble Princes Quene Mary Quene of Englande* (London, 1553)

Trelawney, Jonathan, Sir, *A Sermon preach'd before the Queen, and both Houses of Parliament at the cathedral church of St Pauls, Nov. 12. 1702* (London, 1702)

Tribbechov, John, *A Funeral Sermon on the Death of his Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark* (London, 1709)

Verney, Margaret, Maria, ed. *Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century from the MSS at Claydon House, Volume I* (London, 1930)

- Vives, Juan Luis, *The Education of a Christian Woman*, ed. and trans. Charles Fontazzi (Chicago, 2000)
- Walsh, William, *A Dialogue Concerning Women, being a Defence of the Sex* (London, 1691)
- Watertoune, Thomas, *An inuectyue against Treason* (London, 1553)
- Wickham Legg, J. ed. *Three Coronation Orders* (London, 1900)
- Wickham Legg, Leopold, G. ed. *English Coronation Records* (Westminster, 1901)
- William and Mary, 1688: An Act declareing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Setleing the Succession of the Crowne [Chapter II. Rot. Parl. Pt. 3 nu. 1.], *Statutes of the Realm: volume 6: 1685-94* (1819), pp. 142-145, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46322> (accessed 31 July 2011)
- William and Mary, 1689: An Act for the Exercise of the Government by her Majestie during his Majestyes Absence [Chapter VI. Rot. Parl. Pt. 1 nu. 8.], *Statutes of the Realm: volume 6: 1685-94* (1819), p. 170, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46335> (accessed 25 February 2011)
- William III, 1700 & 1701: An Act for the further Limitation of the crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject [Chapter II. Rot. Parl. 12 & 13 Gul. III. P. 1. N. 2.], *Statutes of the Realm: volume 7: 1695-1701* (1820), pp. 636-638, reproduced at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46966> (accessed 09 May 2011)
- Williams, C.H., ed. *English Historical Documents, Volume V. 1485-1558* (London, 1967)
- Wingfield, Robert, *The Vita Mariae Angliae of Robert Wingfield of Brantham*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Camden Miscellany*, 28, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, 29 (London, 1984)
- Wriothesley, Charles, *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from A.D. 1485 to 1559*, Vol. 2, ed. W.D. Hamilton (London, 1877)
- The Zurich Letters, Comprising the correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* ed. H. Robinson (Cambridge, 1845)

## SECONDARY SOURCES

Allen, Prudence, *The Concept of Woman. Volume II: The Early Humanist Reformation, 1250-1450* (Cambridge, 1980)

Alsop, J.D., 'The Act for the Queen's Regal Power, 1554', *Parliamentary History*, 13, 3 (1994), pp.261-276

Anglo, Sydney, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London, 1992)

----- *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford, 1997)

Barash, Carol, *English Women's Poetry 1649-1714* (Oxford, 1996)

Baxter, Stephen, *William III* (London, 1966)

Beddard, Robert, *A Kingdom Without a King: The Journal of Provisional Government in the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988)

Beddard, Robert, ed. *The Revolutions of 1688: The Andrew Browning Lectures 1988* (Oxford, 1991)

Beem, Charles, '“I am her Majesty's Subject”: Prince George of Denmark and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', *Canadian Journal of History*, 38, 3 (2004), pp.458-487

----- *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History* (New York, 2006)

Beem, Charles and Moore, Dennis, eds., *The Name of a Queen: William Fleetwood's Itinerarium ad Windsor* (Basingstoke, 2013)

Beem, Charles and Taylor, Miles, eds., *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (Basingstoke, 2014)

Bennett, Judith, M., 'Feminism and History', *Gender and History*, 1, 3 (1989), pp. 251-272

Berry, Helen, *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late Stuart England* (Aldershot, 2003)

Betteridge, Thomas, 'Maids and Wives: Representing Female Rule During the Reign of Mary Tudor', in Susan Doran and Thomas Freeman eds., *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2011)

Bowen, Marjorie, *The Third Mary Stuart: Mary of York, Orange & England. Being a Character Study with Memoirs and Letters of Queen Mary II of England, 1662-1694* (London, 1929)

Bowers, Toni, *The Politics of Motherhood* (Cambridge, 1996)

Brigden, Susan, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors 1485-1603* (London, 2001)

Browning, Andrew, *Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds 1632-1714, Volume II* (Glasgow, 1944)

Bucholz, Robert, "'Nothing but Ceremony": Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual', *Journal of British Studies*, 30, 3 (1991), pp.288-323

----- *The Augustan Court: Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture* (Stanford, 1993)

----- 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues?', in Campbell Orr, Clarissa ed. *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester, 2002)

----- 'The "Stomach of a Queen" or Size Matters: Gender, Body Image and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne', in Levin, Carole and Bucholz, Robert eds., *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England* (London, 2009)

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester, 2002)

Carmi Parsons, John, *Medieval Queenship* (Stroud, 1994)

Chapman, Hester, W., *Mary II, Queen of England* (London, 1953)

Claydon, Tony, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996)

Coward, Barry, *The Stuart Age. England 1603-1714* (Harlow, 2003)

- Cressy, David, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989)
- Cruz, Anne, J. And Suzuki, Mihoko eds., *The Rule of Women in Early Modern Europe* (Urbana, 2009)
- Dawson, Jane, E.A., 'The Two John Knoxes: England, Scotland and the 1558 Tracts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 42, 4 (1991), pp. 555-576
- Dewhurst, John, 'Royal Pseudocyesis', *History of Medicine*, 8 (1980), pp.12-17
- Doran, Susan and Freeman, Thomas, S., eds., *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2011)
- Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (London, 1992)
- Duncan, Sarah, *Mary I: Gender, Power and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen* (Basingstoke, 2012)
- , "'He to Be Intituled King": King Philip of England and the Anglo-Spanish Court', in Charles Beem and Miles Taylor eds., *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (Basingstoke, 2014)
- Dunham, Jr. William Huse, 'Regal Power and the Rule of Law: A Tudor Paradox', *Journal of British Studies*, 3, 2 (1964), pp. 24-56
- Eales, Jacqueline, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (London, 1998)
- Eccleshall, Robert, *Order and Reason in Politics: Theories of Absolute and Limited Monarchy in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1978)
- Edie, Carolyn, 'The Public Face of Royal Ritual: Sermons, Medals and Civic Ceremony in Later Stuart Coronations', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 53, 4 (1990), pp. 311-336
- Edwards, John, *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (London, 2011)
- Elton, G. R. *England Under the Tudors* (London, 1955)
- Emson, H. E., 'For the Want of an Heir: The Obstetrical History of Queen Anne', *British Medical Journal*, 304 (1992), pp.1365-1366

- Erickson, Carolly, *Bloody Mary: The Life of Mary Tudor* (London, 2001)
- Fletcher, Anthony and MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Tudor Rebellions* (Abingdon, 2014)
- Fradenburg, L. O., ed. *Women and Sovereignty* (Edinburgh, 1992)
- Gowing, Laura, *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in Seventeenth Century England* (London, 2003)
- Green, David, *Queen Anne* (London, 1970)
- Gregg, Edward, *Queen Anne* (New Haven, 2001)
- Guy, John, *Tudor England* (Oxford, 1988)
- , 'The Marian Court and Tudor Policy Making', available at <http://www.tudors.org/undergraduate/the-marian-court-and-tudor-policy-making/>
- Hamilton, Elizabeth, *William's Mary* (London, 1972)
- Harris, Tim, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2006)
- Healey, Robert M., 'Waiting for Deborah: John Knox and Four Ruling Queens', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25, 2 (1994), pp. 371-386
- Hoak, Dale, 'Two Revolutions in Tudor Government: The Formation and Organization of Mary I's Privy Council', in Christopher Coleman and David Starkey, eds., *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration* (Oxford, 1986)
- , 'The Coronations of Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth and the Transformation of the Tudor Monarchy', in C.S. Knighton and Richard Mortimer eds., *Westminster Abbey Reformed 1540-1640* (Aldershot, 2003)
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *British Politics in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1967)
- Horowitz, Henry, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977)

Huneycut, Lois, L., 'Female Succession and the Language of Power in the Writings of Twelfth Century Churchmen', in John Carmi Parsons ed. *Medieval Queenship* (Stroud, 1994)

Hunt, Alice, 'Legitimacy, Ceremony and Drama: Mary Tudor's Coronation and Respublica', in Peter Happe and Wim Huskin, eds., *Interludes in Early Modern Society: Studies in Gender, Power and Theatricality* (Amsterdam, 2007)

-----, *The Drama of the Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2008)

-----, 'The Monarchical Republic of Mary I', *Historical Journal*, 52, 3 (2009), pp. 557-572

-----, 'Reforming Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock, eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

Hunt, Alice and Whitelock, Anna, eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

Jordan, Constance, 'Women's Rule in Sixteenth Century British Political Thought', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40, 3 (1987), pp. 421-451

----- *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca, 1990)

Kantorowicz, E.H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Thought* (Princeton, 1997)

Kelly, Joan, *Women, History and Theory* (Chicago, 1984)

Kelsey, Harry, *Philip of Spain King of England: The Forgotten Sovereign* (London, 2012)

Kewes, Paulina, 'Godly Queens: The Royal Iconographies of Mary and Elizabeth', in Hunt and Whitelock eds., *Tudor Queenship: The reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

King, John, N., *Tudor Royal Iconography* (Princeton, 1989)

Kipling, Gordon, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford, 1998)

Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1997)



- Lacquer, Thomas, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (London, 1992)
- Lake, Peter, and Pincus, Steve, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45, 2 (2006), pp. 270-292
- Lee, Patricia-Ann, 'A Bodye Politique to Governe: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship', *Historian*, 52 (1990), pp. 242-261
- Levin, Carole, 'Queens and Claimants: Political Insecurity in Sixteenth Century England', in Janet Sharistianian, ed. *Gender, Ideology and Action: Historical Perspectives on Women's Public Lives* (London, 1986)
- Levin, Carole, Eldridge Carney, Jo, and Barrett-Graves, Debra, eds., "*High and Mighty Queens*" of *Early Modern England: Realities and Representations* (Basingstoke, 2003)
- Levin, Carole, and Bucholz, Robert, eds., *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England* (London, 2009)
- Levine, Mortimer, *Tudor Dynastic Problems* (London, 1973)
- Linecar, H.W.A., *British Coin Designs and Designers* (London, 1977)
- Loach, Jennifer, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford, 1986)
- , 'The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press', *English Historical Review*, 101, 395 (1986), pp. 135-148
- , 'Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-8', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 48 (1975), pp. 31-44
- Loades, David, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England, 1553-1558* (London, 1979)
- , 'Philip II and the Government of England', in C. Cross, D. Loades and J.J. Scarisbrick eds., *Law and Government Under the Tudors: Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton Regis Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge on the Occasion of his Retirement* (Cambridge, 1988)
- *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford, 1989)
- *Mary Tudor: The Tragical History of the First Queen of England* (Richmond, 2006)

McCoy, Richard, *Alterations of State. Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation* (New York, 2002)

McLaren, Anne, 'Memorializing Regnant Queens in Tudor and Jacobean England', in Anna Whitelock and Alice Hunt eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

McShane Jones, A., 'Revealing Mary', *History Today*, 54, 3 (2004), pp. 40-46

MacCubbin, Robert P., and Hamilton-Philips, Martha, eds., *The Age of William III and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688-1702* (Virginia, 1989)

Maclean, Ian, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman* (Cambridge, 1980)

Medvei, V.C., 'The Illness and Death of Mary Tudor', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 80 (1987), pp.766-770

Mendelson, Sara, and Crawford, Patricia, *Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1998)

Monod, Paul, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles in the reign of William III', *Historical Journal*, 30,2 (1987), pp.289-310

----- *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989)

Moore, Dennis, 'Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor Queenship Controversy', in Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson, eds., *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Detroit, 1987)

Mullin, Emily, 'Macready's Triumph: The Restoration of *King Lear* to the British Stage' *Penn History Review*, 18, 1 (2010), pp.17-35

Nenner, Howard, 'Pretense and Pragmatism: The Response to Uncertainty in the Succession Crisis of 1689', in Lois, G. Schwoerer ed. *The Revolution of 1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1992)

----- *The Right to be King* (London, 1995)

----- 'Sovereignty and the Succession in 1688-89', in Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold eds., *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford, 1996)

Opfell, Olga S., *Queens, Empresses, Grand Duchesses and Regents. Women Rulers of Europe A.D. 1328-1989* (London, 1989)

Prescott, H.F.M., *Mary Tudor* (London, 1952)

Price, Richard, 'An Incomparable Lady: Queen May II's Share in the Government of England, 1689-94', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75, 3 (2012), pp.307-326

Redworth, Glyn, "'Matters Impertinent to Women": Male and Female Monarchy Under Philip and Mary', *English Historical Review*, 112, 447 (1997), pp. 597-613

Richards, Judith, "'To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule": Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 28, 1 (1997), pp. 101-121

----- 'Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'? Gendering Tudor Monarchy', *Historical Journal*, 40, 4 (1997), pp. 895-924

----- 'Gender Difference and Tudor Monarchy: The Significance of Queen Mary I', *Parergon*, 21, 2 (2004), pp. 27-46

----- *Mary Tudor* (Oxon, 2008)

----- 'Examples and Admonitions: What Mary Demonstrated for Elizabeth', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock, eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

Samson, Alexander, 'Changing Places: The Marriage and Royal Entry of Philip, Prince of Austria, and Mary Tudor, July-August 1554', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 36, 3 (2005), pp.761-784

----- 'Power Sharing: The Co-Monarchy of Philip and Mary', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock, eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)

-----, 'Images of Co-Monarchy in the London Entry of Philip and Mary (1554)', in Marie-Claude Canova-Green, Jean Andrews, and Marie-France Wagner, eds., *Writing Royal Entries in Early Modern Europe* (Turnhout, 2013)

Schochet, Gordon, J., *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford, 1975)

- Schramm, P.E., *A History of the English Coronation* (Oxford, 1937)
- Schwoerer, Lois, G., 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89', *American Historical Review*, 82, 4 (1977), pp. 843-874
- 'Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 42, 4 (1989), pp. 717-748
- ed. *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1992)
- 'The Bill of Rights, 1689, Revisited', in Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold eds., *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford, 1996)
- Schulte, Regina, ed. *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World 1500-2000* (New York, 2006)
- Scott, Joan, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1999)
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and image in Sixteenth Century England* (New Haven, 2009)
- *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, 2013)
- Shephard, Amanda, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth Century England: The Knox Debate* (Keele, 1994)
- Smith, Hannah, "'Last of all the Heavenly Birth": Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship', *Parliamentary History*, 28, 1 (2009), pp. 137-149
- Sommerville, Margaret, *Sex and Subjection: Attitudes to Women in Early Modern Society* (London, 1995)
- Speck, W.A., 'Religion, Politics and Society in England', in R. Maccubbin and M. Hamilton-Phillips eds., *The Age of William III and Mary II: Power Politics and Patronage 1688-1702* (Virginia, 1989)
- 'William – and Mary?', in Schworer, Lois, G., ed. *The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Cambridge, 1992)

- Smuts, Malcolm, 'Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: the English Royal Entry in London, 1485-1642', in A.L. Beier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim eds., *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone* (Cambridge, 1989)
- Somerset, Anne, *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion* (London, 2012)
- Stone, J.M., *The History of Mary I, Queen of England as found in the public records, despatches of ambassadors, in original private letters, and other contemporary documents* (London, 1901)
- Streckfuss, Corinna, '“Spes Maxima Nostra”: European Propaganda and the Spanish Match', in Alice Hunt and Anna Whitelock, eds., *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth* (New York, 2010)
- Strickland, Agnes, *Lives of the Queens of England, Volume II* (London, 1890)
- *Lives of the Queens of England, Volume VI* (London, 1889)
- Strong, Roy, *Coronation: From the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (London, 2006)
- Sutherland, C.H.V., *English Coinage 600-1900* (London, 1973)
- Tittler, Robert, *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (London, 1983)
- Traver, Hope, *The Four Daughters of God: A Study of the Versions of this Allegory with Especial Reference to Those in Latin, French and English* (Philadelphia, 1907)
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, *England Under Queen Anne* (London, 1930)
- Vallance, Edward, *The Glorious Revolution* (London, 2007)
- Van der Kiste, John, *William and Mary* (Stroud, 2003)
- Waldman, Milton, *The Lady Mary* (London, 1972)
- Waller, Maureen, *Ungrateful Daughters: The Stuart Princesses Who Stole Their Father's Crown* (London, 2002)
- Watkins, John, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2002)

Wayne, Valerie, 'Zenobia in Medieval and Renaissance Literature', in Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson eds., *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Detroit, 1987)

Weil, Rachel, 'The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming Pan Scandal', in Lois G. Schwoerer ed. *The Revolution of 1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1992)

----- *Political Passions: Gender the Family and Political Argument in England 1680-1714* (Manchester, 1999)

----- 'Royal Flesh, Gender and the Construction of Monarchy', in Regina Schulte ed. *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500-2000* (New York, 2006)

Whitelock, Anna, and Macculloch, Diarmaid, 'Princess Mary's Household and the Succession Crisis, July 1553', *The Historical Journal*, 50,2 (2007), pp. 265-287

Whitelock, Anna, 'A woman in a Man's World: Mary I and Political Intimacy, 1553-1558', *Women's History Review*, 16, 3 (2007), pp. 323-334

----- *Mary Tudor: England's First Queen* (London, 2009)

Wiesner, Merry, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1993)

Winkelman, Michael, A., *Marriage Relationships in Tudor Political Drama* (Aldershot, 2005)

Wizeman, William, 'The Virgin Mary in the Reign of Mary Tudor', in R.N. Swanson ed. *The Church and Mary* (Woodbridge, 2004)

Zee, Henri, van der, *1688: Revolution in the Family* (London, 1988)

Zook, Melinda, 'History's Mary: the Propagation of Queen Mary II, 1689-1694', in Fradenburg, L.O., ed. *Women and Sovereignty*

----- 'The Shocking Death of Mary II: Gender & Political Crisis in Late Stuart England', *British Scholar*, 1, 1 (2008), pp.21-36

