Anne Stuart Reexamined: Reconsidering Female Rule in the "Long" Seventeenth Century, 1558-1714

State University of New York at New Paltz
Department of History

Jessica Minieri

Dr. L.H. Roper
HIS492- Seminar in History
16 May 2019

The last Stuart monarch, Anne (r. 1702-1714), may be one of British history's most understudied heads of state. During her twelve-year reign, England and Scotland unified, a major "world war" was fought over the fate of the Spanish Empire, and the two-party political system developed in Parliament. Why then is Anne overshadowed by both her Tudor predecessors and Hanoverian successors? Could this be due to the tragic circumstances that surround the legacy of many other Stuart sovereigns or Anne's position as a female ruler in a patriarchal society?

While there is no "answer" to this historiographical problem, it is pertinent to reexamine Anne's reign, as has been the case with several other queens regnant in medieval and early modern history, as well as average women. If Juana "the Mad" of Castile and Mary I of England have received new attention from scholars, then why not Anne? Certainly, a monarch responsible for the political unification of Scotland and England into Great Britain deserves to be remembered for more than just her misfortunes in the childbed. [1]

Queenship Studies – A Budding Historiographical Field

The study of female monarchs, both regnant and consort, began to interest scholars in the 1980s following the second wave of feminism and resulting rise in the study of women's histories. Previously, much of the literature on queens consisted of biographies of English and French queens, i.e. Isabella of France, Margaret of Anjou, and Anne Boleyn; since the 1980s,

---

[1] Fleming, Gillian B. *Juana I: Legitimacy and Conflict in Sixteenth Century Castile* (United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Duncan, Sarah. *Mary I: Gender, Power, and Ceremony in the Reign of England's First Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Edwards, John. *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2011); Thomas, Melita. *The King's Pearl: Henry VIII and His Daughter Mary* (Gloucestershire: Amberly Publishing, 2017); Porter, Linda. *The Myth of "Bloody Mary": A Biography of Queen Mary I of England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2013); Dunn-Hensley, Susan. *Anna of Denmark and Henrietta Maria: Virgins, Witches, and Catholic Queens* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Schutte, Valerie. *Mary I and the Art of Book Dedications: Royal Women, Power, and Persuasion* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Rohr, Zita Eva. *Yolande of Aragon (1381-1442) Family and Power: The Reverse of the Tapestry* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Tanner, Heather J, ed. *Medieval Elite Women and the Exercise of Power, 1100-1400: Moving Beyond the Exceptionalist Debate* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019); Nader, Helen. *Power and Gender in Renaissance Spain: Eight Women of the Mendoza Family, 1450-1650* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004).

scholars have begun to dismantle the old thinking on queenship that placed royal women under the domination of their husbands and ignored their agency. The accounts of regnant queens, female monarchs that ruled in their own right, have now begun to capture the interest of historians of medieval and early modern Europe, such as Theresa Earenfight, Carole Levin, and Charles Beem. Additionally, the work of these historians aims to change the way popular audiences perceive women in the political sphere prior to the modern (1900 to present) era, as well as how women interacted with political and social restrictions in all areas of life.

Accordingly, queenship and women's studies have worked to bring women's political contributions into the spotlight, historian, Joan Scott, published her groundbreaking article, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", as the "first step" in this new direction of historical understanding.[2] Queenship studies scholars have used Scott's conception to analyze how queens, such as Anne, exercised political, social, and familial power, while also understanding the patriarchal aspects of the societies in which pre-1789 queens lived (i.e. legal and social values). This perspective has contributed to the reexaminations of other regnant queens, yet Anne remains the queen with an "image problem."[3]

Queen Anne and Her Historians – "An Image Problem"

The literature on Queen Anne consists primarily of popular biographies written in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, hardly any scholarly investigations on her life and career exist outside of a few articles, doctoral dissertations, and book chapters. The monographs we do have convey an image of a tragic, unintelligent, corpulent, and disagreeable monarch whose

---

[2] Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91, no.5 (1986): 1053-075. doi: 10.2307/1864376.

[3] "Queen Anne has what we know might call an image problem" – this is the assessment from Kevin Sharpe's study of the Post-Restoration Stuart dynasty in *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714*. Sharpe like many author early modernists, cast Anne out as a lackluster figure who had an "uneventful" reign.

gynecological misfortunes ended the Stuart dynasty in Britain (1603-1714). For example, David Green and Beatrice Curtis Brown focus on Anne's personal life and less on her contributions to British statecraft, instead, her seventeen pregnancies take "center stage"; other works by Gila Curtis and Herbert W. Paul also focus on the "negative" aspects of her career, such as the poor education Anne received in childhood.[4] In comparison with her Tudor predecessors, her knowledge on the classics, foreign languages, and history was limited, while in the sixteenth century, Catherine of Aragon provided her daughter, Mary, with an education befitting the heir to the throne, a luxury that Anne did not have due to her obscure place in the line of succession.[5] Accordingly, the image of Anne as "lacking perception and in spite of a stubborn will she was too easily imposed upon" has persisted in the literature.[6]

Few early studies of Anne have worked to remodel this powerful contemporary image of Anne against the ideas of Sarah Churchill in her memoirs. Beginning with a three-volume biography by G.M. Trevelyan published in the 1930s, the perception of Anne as a monarch dominated by favorites began to deteriorate due to his argument that she played a key role in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), the Act of Union (1707), and acted to bridge the gap between the Tory and Whig parties.[7] Since the publication of Trevelyan's work, Geoffrey Holmes, Edward Gregg, Anne Somerset, and James Anderson Winn have studied her in the context of her political achievements and worked to dispel the image created by Churchill.[8] As

---

[4] Green, David. *Queen Anne* (New York: Scribner, 1971); McCarthy, Justin. *The Reign of Queen Anne* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1911); Paul, Herbert W. *Queen Anne* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912); Waller, Maureen. *Ungrateful Daughters: The Stuart Princesses Who Stole Their Father's Crown* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2013); Curtis, Gila. *The Life and Times of Queen Anne* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972); Curtis Brown, Beatrice. *Anne Stuart, Queen of England* (London: G. Bles, 1929); Sharpe, Kevin. *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

[5] Elston, Timothy G. "Transformation or Continuity? Sixteenth- Century Education and the Legacy of Catherine of Aragon, Mary I, and Juan Luis Vives" in *"High and Mighty Queens" of Early Modern England: Realities and Representations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

[6] Green, 11.

[7] Trevelyan, G.M. *England under Queen Anne* (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1932).

all argue, Anne did not depend on the Marlboroughs or Sidney Godolphin. It seems the portrayal of Anne as an aloof and tragic ruler fostered in the eighteenth century has remained the popular image of her, three centuries after her death.

Additionally, David Green's monograph makes other harsh judgements of both her character and place within British royal history. Within the introduction, Green argues:

> "No, she was no great queen; nor were all her actions noble. But she was so handicapped - so ill, so bullied, at the last so bewildered and desperate – one would need a heart of stone not to feel for her."[9]

While this image often persists in most studies of Anne, it also demonstrates the ways that biographers and historians treat female historical figures. In comparison, notable "bad" kings in English history, i.e. Richard "the Lionheart" (r.1189-1199), do not receive as harsh a judgment from popular biographies or films as Anne does in the eighteenth-century.[10] While Anne's reign had more successes than that of Richard I, her reign does not receive much of the credit that the crusader king of the late twelfth century does. Therefore, gender plays a significant role in how monarchs, prime ministers, and other political leaders, get remembered by their biographers and in the popular imaginary. In the case of Anne, few monographs have worked to dismantle this gendered view of Anne and rightfully place her among the "great" monarchs of Great Britain, medieval or modern.

Much of the focus on the so-called "important" monarchs in British history often focus on men and other more prominent female figures such as Elizabeth I, Victoria, and Elizabeth II, thus, leaving Anne on the sidelines. More recent scholarship has not paid Anne much attention

---

[8] Gregg, Edward. *Queen Anne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); Somerset, Anne. *Queen Anne: Politics of Passion* (New York: Vintage, 2014); Winn, James Anderson. *Queen Anne: Patroness of Arts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Holmes, Geoffrey. *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London: Macmillan, 1967).

[9] Ibid, 13.

[10] Flori, Joan. *Richard the Lionheart* (Westport: Praeger, 2007); Hindley, Geoffrey. *The Crusades: A History of Armed Pilgrimage and Holy War* (New York: Avalon Publishing, 2003).

either, as much of the focus on English queenship and early modern political history remains fixated on Tudor and Plantagenet women, i.e. the six wives of Henry VIII, Elizabeth of York, and Margaret of Anjou. The Palgrave Macmillan series, *Queenship and Power* only mentions her in few essays that focus on the role of her consort, Prince George of Denmark.[11] Noted Elizabethan historian, Carole Levin, edits this series and her Tudor biases come through in her essay selections and authorship. In total, the series mentions the Elizabethan era within twenty-four of its fifty-seven books.[12] If the infamous, Mary Tudor, receives so much attention from this collection, why not Anne and other monarchs?

Sovereigns and Subjects – Anne and the "Whiggish" View of History

For the Whig party in the eighteenth century and most historians of modern European history, Queen Anne symbolizes the role of the monarchy prior to the "rise of Parliament" in the Hanoverian age. In the Whiggish school, Anne's reign hindered the "progress" that men such as John Locke and David Hume, advocated for in British government, such as Locke's argument for religious toleration and thoughts concerning property ownership.[13] Anne did not favor a Lockean viewpoint on religious freedoms, as in the 1689 Bill of Rights and Test Acts of 1673,

---

[11] Beem, Charles. *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Beem, Charles and Taylor, Miles, ed. *The Man Behind the Queen: Male Consorts in History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Schutte, Valerie. *Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe: Potential Kings and Queens* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

[12] Paranque, Estelle. *Elizabeth I of England Through Valois Eyes: Power, Representation, and Diplomacy in the Reign of the Queen, 1558-1588* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Bajetta, C.M. *Elizabeth I's Italian Letters* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Bajetta, C.M., et al. *Elizabeth I's Foreign Correspondence: Letters, Rhetoric, and Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Warnicke, R. *Wicked Women of Tudor England: Queens, Aristocrats, Commoners* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Bell, I. *Elizabeth I: The Voice of a Monarch* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Loomis, C. *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). These are but a sample of the long list of books within the series that cover Elizabeth I or the Elizabeth Era in some capacity.

[13] For Locke, limits were placed on the amount of property that an individual could require. In his philosophy, everyone has access to the earth in common and once one mixes their labor with an item, i.e. an apple from a tree, the item becomes their property. Locke places limits on the amount of goods an individual can acquire, as they must leave enough goods of quality for others. For Locke, the natural rights that all human beings must have protected was the right to life, liberty, and property. A clear break from older ways of thinking in late-Stuart Britain, as in the previous centuries, enclosure of farmland was a problem for many English and Scottish subjects.

Catholics could no longer have a place in the line of succession or hold most government positions openly. Therefore, for Whigs such as Locke and his mentor, Anthony Ashely Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, Anne represents an obstacle for republicanism and classical liberalism, could this Whiggish perception contribute to her neglect in modern scholarship?[14]

In his groundbreaking monograph, *The Whig Interpretation of History*, historian Herbert Butterfield addressed many of the problems that accompany the whiggish, or modernist, perception of history. Butterfield writes:

> Instead of seeing the modern world emerge as the victory of the children of light over the children of darkness in any generation, it is a least better to see it emerge as the result which often neither party wanted or even dreamed of, a result which indeed in some cases both parties would equally have hated, but a result for the achievement of which the existence of both and the clash of both were necessary.[15]

This argument reflects the underlying issue with modern historiography on Anne's reign, as the so-called "enlightenment" of the period from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries places the medieval world and those that upheld many of its principles, i.e. Anne, Edmund Burke, and Joseph de Maistre, as representing challenges to progress. This thinking still clouds how many view the Tudor-Stuart periods, as Britain did not become "the first modern nation" until well into the Hanoverian and Saxe-Coburg dynasties as it grew as an imperial power.[16]

In this understanding, Whigs viewed Anne and her policies as the antithesis of the supposed ideals of the Glorious Revolution, i.e. Locke's *Second Treatise of Government*, therefore, placing her in line with Stuart "absolutism."[17] While Anne herself identified as a Tory,

---

[14] Farr, James, and Clayton Roberts. "John Locke on the Glorious Revolution: A Rediscovered Document." *The Historical Journal*28, no. 2 (1985): 385-98. http://www.jstor.org.libdatabase.newpaltz.edu/stable/2639105. Laslett, Peter. "The English Revolution and Locke's 'Two Treatises of Government'." *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 12, no. 1 (1956): 40-55. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3021052.

[15] Butterfield, Herbert. *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1965), p.28.

[16] Pincus, Steven A. *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011) and Keir, David. *The Constitutional History of Modern Britain since 1485* (London: Black, 1975). Two examples of works that attempt to place 'modern' Britain in the late fourteenth and late seventeenth centuries, two periods that were more alike in terms of religion and monarchy than different.

a party opposed to constitutional monarchy, she should not be condemned for her political views. This teleological narrative places Anne outside of modern "progress" and instead view her as a relic of the old order in Britain, as her successor, George I (r.1714-1727), delegated much of his power to parliamentary institutions and Sir Robert Walpole.[18] Bearing this in mind, how could Anne ever receive a "fair" assessment by historians if she remains in the shadow of whiggish historiography, George of Hanover, and the succeeding system of constitutional monarchy?

Unfortunately for Anne, the voices of many of her Whig contemporaries have spoken louder across the centuries, with many European governments, such as those in France and the German states, following the model of classical liberalism postulated by Anne's opposition. Additionally, Anne's belief in her prerogative as monarch and strong Protestant faith have allowed her to be cast aside as a failed sovereign and left-over of a bygone era. As this image continues to persist, Anne may always be remembered as a "medieval" woman in a changing political landscape, as her intense religiosity does not garnish the praise of Whiggish historians. Therefore, any study that seeks to reshape Anne's historical memory must work to dismantle the hubris of the modern world and its role in the neglect of one of Britain's most important monarchs.

The Augustan Age– Queen Anne and her Achievements

Despite the many successes of her short reign, historians often do not pair them with Anne and instead place the "credit" with men such as the Duke of Marlborough and Sidney Godolphin. Within the first few pages of Robert Bucholz's essay, "The 'Stomach of a Queen,' or

---

[17] Locke, John and Macpherson, C.B., ed. *The Second Treatise of Government* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1980); Burgess, Glenn. *Absolute Monarchy and the Stuart Constitution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).
[18] Dickinson, H.T. *Walpole and the Whig Supremacy* (London: English Universities Press, 1973) and Imbert-Terry, H.M. *A Constitutional King: George the First* (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1972).

Size Matters: Gender, Body Image, and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne", it is evident that the achievements of Anne's reign, or the so-called "Augustan Age", have never been attributed to her, i.e. the Peace of Utrecht (1713) and Act of Union (1707).[19] If her reign had so many important events for the future of Great Britain and its Empire, why do historians place them with her male councilors and with the succeeding dynasty?

The fact that historians label the late Stuart and early Hanoverian periods as the "Augustan Age" speaks volumes to both the oversight of Anne and her achievements, as well as how seriously eighteenth century took their supposed "modernity." Excluding Anne from the roster of Britain's most successful monarchs forgets the Stuart dynasty in favor of more recent dynasties, i.e. Hanover, Saxe-Coburg, and Windsor. Evidentially, this neglect may stem from Anne's "weird" placement within the context of female rule in early modern Britain. Her reign comes prior to the better-known monarchies of Victoria (r.1837-1901) and Elizabeth II (r.1952-present), therefore, Elizabeth I presented the only truly successful model for female rule in British history by the early eighteenth century. Could Anne's awkward place within the understanding of female sovereignty in her own period have much to do with her current historiographical problems? After all, how could a queen of Anglo origin match up to the long history of successful female governance in places such as Castile, Navarre, Sicily, and Jerusalem, long before the eighteenth century?[20]

---

[19] Bucholz, Robert. "The 'Stomach of a Queen' or Size Matters: Gender, Body Image, and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne" in *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), pgs. 242-272. Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014). Stephen, Jeffrey. *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007). Few scholarly studies of the Act of Union exist. Considering this document has had such broad impacts, i.e. Scottish Independence in 2014 and current Brexit talks, why do historians ignore it?

[20] Urraca of Leon-Castile presents an interesting contrast to Anne, as "Spain" witnessed the rule of a successful queen regnant long before Britain did with Elizabeth or Anne. Urraca ascended to the thrones of Castile and Leon following the death of her father, Alfonso VI, and brother, Sancho. Her ascent to the throne came after an agreement between Leonese and Castilian nobles that only after she married, could she ascend to the throne without resistance. In a plan by her father, Alfonso VI of Castile, to unite Castile-Leon with Aragon, Urraca wed the Aragonese king,

Female Rule in the Medieval and Early Modern Worlds – Geographical Barriers

The study of queens regnant and consort goes well beyond the confines of "modernity", as Anne does not constitute neither a rarity nor an or anomaly in pre-1750 European politics, as dozens of women ruled kingdoms across the continent prior to the eighteenth century. Interestingly, a geographical divide exists between Anne and her female predecessors due to a concentration of regnant queens in kingdoms in the Mediterranean and South. Several women ruled Northern European states, such as Margaret of Denmark, Christina of Sweden, and the Empress Matilda, but in far fewer numbers than their Iberian and Mediterranean counterparts.[21] How did this "divide" affect the reign of Anne long after the rule of her medieval predecessors?

For example, the Kingdom of Navarre witnessed several queens regnant in the medieval and early modern periods, such as Joan I, Joan II, Blanche I, Eleanor, and Catherine I, several of whom simultaneously held the title of queen consort of France.[22] The rule of Navarrese,

---

Alfonso "The Battler." Urraca's story beings in Burgos in April 1079 with her birth as the only surviving and legitimate successor to Alfonso VI and Constance of Burgundy. Like most female royal children, Urraca soon married Raymond of Burgundy at eight years of age. Royal and noble women typically entered into contracts to marry between the ages of twelve and fourteen, to allow sexual maturity to occur. She went on to have two children by Raymond, Sancha Raimundez (b.1095-1102) and Alfonso VII (b. March 1, 1095). Two events greatly impacted Urraca's life in 1107, the death of her husband and her displacement in the succession by her brother, Sancho. Her disinheritance did not last due to Sancho's death at the Battle of Ucles against the Almoravid Berbers in 1108. She succeeded to the throne of Leon-Castile as Empress of All Hispania a year later and brought the King of Aragon as her new husband alongside her. The marriage to Alfonso occurred with the intent of unifying the kingdoms of Leon-Castile with Aragon against the desires of many nobles and subjects. Many feared that Alfonso would dominate his wife and rule Leon and Castile in her name. Urraca's half-sister, Theresa of Portugal, and her husband, Henry, led an uprising against their rule in both kingdoms. Theresa and Urraca's military engagements expanded beyond this incident, as in 1116 and 1120 Theresa challenged her sister over lands in Leon to expand her power. Their dispute ended with a peace treaty that outlined Portuguese vassalage to Urraca's Leon. In addition, after Urraca's marriage began to sour, she and her husband's territories broke out in civil war. Alfonso aligned himself with Theresa and Henry of Portugal against Urraca and her army. The civil war ended with Urraca maintaining territory in Leon, Galicia, Asturias, and most of Castile. Alfonso retained Aragon and a fraction of Castilian land, as well as annulling their marriage. The example of Urraca and Theresa demonstrates the importance of women in Iberian and Western European politics before modernity

[21] Interestingly, many of the reigns of the medieval queens regnant of England, Scotland, and elsewhere are now disputed by historians. Examples include Margaret, maid of Norway, Empress Matilda, and Lady Jane Grey. You do not see many disputed reigns in Iberia. Only one example comes to mind from the Iberian world – Theresa of Portugal in the twelfth century is not always regarded as the first monarch of Portugal. That title often goes to her son, Alfonso I (r. 1139-1185).

Castilian, Portuguese, Aragonese, and Aquitanian women demonstrates that Pyrenean kingdoms in the High Middle Ages (c. 1000-1300) legally and theoretically accepted female rule, while maintaining rigid gender roles and social structures. Despite the acceptance of female rule in the South, Northern kingdoms did not share the same ideas with an absence of accepted queens regnant until the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. [23]

What made medieval Iberia so "exceptional" that it witnessed the ascendancy of approximately fourteen queens regnant between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries? Interestingly, the Iberian "exception" expanded across the Mediterranean and Southern Europe, as many of those territories fell under the Crown of Aragon's jurisdiction. Additionally, the crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem had five queens regnant in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in addition to other female sovereigns appearing in Sicily, Sardinia, Cyprus, and Bosnia.[24] Did

---

[22] Woodacre, Elena. *The Queens Regnant of Navarre: Succession, Politics, and Partnership, 1274-1512* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). Joan I was married to French King, Philip IV from 1284 until 1305. Joan never lived in Navarre and ruled the Kingdom from Paris, thus bringing Navarre into France's orbit.

[23] Mary I receives the credit in many history books as the first queen of England in the mid-sixteenth century. Contrary to that belief, England's first queen regnant ruled for a brief period in the mid-twelfth century, but due to her failure to have a coronation, modern scholars often leave her off the roster of English monarchs. Matilda, Lady of the English came to the throne during an interlude in The Anarchy, a civil war between herself and her cousin, Steven of Blois. Matilda's rule lasted from c.1141 to 1148 and remains a topic of dispute. The literature on Matilda is confined to the accounts of her contemporaries and Marjorie Chibnall's 1991 biography, *The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother, and Lady of the English*. Like Urraca of Leon-Castile, Matilda does not receive much attention from modern historians and biographers. This raises an important question for scholars of queenship and women's history, why do female rulers (i.e. queens regnant and duchesses) receive less scholarly attention than their male counterparts? Urraca and Matilda were near contemporaries, yet historians of monarchy and the twelfth century focus less on their reigns in favor of other monarchs such as Henry I of England and Alfonso VI of Castile. In relation to Anne, this theme is present as she is often cast aside in favor of her male councilors and male predecessors.

[24] Tranovich, Margaret, *Melisende of Jerusalem: The World of a Forgotten Crusader Queen* (Sawbridgeworth, East and West Publishing, 2011); Folda, Jaroslav. "Images of Queen Melisende in Manuscripts of William of Tyre's History of Outremer: 1250-1300." Gesta 32, no. 2 (1993): 97-112. doi:10.2307/767168; Gaudette, Helene. "The Piety, Power, and Patronage of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem's Queen Melisende." (Doctoral thesis, The City University of New York, 2005); Mayer, Hans Eberhard. "Studies in the History of Queen Melisende of Jerusalem." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972): 93-182. doi: 10.2307/1291317; Piatmber, Naomi Ruth. "Hybrid Devotion in Medieval Jerusalem: The Melisende Psalter's Identity Crisis" (Master's thesis, University of Texas at San Antonio, 2005). After the establishment of the Crusader state of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the early twelfth century, approximately five regnant queens presided over it until its fall in the late-thirteenth century. Within the twelfth century, several women ruled kingdoms across the Mediterranean and Southern Europe. Few studies of queenship in Jerusalem exist due to a lack of primary documents from the period. Unfortunately, this has led to the reigns of Melisende, Sibylla, Isabella I, Isabella II, and Maria, to be largely forgotten.

geography have anything to do with this occurrence and why did the North take much longer to "catch up?"[25]

In the case of Anne, the patriarchal structure within medieval and early modern Britain favored male heirs over female, reflects her current perception by her historians and her contemporaries. Prior to Anne's reign, only three women held the English throne as regnant queens – Mary I, Elizabeth I, and Mary II, both Mary's ruled jointly with their husbands. All of these women received varying degrees of skepticism by their subjects, i.e. Mary I's Roman Catholic faith, Elizabeth's supposed illegitimacy, and Mary II's co-rule with William of Orange.[26] Why were Britons so opposed to female rule not just in their government but in their social structure? Could this have anything to do with the religious differences between the Northern and Southern European worlds? In contrast, the early modern period in Spain boasted no regnant queens, besides the ill-fated Juana "La Loca" and government of Isabella II in the nineteenth century. So, it seems governmental structures shifted after the Protestant Reformation with Britain witnessing the Ages of Anne and Victoria and Spain removing its "modern" queens from their thrones.[27] Therefore, Anne should be studied within this context and not within the

---

[25] Minieri, Jessica. "Regina Regnans: Queenship and Authority in Medieval and Early Modern Europe, 1109-1714" (unpublished paper, independent study, Fall 2018).

[26] Knox, John. *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (Amsterdam: De Capo Press, 1972). Knox's writings on female sovereignty in the sixteenth century reflect the differing attitudes on female rule between Britons and their counterparts on the continent. Knox ignores the history of female rule and instead calls Elizabeth I and Mary Queen of Scots' reigns "unnatural."

[27] Juana I succeeded her mother, Isabella I, as queen of Castile in 1504, but due to the dominance of Ferdinand II and Charles of Ghent, Juana's time spent as Queen of Castile often gets ignored by historians and popular narratives. The ascendancy of Charles of Ghent to the throne of Castile in in 1516 as Charles I of Castile presents a difficulty in studying the reign of Juana, as her son's reign coincides with her own. Several factors prevented her from exercising much influence on Castile or Aragon due to her imprisonment in a nunnery in Tordesillas in 1509, a confinement for which she remained until her death in 1555. Therefore, the study of the political life of Juana of Castile presents issues for modern historians due to her title bearing little legal power. Charles V was the "true" monarch of Spain for much of the sixteenth century and his reign garnishes more popular attention. Juana's reign demonstrates a shift in the position of the queen in the Spanish monarchy in modernity. The reigns of Urraca and Juana, as well as their Navarrese counterparts, demonstrates the prevalence of female rule in pre-modern Iberia, in stark contrast with England and France. In the modern period, the number of queens regnant decreases to two, Juana and Isabella II. This raises the question as to what changed in modern Spain to see a decrease in female rule?

framework of her supposed "idiocy" or aloofness that modern historians attach to her. Religion may explain her rule and context for gendered sovereignty within a pan-European setting.

In addition to a division between English and Iberian acceptance of female rule, where does France lie in all of this? A connection between England's aversion to female authority prior to the sixteenth century may relate to its close connection between the Capetian and Plantagenet dynasties from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries. While England did not have a female sovereign until the 1550s, France never had a woman wear the crown in her own right, possibly relating to the Salic Law of the Merovingian Franks in the late antique and early medieval periods (c. 500-751), which after the fourteenth century forbade female inheritance of land and other property, thus translating to a rejection of female involvement in monarchy beyond the role of a consort. Over the centuries, the social and legal implications of this law spread to other nations and monarchies, i.e. the Francophile government of Plantagenet England. Therefore, England's lack of an accepted regnant queen until after the Hundred Years War may be explained by the influence of the Salic Law and other legal institutions in Capetian and Valois France, as well as an abundance of male heirs in late medieval England.[28] In contrast, the kingdoms over the Pyrenees reflect several examples of successful female governance outside of the orbit of the Salic Law.[29]

---

[28] The impacts of French views on female rule expanded over the Pyreneans into the Kingdom of Navarre, when Joan II was forbidden to ascend to the French throne as queen regnant. While she was able to secure the throne in Navarre and co-rule with her husband, Philip d'Evreux, the French throne went to Philip V instead. This example demonstrates that France's unwillingness to accept a woman as monarch impacted other kingdoms in its orbit. Could this possibly explain the inability of Matilda and other medieval women in ascending to the English throne?

[29] Taylor, Craig. 2006. "The Salic Law, French Queenship, and the Defense of Women in the Late Middle Ages." *French Historical Studies* 29 (4): 543–64. doi:10.1215/00161071-2006-012; Charon, Philippe. "Jeanne De Valois, Reine De Navarre Et Comtesse d'Évreux (1343-1373)/Joan of Valois, Queen of Navarre and Countess of Evreux." *En la España Medieval* 32 (2009): 7-49. *ProQuest.* Web. 29 Apr. 2019. Lewis, Andrew M. *Royal Succession in Capetian France: Studies on Familial Order and the State* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981).

Beyond Western and Southern Europe, queens regnant can be found in Scandinavia, notably Christina of Sweden (r.1632-1654) who reigned at the same moment as England and Scotland's Charles I.[30] In comparison with Anne, Christina presents an interesting case due to her place as a female sovereign in an intensely patriarchal north. Like early modern England, Sweden had no examples of queens regnant prior to her reign, despite this, Christina's reign receives a more favorable characterization from historians due to her intelligence, which attracted notable Enlightenment intellectuals, Rene Descartes and Bulstrode Whitelocke, to her court. If anything, this demonstrates the differences in queenship across Europe due to its infrequency in the North and the resulting scrutiny that women that ruled faced. Could the differences in regnant queenship in the North and South have anything to do with religious differences in Stuart England as opposed to Trastamara-Habsburg Spain, or Maria Theresa's Austria?[31]

"The Scandal of Christendom": Is Protestantism Good for Women?[32]

Anne Stuart, like many of her contemporaries, regarded religion very highly and went to great lengths to protect Orthodox English Protestantism. The preceding section places her within the context of European regnant queenship, raising the question if a religious divide between "popish" Catholicism and different Protestant sects in the North contributed to the acceptance of female ruler in varying regions? In early modernity, regnant queenship occurred most often in nations ruled by Protestants, contrasting the zenith of female rule in the Aragonese dominated Mediterranean prior to the seventeenth century. Does a relationship exist between the acceptance

---

[30] Buckley, Veronica. *Christina, Queen of Sweden: The Restless Life of a European Eccentric* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2004) and Masson, Georgina. *Queen Christina* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968).

[31] Crankshaw, Edward. *Maria Theresa* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013). Queen Maria Theresa was not only monarch of Austria, Hungary, and Croatia, but was the Holy Roman Empress from 1745-1765. In sum, she reigned for 45 years, as long as Elizabeth I in the sixteenth century.

[32] This is a quote from English queen consort, Catherine of Aragon (r.1509-1533). This quote is in reference to Anne Boleyn, the woman who succeeded her on the English throne and helped initiate the English Reformation.

of female sovereignty and religion? After all, how can Protestantism's merit for women on a broader scale be measured? While this question may not have an answer, it offers a partial explanation for Anne's place in post-1688 Britain, as well as her place within a broader European context.

In comparison with late Stuart England, Hapsburg Spain received condemnation from Protestants and modern historians alike due to its religious conservatism, state building efforts, and suppression of the "tolerance" that existed in both Christian and Islamic Spain during the High Middle Ages. Once Ferdinand II and Isabella I came to power in the late fifteenth centuries, Spain began the now infamous Inquisition that aimed to purge Iberia of Jews, Muslims, and other "heretics."[33]

The desire to purge Spanish society of religious and political dissenters affected women's place in society due to the Inquisition targeting them in great numbers, possibly due to the rise in "machismo" in the sixteenth century that related to Castile-Aragon's attempt to combat the rise of Protestantism. Historian, Mary E. Giles, explores this theme in her monograph, *Women in the Inquisition: Spain and the New World*, arguing that the Reformation and changes in early modern Europe negatively affected the lives of Spanish women due to a large portion of the accused being female. [34] Additionally, European women became the victims of witch hunts in the early modern period due to their vulnerability in society, as well as the rise in prominence of the male physician at the expense of the midwife or female apothecary.[35]

---

[33] "Tolerance" is in quotations due to the existence of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia that existed in late medieval Spain. For much of the medieval period, Spain had Muslims, Jews, and Christians living together within cities and kingdoms such as Granada and Cordoba. Not everyone was religiously tolerant, as in the fourteenth century there were several anti-Semitic and Islamophobic acts committed by Christians

[34] Giles, Mary E. *Women in the Inquisition: Spain and the New World* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999) and Tausiet, Maria. *Urban Magic in Early Modern Spain: Abracadabra Omnipotens* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

[35] Green, Monica Helen. *Making Women's Medicine Masculine: The Rise of Male Authority in Pre-Modern Gynecology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); McTavish, Lianne. *Childbirth and the Display of Authority in*

Therefore, does any correlation exist between the rise in the "demonization" of women in early modern Europe, notably Hapsburg Spain, with the treatment of Queen Anne and other women in politics during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? If accusations of witchcraft threatened the lives of women on the periphery of society, how did this affect a women's place in all socioeconomic backgrounds? Elite women such as Anne and Sarah Churchill lived at the end of the witch hunt, as trials and persecutions waned in popularity in the eighteenth century, despite this, could this have affected contemporary views of Anne or did she just reign at the end of a "failed dynasty"?

An Ill-Fated Dynasty?

Much of the literature on the Stuart dynasty that ruled Scotland from 1371 to 1714 and England from 1603 to 1714, encompasses themes of tragedy, failure, and misfortune. Notable Stuart monarchs, such as Mary Queen of Scots (r. 1542-1567), Charles I (r.1625-1649), and James II (r. 1685-1688), get studied within the context of their demises at the end of large events such as the English Civil War and Glorious Revolution, resulting in the dynasty's association with failure by historians, notably in, *King Charles the Martyr, 1643-1649* by Esme Wingfield-Stratford, *The Sickly Stuarts: The Medical Downfall of a Dynasty* by Frederick Holmes, *The Tragedy of Charles II* by Hester W. Chapman, *Mary, Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* by Jenny Wormald.[36]

Early Modern France (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); Minkowski, William L. "Women Healers of the Middle Ages: Selected Aspects of Their History." American Journal of Public Health 82, no. 2 (February 1992): 288–95. doi:10.2105/AJPH.82.2.288.

[36] Wingfield-Stratford, Esme. *King Charles the Martyr, 1643-1649* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1950); Holmes, Frederick. *The Sickly Stuarts: The Medical Downfall of a Dynasty* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2005); Chapman, Hester W. *The Tragedy of Charles II in the Years 1630-1660* (Boston: Little Brown, 1964); Wormald, Jenny. *Mary, Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: Tauris Parke, 1988).

While most of these studies view the supposed decline of the dynasty in political or economic terms, Holmes argues that the "failures" of the Stuart dynasty attribute to medical causes such as Queen Anne's miscarriages or William of Gloucester's hydrocephalus: "Anne came to the throne in 1702 sickly and spent, not unlike the dynasty she represented."[37] It seems that this view of the dynasty, both medically and politically, has dominated the study of Stuart England since the eighteenth century. Could this negative perception have contributed to the undervaluing of the reign of Anne?

Prior to the Union of the Crowns of Scotland and England with the ascension of James VI-I after the death of Elizabeth I in 1603, the Stuarts had sat on the Scottish throne since 1371.[38] Stuart historians often neglect the dynasty's place in Scotland, could this oversight stem from an aversion and/or ignorance of the study of the Middle Ages by modernists, or due to an Anglo-centric perspective? To uncover the lives of Stuart monarchs prior to the seventeenth century, one must look to general studies on Scottish history in the late medieval period, such as *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603* by W. Croft Dickson and *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages* by Ranald Nicholson, with both offering glimpses into the lives of Robert II to James V, but could be outdated due to their use of terms such as "feudal" and "dark age."[39] Therefore, early Stuart Scotland deserves a second look, possibly reshaping the tragedy associated with this "ill-fated" dynasty by telling their story outside of the context of Mary of Scotland's execution and James II's forced exile.

---

[37] Holmes, 161.

[38] Ashley, Maurice. *The House of Stuart: Its Rise and Fall* (London: J.M. Dent, 1980); Cowan, Samuel. *The Royal House of Stuart: From its Origins to the Accession of the House of Hanover* (London: Greening, 1908).

[39] Dickson, William Croft and Duncan, A.M. *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977); Nicholson, Ranald and Donaldson, Gordon. *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages* (Edinburgh: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974). Elizabeth A.R. Brown "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe." *The American Historical Review* 79, no.4 (1974): 1063-088. doi: 10.2307/1869563.

The negative imagery surrounding the Stuart dynasty after 1603 begins with the life and career of Mary, Queen of Scots in the mid-sixteenth century, as she gained much attention for her execution by the government of Elizabeth I.[40] Most document collections, biographies, films, and studies on Mary pertain to this event and in turn, label her life as "tragic" or her career as a "failure."[41] While Mary's career had many misfortunes, i.e. the murder of her second husband, Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, her historical image has contributed to the mislabeling of the Stuart dynasty. Whether or not one agrees with this view of Mary, it has remained the view of popular sources and has "stained" the historiography surrounding her successors. The accession of Mary's son, James VI and I, to the throne of England in 1603 brought the "unlucky family" south to London.[42]

By the 1640s, Stuart rule in England had gone "wrong", as the head of Charles I had been removed in January following years of civil war. Since his demise, the literature on Charles, like his granddaughter Anne, has characterized his reign within tragic and teleological terms. In comparison, Charles' reputation differs from Anne's due to his role as a martyr, historians in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries wrote of Charles in hagiographical terms, contributing to a "saintly" image created due to his beheading. Whether Charles deserves this characterization or not, depends on one's perspective and position on the prerogative of monarchs. Regardless, these ideas on Charles have shaped the literature on his Stuart successors, as Anne's father, James II,

---

[40] After decades of animosity, Mary was executed by the English government in 1587. This execution was hardly a "tragic" event due to Mary's implication in a plot to murder Elizabeth I. While it is very likely that she was tricked into participating due to the maneuvering of Francis Walsingham and associates, Mary had also been no stranger to plotting against Elizabeth. Therefore, for many historians to simply label Mary as a symbol of a family feud gone "wrong" is to forget her own role in her demise, as well as the implications for a "popish" monarch to take the throne of England in the later Tudor period. At least in my view, I do not view Mary as a victim or a martyr. While of course, it is horrible for cousins to commit these acts, it may have been warranted in this case.

[41] Lewis, Jayne Elizabeth, ed. *The Trial of Mary Queen of Scots: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 1999) and Henderson, T.F. *Mary Queen of Scots: Her Environment and Tragedy* (New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969).

[42] The characterization of the Stuarts comes from Louis XVI of France. An interesting description from the Bourbon King that met his end in a similar fashion to Charles I in 1649.

receives much flak for his forced abdication and mistakes that carried over into his daughters' reigns.[43]

In similar fashion to his daughter and successor, James II's reign has not received as much attention from scholars. Few biographies cover his life and career and those that do dedicate much attention to the "Glorious" Revolution and its aftermath, perhaps rightfully so.[44] Additionally, due to the fact that James II was Anne's father, much of the flack that he receives from historians permeates to her. With much emphasis on the preceding Tudor dynasty (r.1485-1603) and succeeding Hanoverian dynasty (r.1714-1901), can the Stuarts ever receive a fair assessment beyond the confines of beheadings, dynastic feuding, and revolutions?

Queen Anne and "Her Future"

In the end, why should we be concerned with Anne and her career, especially when many specialists view her as a relic of ancien regime, pre-1688 Britain? What does her tenure mean for British history, as well as late-Stuart Britain's relationship to "modernity"? For some, the beginning of the modern period may begin with events such as the publication of Niccolo Machiavelli's *The Prince* in 1513, Columbus' voyages to Hispaniola in 1492, or the alleged beginning of the Protestant Reformation in 1517.[45] Despite modernity's so-called beginnings in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, can Anne's reign present a new outlook on modernity's foundations? After all, her reign provides an interesting prospect for such due to a shift in politics, governmental structures, and Britain's place in international affairs in her relatively short reign.[46]

---

[43] Chapman, Hester W. *The Tragedy of Charles II* in the Years 1630-1660 (Boston: Little Brown, 1964).
[44] Ashley, Maurice. *James II* (London: Dent, 1981); Turner, Francis C. *James II* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1950); Speck, W.A. *James II* (London: Routledge, 2017); Callow, John. *The Making of James II: The Formative Years of a Fallen King* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000); Miller, John. *James II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978).
[45] Machiavelli, Niccolo and Bondanella, Peter, ed. *The Prince* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

It does not seem that Anne will receive a new examination in the near future, as the 2018 film, *The Favourite*, portrays Anne in accordance with the descriptions given by Green, Curtis, and Sarah Churchill; the Academy Award winning film shows her as the sickly and mad end to the Stuart dynasty, complete with melodrama and intrigue.[47] If anything, this film demonstrates that the older images of Anne will not soon be replaced with accounts of her strength as monarch. One can only hope that this film will spark new interest in Anne's reign and in similar fashion to her predecessors, Mary of Scotland and Elizabeth I, film will begin the conversation on Anne's role in British history.[48]

How can future historians work to "rehabilitate" Anne when the historiography of the Age of Anne remains tinged by themes of infertility, tragedy, and dominance. This representation not only does her reign a disservice, but also contributes to the relegation of the reigns of Europe's "forgotten queens" to the periphery due to few "successful" examples of female rule remaining in the popular vision.[49]

---

[46] Often, historians view Queen Victoria as the beginning of the modern British state. This is evident in the sheer number of biographies written about Victoria in comparison to Anne. Victoria has captivated popular attention with her reign usually ranking among the "best" in British history. This also relates to the historians in the nineteenth century placing their own historical moment above all others. Why should Victoria be praised so much? If anything, her reign was demonstrative for women and its ideas on sex and gender are still with us.

[47] Davis, Deborah and McNamara, Tony. *The Favorite*, directed by Lanthimos, Yorgos (2018; London, Fox Searchlight Pictures) DVD.

[48] Elizabeth I and Mary of Scotland have been the subject of several films since the 1920s. Most notably, *Elizabeth* (1998), *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (2007), *Mary Queen of Scots* (2018), and Mary, Queen of Scots (1971). It is possible that *The Favourite* will spark some renewed interest in Anne's reign and eighteenth-century Britain as a whole.

[49] Mill, John Stuart. *The Subjection of Women* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1911). Within this volume, Mill makes the argument that modern women have been eclipsed by their own repression. Mill also argues that women have not been politically involved, obviously a mistruth. It is through works such as this that queens regnant are often ignored. People inaccurately believe that women have not been politically involved throughout history. In reality, dozens of women ruled European kingdoms in their own right in the medieval and modern worlds. While female inheritance was not preferred or encouraged on a broad scale, it did occur across Europe. Therefore, Mill's arguments, as well as Jean Jacques Rousseau's, contribute to the placement of Anne into the realm of obscurity.

In an early modern context, i.e. Henry VII (r.1485-1509) to George I (r.1714-1727), Anne usually falls short of "greatness", with historian Kevin Sharpe characterizing her reign as "unexciting and uneventful."[50] While she may not be considered one of the "best" monarchs in British or English history by some, her tenure has been long-lasting in terms of its impacts.[51] The Acts of Parliament of few other early modern monarchs, besides Henry VIII (r. 1509-1547), have been relevant for political discourse three centuries following.[52] In future, Anne's reign should be considered within the context of the early modern British monarchy and the legacy of her twelve-year reign.[53] Compared with her Stuart predecessors, Anne provided more stability for English people than Charles I during the Civil Wars and Henry VIII during the English Reformation, an aspect that future historians would do well to remember.[54]

If current trends continue, Anne will join the ranks of other queens in European history that have been cast as "obscure" i.e. Blanche II of Navarre and Urraca of Leon-Castile, instead of recognizing the value of her career.[55] While Anne may have difficulties with her "image

---

[50] Sharpe, 509.

[51] "Top 11 Monarchs in English History", *History Extra*, last modified November 13, 2018, https://www.historyextra.com/period/viking/top-11-monarchs-in-british-history/. News outlets and magazines such as *History Extra*, Business Insider, BBC, among others, have all complied lists of the top 10 "best" British monarchs. Of all the lists from the aforementioned networks, neither places Anne on the list. The reoccurring monarchs are Charles II, Elizabeth I, Elizabeth II, Henry VIII, and Victoria. Beyond Charles II, few Stuart monarchs make it on any of these lists.

[52] Elliot, J.H. *Scots and Catalans: Unions and Disunion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

[53] As referenced earlier, Anne often gets compared to her Hanoverian successors in the Whiggish school of historiography. Is it really fair to do that? Should historians be comparing her to Victoria or Elizbeth II? Clearly, Anne's governmental structure and relationship with parliament was much different than in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Therefore, Anne should not be compared with the more "modern" monarchs of Great Britain.

[54] Riding, Jacqueline. *Jacobites: A New History of the '45 Rebellion* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016); Prebble, John. *Culloden* (London: Pimlico, 2002); Szechi, Daniel. *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). While Jacobites were always a constant threat for Anne and her successors, the cause did not become violent until after Anne's death. A failed Jacobite attempt to sail to the Scottish coast and recapture the lost Stuart crown failed with his fleet never making it to Britain. Jacobite risings did not become violent or strong until 1715 when George of Hanover was crowned king. Therefore, as Jacobites continue to become a hot topic in early modern British history, should Anne be remembered within its context for her relative stability?

[55] Beyond the usual suspects, Elizabeth I, Victoria, Mary I, and Isabella of Castile, few other regnant queens get a second look. This is problematic because it furthers the idea that few women ruled European states beyond modern

problem", will the consideration of she and her contemporaries ever move past the harsh judgments made by their first biographers, many of whom male. If Anne's image has any chance of improving, historians must work to fill the historiographical gaps that surround her reign, i.e. the absence of a study on Queen Anne's War in North America.[56]

If the historiography of Anne and, indeed other women remains overshadowed by tragedies, how might our comprehension "transcend" their adversities?[57] The time has come for scholars to conduct studies that view "tragic heroines" such as Anne beyond the events and characterizations that provide them with that label, as her reign contributed more to British history than the death of William of Gloucester.[58]

Very good overview.

A

G

---

prime ministers and chancellors. It also works to alienate Spain and its long history of queenship. Perhaps a product of the black legend?

[56] Leitch Wright, James. *Anglo-Spanish Rivalry in North America* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1971); Falkner, James. *The War of the Spanish Succession 1701-1714* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2015); Kamen, Henry. *The War of the Spanish Succession in Spain, 1700-15* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969. Beyond these studies, few works exist about the war in both Europe and North America. No comprehensive study of Queen Anne's War exists.

[57] Minieri, Jessica. "Catherine of Aragon: Beyond the Legacy of England's 'Discarded Queen'" (unpublished manuscript, Spring 2018). In a previous investigation, I've spelt out a similar approach to the tragedies that surround Catherine of Aragon's later life. She is often studied within the context of her divorce from Henry VIII and resulting English Reformation. Despite her miserable final years, Catherine led a successful career and early life in Castile-Aragon. She was Europe's first female ambassador from 1507-1509, acted as queen regent in 1513, and garnished the respect of her subjects. Why then, can Catherine not escape her tragedies?

[58] Chapman, Hester W. *Queen Anne's Son: A Memoir of William Henry, Duke of Gloucester, 1689-1700* (London: Deutsch, 1955).