QUEEN ANNE'S UPBRINGING, EDUCATION, AND THEIR IMPACT ON HER REIGN AND INFLUENCE OVER THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

A Thesis submitted by

Troy A. Heffernan, BA, MA

For the award of

Doctor of Philosophy

2017

ABSTRACT

Three hundred years of historical study has shaped current understandings of Queen Anne, but little has been written about the influence she believed she held in shaping England's politics and religion, or how both shaped her actions as Queen and Supreme Governor of the Church of England. This thesis begins by examining the implications of Anne's unremarkable place in the line of succession. It assesses why the Catholic suspicions surrounding her father and uncle (James, Duke of York and King Charles II) unexpectedly shaped the approach of a future queen regnant to her sovereignty. An evaluation of Anne's upbringing and beliefs concerning the Church's role in government and society establishes that her political and religious views were defined before and during James II's reign, leading up to the 1688 Revolution, and continued to mature throughout William III's rule. The consequence of the political landscape she inherited, and her education and beliefs, is that she was destined to face conflict with the Whig-majority in the House of Lords and Whig-sympathetic bishops in the episcopate. After Anne became queen, she attempted to protect the Church by increasing its voting influence in Parliament and the episcopate by filling the episcopal bench with Tory-sympathetic bishops who shared her vision. She was nonetheless often defeated by her inability to combat the Whiggish strength in Parliament and influence in the episcopate that had grown during William's reign, but Anne adapted and she represents a new expression of monarchical rule with minimal royal prerogative or authority. This thesis sits within the historiography of English royal history, and the histories of the Stuarts. Anne has not attracted as much modern scholarly attention as other Tudor and Stuart monarchs (including Tudor queens regnant), which this thesis amends by highlighting why Anne's successes and difficulties merit attention. The work builds on the body of literature that has developed since Anne's lifetime and following her death when her contemporaries wrote about her, to the substantial foundational works of the nineteenth century and more recent seminal scholarship. The thesis adopts a methodology focused on evidence-based historical analysis of seventeenth and eighteenth-century documents which are largely focused on how Anne's personal relationships influenced her life and rule in the form of letters, diaries, and memoirs. The sources derive from those who were responsible for her upbringing, and later those who were close to her or part of her interactions with the episcopate and Parliament and provide evidence via

personal documents and material contained within political tracts, proclamations, and speeches. These personal and formal sources provide multiple perspectives of the same events that shaped Anne's life and ability to achieve her goals as Queen and Supreme Governor of the Church. The thesis demonstrates that while Anne faced frequent difficulties in achieving her objectives, she developed strategies to negotiate the politics of religion, and remained constant in her commitment to securing the Church's role in society and government.

CERTIFICATION OF THESIS

This thesis is entirely the work of Troy A. Heffernan except where otherwise acknowledged. The work is original and has not previously been submitted for any other award, except where acknowledged.

Student and supervisors' signatures of endorsement are held at USQ.

Dr Marcus Harmes
Principal Supervisor

Dr Catherine Dewhirst
Associate Supervisor

Professor Emeritus Sybil M. Jack
Associate Supervisor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In completing my thesis, the greatest of thanks must go to Dr Marcus Harmes for being willing to support and supervise my project from its inception to completion. For the last three years, he has been the one sitting through regular meetings and reading countless drafts as a research idea turned into an 80,000 word scholarly contribution. At all times, Dr Catherine Dewhirst was also there to answer questions and give invaluable input towards my thesis's relation to early modern European history. Professor Emeritus Sybil M. Jack has for several years also given her feedback and advice on my thesis and other research projects. Her comments added to my thesis a lifetime of experience and knowledge concerning early modern English history.

Thanks must also go to my wife, Amanda. As life would have it, we completed our doctoral journeys at the same time which meant there was never a time when we felt alone or did not understand the difficulties of doctoral study that sometimes occur. Yes, the question of who would finish our doctorate first turned into a competition, but I am happy to have come second to such a worthy competitor. When it comes to deciphering Stuart manuscripts and eighteenth century French archival material, her skills are also faultless and much appreciated.

Studying seventeenth and eighteenth century English monarchical history at a small university in regional Australia was always destined to be difficult, but it did ensure several trips to Europe were required. Carlene and Scott Riley must be thanked for making this possible, so thank you Scott for opening your house to us for months at a time. It was spectacular to live in the centre of London and only be 10 minutes from Lambeth Palace, and 20 minutes from the National Archives. Staying in a home with a friendly face and not a hotel made for experiences beyond compare and was perhaps one of the most important elements in seeing this thesis completed.

It was while I was overseas that I was also able to gain the advice of several others who have helped shape this thesis. Thank you Professor Diarmaid Macculloch and Dr Judith Maltby for helping me overcome the complexities of issues that centred around the mix of religion and politics, and thank you Professor Ronald Hutton for assisting me in establishing how to view a very specific topic amongst the wide and varied issues that shaped the monarchy in the later-Stuart period.

Finally, thanks must go to the staff at the archives I spent so many months at including Lambeth Palace, Dr Williams's Library, the Bodleian, and the National

Archives at Kew but also further afield in some of their other locations. Though I spent time at other archives and libraries in England and Europe, it was the staff from the above-mentioned locations that helped me find my feet in early modern research.

Thanks must also go to the Australian Commonwealth Government contribution for tuition fees through the Research Training Scheme (RTS), and the provision of an Australian Postgraduate Award (APA) scholarship which supported the research required to complete the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE - Introduction

The Tudor and Stuart monarchs have not only been the focus of scholarly attention, but many of them sit heavily in popular culture and imagination. In the period from 1485 to 1714, these two dynasties participated in events including religious reforms, civil and foreign religious conflicts, regicide, and revolution. Yet in contrast to dramatic events involving Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, Jane, Mary, Elizabeth I, James VI and I, Charles I, Charles II, James II, and William III and Mary II, the ultimate monarch before the 1714 Hanoverian succession is often overlooked. Robert Bucholz concluded that Queen Anne can be easily disregarded as there were few controversies in her reign.[1] However, this thesis examines the circumstances that, while more subdued than the wars and revolutions of her predecessors, were flashpoints of controversy and drama, and shaped English and British history.

The thesis focuses on Queen Anne in her private life as a committed member of the Church of England, in public life as supreme governor of that Church, and as an unexpectedly adroit and occasionally successful participant in the politics of religion and Parliament before and during her reign. It considers the manner in which her upbringing and education formed her understanding of Church and State, reactions to others, and her religious and political position within England. It also examines how she inherited political and religious issues that originated from before the English Civil Wars, which shaped the Crown's relationship with political parties and the Church. These were unresolved matters that remained contentious throughout Anne's rule and were not confined to England. She may have ruled over Scotland, Wales, and Ireland as England's presence in the Americas was growing rapidly, but it was issues of English religion and politics that preoccupied her due to her upbringing and concern for the Church and English affairs. While not a biography, this thesis takes areas of Anne's life to form a linear analysis of the personal beliefs of those closest to her that became a guiding force in her public and private life. It also assesses Anne's views of the political and religious events that unfolded around her. By taking this perspective, the religious developments during her reign are shown not to be coincidental to her rule, but part of a consistent but contested strategy to protect the Church and guide

[1] Robert Bucholz, 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues', in Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837,* Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2002, p. 120.

Parliament during her reign.

With a long line of often hostile or contemptuous propagandists, journalists, writers, and scholars commenting on her, Anne has been viewed poorly in much of the historiography concerning her reign. Edward Gregg best summarised the scholarly consensus when he wrote that 'Queen Anne has traditionally been depicted as a weak monarch, subject to the persuasion of her favourites'.[2] He added that this perception was formed due to 'her poor health, her sex, and her mediocre intelligence', a view 'largely accepted by historians'.[3] Gregg's assessment is almost 40-years old, but his evaluation remains relevant, is repeated by more recent scholars, and will be discussed in the literature review.

Where Anne does attract scholarly attention is in relation to the Church of England. By the end of her reign, measures were in place to make sure the clergy were better paid (courtesy of Queen Anne's bounty) and the 50 New Churches Act meant the construction of more places of Anglican worship (although the total of fifty was never reached). As such, the signature actions of her reign related to the status and wellbeing of the institution. The connection between Queen and Church registered in proverbial and folk knowledge and in due course one of the verses of the satirical song *The Vicar of Bray* came to speak of Anne as 'the Church of England's glory', and during Anne's reign the malleable vicar became a Tory. As the relevant verse continues:

> Occasional conformists base; I blamed their moderation.
> And thought the Church in danger was from such prevarication.

Inevitably folk music simplifies the picture while providing some meaningful introduction to the reign. It nonetheless identifies Anne with the Church, but, as we shall see, Anne's relationship with the Tories and her reaction to the cry of 'The Church in Danger' were both far from straightforward.

This thesis examines the personal, religious and political factors that shaped, but also limited, Queen Anne's objective of protecting the security of the Church of England. Anne was born in 1665 during Charles II's reign, and from there the thesis explores her early childhood, her education, and her participation in the crisis of the

[2] Cited in: Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), pp. 136-137.
[3] *ibid.*

'Glorious Revolution'. It then considers the impact of her education and upbringing on a queen regnant whom few predicted would ever reach the throne and become Supreme Governor of the Church of England from 1702 to 1714. A linear approach brings into view a strong tension between the clarity of Anne's education and the ambiguous reality of ecclesiastical politics in her reign. As Queen, she felt this ambition could be achieved by seeing Tory-sympathetic bishops who shared her vision being promoted to the Upper House of Convocation and the episcopal bench in the House of Lords. However, she came to compromise her religious principles to gain favour from the Whig-supporting bishops in the episcopate and the Whig-majority in the House of Lords, both of which were major factors in all religious and political action she undertook. Anne's troubled relationship with the Whigs in Parliament and the Whig-sympathetic bishops on the episcopate derived from what Anne saw as the Whiggish aspiration to minimise the monarch's influence and position in Parliament. Regarding the Whig-aligned bishops, she believed they hoped to see the Church governed by the Houses of Convocation with minimal influence from the monarch, even though the monarch was the Supreme Governor of the Church. Thus, it was clergymen and politicians with whom she had to negotiate and compromise to promote the interests of her beloved Church of England.

The thesis shows how the factors that shaped Anne's religious sympathies and political priorities were in place before her birth, and thereafter had unexpected consequences as she became queen regnant due to circumstances few could have predicted. Charles II's appointment of her governess, chaplain, and senior tutor were decisions made as a response to England's religious and political status quo from 1665 onwards. Charles intended to use Anne's upbringing as a means of neutralising rising anxiety at the royal court about Catholicism. The outcome was an adult princess with firm religious and political ideals. Anne's view of the Church's place in English society can be reconstructed from her correspondence which reveals a woman devoted to the Church of England to a degree rare among the Stuart monarchs except for perhaps Charles I. When she became Queen and Supreme Governor, her early religious decisions regarding the selection of bishops reveal a monarch eager to see an increase in Tory-supportive bishops in the episcopate who were more likely to share her vision for the Church's operation and role in society and government. In reality, she was never able to overcome the Whig majority in Parliament and the Whiggish-supporters in the Upper House of Convocation. Anne dedicated her life to the Church

and was a Queen and Supreme Governor who had her own visions of how the High Church could have an increasing presence in parliamentary decisions. However, her objectives to remake and remould the Church could only be achieved in a compromised form.

As Anne was being raised with, and later maintained High Church and Tory ideals, some attention must be paid to the notions of the High and Low Church, and how they relate to Toryism and Whiggism for these are the fundamental principles that guided much of Anne's adult life and queenship. These connections and opposite views were influential in shaping Anne, but also guided the views of her advisers, parliamentarians, and clerics, as well as her opinions of these people. High and Low Church, and Toryism and Whiggism, describe religious and political views in unsophisticated terms, so it must be noted that people's attitudes towards them were not set. People could have different perspectives, and they could change at any time and for many reasons. Thus, modern historians have regarded Compton as a High Church Tory, while Gilbert Burnet has been viewed as someone who exhibited Low Church Whiggish ideals.[4] However, William Fleetwood, Bishop of St Asaph from 1708, is an example of someone with mixed views. He had Whiggish political views, but Anne believed his allegiance to the High Church overruled his political perspectives and subsequently referred to him as 'my Bishop'.[5]

Some adherents of the High Church favoured certain understandings of ecclesiology, which saw elements of liturgy and the nature of theology be influenced by traditionally formal approaches to worship, doctrine, and the structures of the Church. The High Church subsequently did have, at least in the eyes of its critics, some connections to the ritual practices associated with Roman Catholicism (although not in the ritualistic sense that 'high church' came to carry in the Victorian period).[6] The traditions of the High Church were usually associated with conservative political views that were upheld by the High Tories, among them the squires. Characteristic High Tory views included supporting the monarch's royal prerogative and the Church having a role in political decisions via the bishops on the episcopal bench. Thus, the High Church clerics such as Thomas Long, a prebend at Exeter between 1661 and his death

[4] Burnet, *History*, p. 109.
[5] Cited in: Charles Doble, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne: Vol. II*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1885, p. 104.
[6] Braaten and Jenson, *Reformation*, p 9.

in 1707, believed 'the ordinance of government is from God', as they promoted the Church's role in government.[7]

The opposing views could be Low Church and Whiggish perspectives. The Low Church's move away from the 'traditional' Church was often paired with the Whigs' liberal views that wanted to diminish the monarch's influence in political decisions.[8] Thus, in Bishop Burnet's 1699 *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles,* he argued that he was defending the Church by warning of it being devalued by religious indulgences interfering in other areas such as government.[9] Burnet's argument was refuted by Francis Atterbury, a High Church Tory, who demonstrated opposite thinking to Burnet. Tony Claydon has since concluded that Burnet's argument was 'clearly loathed by some breeds of Tory High Churchmen'.[10] The previous discussion has outlined the differences between the High and Low Church and how they can relate to Toryism and Whiggism. Yet the complete fluidity of these concepts must be reiterated and is demonstrated by Claydon's declaration that Burnet's *Exposition* was loathed by 'some breeds' of Tory High Churchmen, because someone who identified as a High Church Tory did not have set or prescribed views on religion or politics.[11] As Walsh, Haydon and Stephen conclude, to describe a Tory High Churchman (for example) is to describe a 'stereotype'.[12] One must thus appreciate that the politicians, clergy and the Queen herself, each demonstrated differing degrees of adherence to religious and political ideals. As will be later discussed, Anne's relationships with High Tories were far from straightforward.

Through an examination not only of the background to her rule but her mature exercise of power, the thesis argues that Anne's sovereignty and the way she led England and its national Church followed markedly different approaches compared to

---

[7] Cited in: Steven Pincus, 'To Protect English Liberties', in *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, 1650-1850*, edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 87-88; J. S. Chamberlain, 'Long, Thomas (*bap.* 1621, *d.* 1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/16977, accessed 12 September 2016.
[8] John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, *The Church of England 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 321.
[9] Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 175.
[10] Claydon, *William III*, p. 175; Martin Greig, 'Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1707', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 3, (1994), pp. 572.
[11] Claydon, *William III*, p. 175.
[12] Walsh, *Church of England*, p. 321.

previous Tudor and Stuart monarchs. A number of factors combined to mean that Anne reconfigured sovereignty. She reigned with minimal royal prerogative and as an Anglican, childbearing woman. She also did not contend with the wars and revolutions of her predecessors, but her political skills developed through the disempowerment imposed on her by the Whig leaders and the betrayal of some of the Tories. As her desires could be ignored by Parliament and the Whiggish majority due to the reduction of royal prerogative before her accession, she also dealt with an inner circle of advisers who felt they could cajole, manipulate, and intimidate her. During these tumultuous times, she exhibited leadership that developed despite her position as a woman with minimal royal prerogative, or political and religious power. Nonetheless, she could not overcome the Whig-majorities in Parliament and the preponderance of Whig sympathisers in the episcopate, and her religious principles and favour for the High Tories ultimately had to be compromised. Political compromise is a primary strategy that has been studied by historians who have founded theories on why compromise as a tactic was used, and what it likely achieved, by comparing instances of its use. Subsequently, Anne's compromises to ensure she had an influential voice (in her case, regarding the Whig-majority's decisions in the House of Lords) strategically matches the use of political compromise as a tactic. Yet the consequences to her rule also follow the frequently negative results of using compromise as a political method that suggest gains can come at greater losses.[13] Nonetheless, Anne also needed to side with the Whig-supportive bishops who voted on ecclesiastical matters in the Upper House of Convocation (the synodical assembly of the bishops and clergy), and on political matters as they sat on the episcopal bench in the Lords. Despite some successes, at the end of Anne's reign her difficulties with the prominent Whig-figureheads of Parliament and the episcopate meant that she had little ability to influence the Church's governance as much of the archival material suggests she had hoped.

This assessment of Anne's religious priorities is presented in chronological order, with the only deviation being when clarity requires factors or events to be assessed outside of their sequential occurrence. This method is suitable because the thesis provides analysis of the cumulative elements and events that shaped her views on how State and Church should influence each other and society. It also examines

[13] Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, *The Spirit of Compromise*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2012.

how she could exercise her ecclesiastical aspirations as Queen and Supreme Governor with varying levels of what she viewed as success. This chronological approach makes possible a clear assessment of the development of her understanding of the Church's direct influence and control over society and government possible, and explains her need for public support from the Tories. It also provides the foundations for discussing how she compromised these beliefs in an attempt to remain an influential voice in government after becoming Queen. James Anderson Winn used a similar method of investigation in his book, *Queen Anne: Patroness of Arts*. Winn's work is not a biography of Anne, but an assessment of the trajectory of her beginning, increasing, and changing patronage of the arts to ascertain how her favour for artistic pursuits altered over her lifetime and why this alteration happened.[14] In this thesis, the same approach Winn took in discussing these foci (in his case relating to artistic pursuits) in chronological order allows a trajectory to form from the events that shaped Anne's life before her birth, to the situations that occurred in the hours before her death. This approach also clarifies that as Anne inherited the British Isles, formed Great Britain, and had a role in the Americas, there were unpredictable consequences of her upbringing as she rose in royal prominence and became Queen. It permits in-depth assessment of the factors that shaped her aspirations for the Church, and the reasons why she was frequently unable to exercise her desires, but on occasion could artfully negotiate situations and project impressions of power.

Using a chronological approach may be the most relevant way of assessing the life of an individual whose childhood and upbringing had clear influences on their adult life and the attitudes they had towards their kingdom and the Church of England, but its limitations must be acknowledged. As this thesis attests, political and religious decisions influenced each other heavily during the early modern English period. This is an expected consequence of bishops voting in the House of Lords and having political sympathies that they carried into their votes in the Upper House of Convocation. However, in a chronologically-organised thesis, this means that at times the analysis and argument is sometimes heavily directed towards, for example, political issues without an equal assessment of their religious repercussions. That is not to suggest that issues of politics and Church have separated, it is reflective of a

[14] James Anderson Winn, *Queen Anne: Patroness of Arts*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.

work analysing the life and reign of a particular individual and being focused on the events most relevant to shaping her ability to see her aspirations reached.

The thesis begins with an assessment of the three centuries of polemical views and historical examination that shaped current twenty-first century interpretations of Queen Anne, her view of the position she held in relation to politics and religion, and how she understood their function in English society. Following this introductory chapter and Chapter Two's literature review, Chapter Three examines the factors guiding Anne's religious upbringing. This assessment establishes the aftermath of High Church and anti-Catholic sentiments being taught to a princess who carried these beliefs into adulthood. The analysis determines the repercussions of English politics and religion in having a princess raised with such uncompromising views who later unexpectedly became Queen of England and the Supreme Governor of the Church. Her attitudes were deeply entrenched to the extent that they overrode her loyalty to her father who on numerous occasions tried to blackmail, bribe, and compel her to convert to Catholicism.[15] As Queen, she nonetheless had to moderate and sometimes even abandon these principles so she could retain some measure of influence with the Whig-majorities in Parliament and the episcopate. The chapter therefore examines how English political events before Anne's birth and during her childhood shaped her education and upbringing. This assessment brings together familiar aspects of the Restoration with examination of their impact on Anne. Ronald Hutton, John Miller, and W. A. Speck have produced seminal works examining Charles II's and James II's lives, though these texts only touch on Anne's life. Yet Charles's and James's actions had a significant effect on the development of Anne's religious and political beliefs but in turn she made her own impact during the Revolution.[16] It is the biographies of Anne herself that examine the causes, motivations, and repercussions to her ecclesiology and governance of the Church. These biographies include works by

[15] Anne refers to her father's attempt to blackmail, bribe, and compel her in: British Library, Althorp Papers, Spencer Manuscripts (Spencer MSS), Section II, *Letters from Princess Anne to Mary of Orange*, Anne to Mary of Orange 29 April 1686.
[16] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989, p. 426; John Miller, *Charles II*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991, p. 210; John Miller, *James II*, London, Methuen, 1989, pp. 46-85; W. A. Speck, *James II*, London, Longman, 2002, pp. 77-78, 139.

David Green, Gila Curtis, Edward Gregg, and Anne Somerset.[17] The nature of the genre of biography means these issues are factual scenarios in chronological accounts, but are not critically assessed for their cause and effect on the wider trajectory of Anne's life and the politics of religion before and during her reign.

Chapter Four examines Anne's political and religious perspectives to understand what people and events had helped shape her view of what values the Church and its personnel should hold. It shows that these were the views she later sometimes had to abandon as she dealt with Parliament and the Whig-sympathetic majority in the episcopate. Understanding how Anne's early life and education shaped her adult religious principles is significant to understanding how her religious instruction guided her response to her father's attempts to bribe and blackmail her into converting to Catholicism, as well as her polemical role in the Glorious Revolution. This assessment is indebted to major works that have examined the Revolution as a political and religious confrontation between England's Parliament, James II, and William of Orange. Yet modern scholars have paid minimal attention to Anne's role in the Revolution's formation and execution. In Tim Harris's *Revolution*, Anne's presence is confined to the fact that her husband (Prince George of Denmark) defected from James's side to William's, and that she abandoned her father and fled Whitehall when news of the defection reached the palace.[18] In Tony Claydon's *William III and the Godly Revolution*, the author refers to Anne, but the emphasis of the work lies elsewhere.[19] A similar type of discussion occurs in Jonathan Israel's edited collection, *The Anglo-Dutch Moment*. That is not to say that historians have neglected or overlooked Anne, as it is quite possible to provide analysis of the history of the Revolution without her. However, bringing Anne into focus in terms of what she did, and what hopes people placed on her as a type of substitute supreme governor when the actual had been found wanting, contributes to understanding the development and expression of her religious identity in the context of the politics of the era.[20] This

[17] David Green, *Queen Anne*, London, History Book Club, 1970, pp. 17-30; Gila Curtis, *The Life and Times of Queen Anne*, London, Book Club Association, 1972, pp. 12-40; Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 1-30; Anne Somerset*, Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*, London, Harper, 2012, pp. 1-56.
[18] Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, London, Allen Lane, 2006, pp. 284-285.
[19] Tony Claydon, *William and the Godly Revolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 67.
[20] Jonathan Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essay on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

chapter also builds on Charles Beem's summary that 'Anne had to formulate a political following within the formal structures of politics and government'.[21] The section subsequently establishes that even before William's reign began, Anne's religious and political perspectives, and political and clerical advisers, were in place and would remain largely unchanged between 1689 and 1702.

Chapter Five examines William's influence on Anne's rule through the inherited politics that governed her reign. It assesses the political and religious standings which affected Anne's ability to employ her royal prerogative and desires. The chapter argues that in the wake of what she inherited from William, she negotiated and constructed monarchical leadership in an entirely new manner for her kingdom. Historians including Geoffrey Holmes, Daniel Szechi, Robert Bucholz, and Elaine Chalus have focused primarily on the political circumstances under which Anne came to power.[22] However, this chapter assesses the political issues that impacted on Anne's ability to influence the Church via religious bills, bishop selections, and increasing the Tory-sympathetic presence in the episcopate.

Chapter Six examines Anne's relationship with the senior members of the clergy including Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, and John Sharp, Archbishop of York. Historians from Norman Sykes to Hannah Smith have examined the religious events that affected and shaped Anne's reign.[23] Building on this work, this examination reveals the implications of Anne inheriting the Whig-dominated House of Lords and a Low Church episcopate which was often paired with the Whigs' liberal views.[24] This was in stark contrast to Anne's High Church beliefs that emphasised

---

[21] Charles Beem, 'I Am Her Majesty's Subject: Queen Anne, Prince George of Denmark, and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, p. 120.

[22] Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, London, Hambledon, 1967, pp. 90-99; Geoffrey Holmes, *Politics, Religion, and Society in England 1679-1742*, London, Hambledon, 1986, pp. 43-51; Daniel Szechi, 'Jacobite Politics in the Age of Anne', in Clyve Jones (ed.), *British Politics in the Age of Holmes*, London, Wiley, 2008, pp. 46-55; Bucholz, 'Queen Anne', pp. 109-119; Elaine Chalus, 'Ladies are often very good scaffoldings: Women and Politics in the Age of Anne', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2008, pp. 150–165

[23] Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1934, p. 136; Norman Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 50, No. 199, 1935, pp. 433-464; Hannah Smith, 'Last of all the Heavenly Birth: Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2008, pp. 137–149.

[24] John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, *The Church of England 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993, p. 321.

more the sacredness rather than the Erastianism of the Church.[25] Establishing the nature of the religious environment Anne inherited upon her accession enables analysis of how she dealt with Parliament and the leaders of the Church as the thesis moves towards assessing her objectives, successes, and failures as Queen and Supreme Governor.

Chapter Seven demonstrates how parliamentary majorities and disputes prevented the Queen from exercising influence over the Church that could be considered in line with Tory and High Church opinions. Anne also contended with parliamentary and religious issues in Scotland and Ireland, but her priority remained the English Church. The presence of the Whig-majority in the Lords and the dominance of the Whig-supportive bishops in convocation ensured that she could not influence voting in Parliament or the convocation. This chapter focuses on the further decline of Anne's ecclesiastical control and argues that she knowingly forwent her aspirations of shaping the Church's bishops and position in Parliament and society because politics had to take precedence over her intentions. She initially had success in appointing and translating Tory-supportive bishops to available dioceses as this activity occurred in an arena where her decisions were technically incontestable. However, as Anne became involved in the proceedings leading up to the parliamentary vote for the first Occasional Conformity bill of 1702 (and later the second and third Occasional Conformity bills of 1703 and 1704), she discovered how politics could limit her aspirations for the Church, and how compromising her religious aspirations could give her influence.

Chapter Eight examines the continued deterioration of Anne's ability to influence her own cabinet, Parliament, or advisers, doing so through the study of the forceful promotion of Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland, into the Queen's cabinet during 1706, against her own desires. The chapter also surveys the decisions of a number of her advisers to act in their own self-interest as they abandoned assisting the Queen to fulfil her own political and religious aspirations. Spencer's political appointment involved highly personal disputes that were part of a wider pattern of the Queen's collapsing power structure as she lost nearly all the allegiance she once held from Sidney Godolphin, and John and Sarah Churchill. These political machinations

[25] Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (eds.) *The Catholicity of the Reformation*, Cambridge, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1996, p 9.

also provide a salient example which demonstrates that the Queen's view was only one of many. The fact that politicians could work around her meant the Queen regnant's wishes could be ignored. She relied on support from her ministers in Parliament and from her clergy in the houses of convocation. An examination of the Queen's first years as sovereign and Supreme Governor contributes to the current scholarship on these events by analysing Anne's political hopes. The assessment also demonstrates how politicians slowly increased their authority over her spiritual and ecclesiastical decisions to influence her appointment of bishops, decisions where parliamentary members officially held no control.[26] The Bishoprics Crisis was evaluated some years ago in G. V. Bennett's article 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707', which set the standard for analysis of the Bishoprics Crisis, and his conclusions continue to be upheld in recent works.[27] In this chapter, the examination of Spencer's appointment and the Bishoprics Crisis combine to form a rare assessment that further cements Bennett's findings by providing further evaluation of how the Queen's political and religious power structure was dismantled by Whig devotees.

Chapter Nine focuses on the power play which placed limitations on Anne during the last half of her reign. As political elites grew cautious of the Whig leaders and the Junto's growing influence, their power soon began to decline and Tory representation in the House of Commons grew to their highest point in Anne's reign following the 1710 general election.[28] Assessment of Anne's position nonetheless establishes that she was rarely able to influence the Whig-majority in the House of Lords, and she was also not able to create a Tory-sympathetic majority in the episcopate who shared her ecclesial priorities. In part, this circumstance occurred as she was not able to overcome the high number of Whig-supportive bishops appointed

---

[26] Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times*, London, S.P.C.K., 1948; Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', pp. 433-464; Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, London, Hambledon, 1967, pp. 90-99; Holmes, *Politics, Religion, and Society*, pp. 43-51; Robert Bucholz, *The Augustan Court*, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, 1993, pp. 226-237; Bucholz, 'Queen Anne', pp. 109-119; Szechi, 'Jacobite Politics in the Age of Anne', pp. 46-55.

[27] Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell*, London, Eyre Methuen, 1973; Clyve Jones, 'Dr Sacheverell's Impeachment, 1710', *The History Journal,* Vol. 19, No. 3, 1976, pp. 759-771; Mark Knights, *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell*, London, Wiley, 2012; Brian Cowan, *The State Trial of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*, London, Wiley, 2012.

[28] W. A. Speck, *Tory and Whig: The Struggle for the Constituencies 1701-1715*, London, Macmillan, 1970, p. 123.

to the episcopate during William III's rule, but nor were her relations with Tories straight-forward. William selected bishops following their deaths and translations (as Anne could), but he also replaced non-juring bishops (those who did not swear allegiance to William III and Mary II) with Whig-supportive appointees. In doing so, he significantly altered the composition of the episcopate, and Anne did not live long enough to create a Tory-sympathetic majority in the episcopate.[29]

Subsequently, the assessment of the final years of Anne's reign determines that she rarely had more than a minimal influence on the guidance and security of the Church, even though her childhood made that her overriding objective. This lack of power occurred despite a lifetime steeped in High Church principles, which was given expression in her letters and in the correspondence and memoirs of those who knew her. Thus, it becomes clear that a lifetime of circumstances, lessons, and beliefs that fixated on reversing what had been, in her view, the side-lining of the Church during the reigns of her uncle, father, and brother-in-law, was not enough to overcome her lack of influence over Parliament and the Church. The trial of Dr Henry Sacheverell and the fall of Sidney Godolphin and John Churchill during 1710-1711, are also significant historical events. Geoffrey Holmes's *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* inaugurated the modern discussion of the political aftermath of Sacheverell's sermon and remains commonly cited.[30] Modern works frequently focus on the political dimensions but are not concerned with the impact that Sacheverell's trial had on Anne's position as Supreme Governor. Yet these same events highlight that Anne refrained from interfering in issues that did not concern her, a significant point considering her interest in the Church and lack of political power.[31] Sacheverell's trial was a flashpoint of the 'Church in danger' controversy, but Anne perhaps unexpectedly did not exhibit this concern. Rather, her reaction to Sacheverell is one of many instances where she demonstrates that she had a personalised vision of how the Church should be supported and maintained. In addition, modern research on Godolphin's and Churchill's political demise similarly focuses on the wider political

[29] Tony Claydon, 'William III and II (1650–1702)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/29450, accessed 9 Feb 2017.
[30] Holmes, *Sacheverell*; Cowan, *Sacheverell*; Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age*, New York, Routledge, 2014, p. 447.
[31] William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, New York, Routledge, 2012, p. 80.

repercussions, not on the repercussions for the Queen.[32] Nonetheless, the events in question had a profound impact on Anne's ambitions for the Church. Largely the only works to acknowledge the connection between these events and the political and religious consequences on Anne's reign are the biographies of her life by Green, Gregg, and Somerset.[33] The genre of biography and the personal singular focus nonetheless means that these works do not examine how major political, personal and ecclesiastical events of Anne's rule intertwined with each other and had long-lasting effects on her ability to influence Parliament and guide the Church. Therefore, this chapter's focus on assessing the implication of such effects assists in better understanding the factors that guided Anne as Supreme Governor.

The methodology adopted in this thesis is evidence-based historical analysis of seventeenth and eighteenth-century documents, and the modern scholarship on Anne. The thesis is placed within the world of political and social elites and many of the letters, diaries, memoirs, speeches, and sermons by the members of this social and political class have survived. This thesis uses sources that explore Anne's personal relationships from those responsible for her upbringing, and later that document her interactions with Parliament and the Church. This work uses the information contained within personal documents in addition to official sources such as political tracts, proclamations, and speeches. These sources provide different perspectives regarding the same events and were written for different audiences and purposes. This variety of materials enable a detailed analysis of Anne's political and religious views and relationships.

Caution must be taken when using these written sources, especially letters of the period. It cannot be denied that these issues are not specific to this thesis, but are faced by any scholar examining the period, or royal and aristocratic correspondence in general. For example, as the critical analysis of the available sources takes place, the historian must be constantly aware that it is unknown how many letters were written but not archived, and it is sometimes unclear if aliases or codes were being used. The

---

[32] Winston Churchill, *Marlborough: His Life and Times, Vol. IV*, London, Folio Society, 1991; Richard Holmes, *Marlborough: England's Fragile Genius*, London, Harper, 2008; Louise Creighton, *Life of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough (1876)*, London, Read Books, 2010; Roy Sundstrom, *Sidney Godolphin: Servant of the State*, Newark, University of Delaware Press, 1992.

[33] David Green, *Queen Anne*, London, History Book Club, 1970; Gregg, *Queen Anne*; Somerset, *Queen Anne*.

sources that are analysed to lead to the thesis's conclusion **are** also analysed with the knowledge that it is also likely that many letters were written with the understanding that they would be read by others in addition to their intended reader, and may have been designed to mislead. They were certainly often circumspect.[34] These aspects are difficult to ascertain, which is why this thesis, and any historical work examining the period, must be formed with the utmost caution when analysing letters as sources. Care has been taken when assessing letters that speak favourably of the Queen such as those penned by Robert Harley, the politician who became her closest adviser for much of her reign. Letters of high praise and little criticism are not assessed purely on their content, as letters that promote unconditional admiration may cause similar historical issues to letters of highly opinionated criticism. Indeed, all sources are analysed from the perspective of their highly political nature in relation to Anne's contentious position and, therefore, are contextualised within the specific dramas of the moment or with the political machinations of their writers. It is the intent of this thesis, as is standard practice of historical works of the period, to cross-reference any information sourced from letters/memoirs/diaries with as many other opinions as possible. Sometimes this means examining an issue from the views of several different courtiers who might all have opinions influenced by their own prejudices, but triangulating multiple opinionated views certainly lays the foundation for a more objective view than solely relying on a single person's assessment.

Nonetheless, the documentary evidence used in this thesis enables access to Anne's views, and contemporary interpretations of her perspectives and beliefs that exist from those who had close access to her. Insights into how the Queen came to think about the Church, how to enhance and protect its place in English society and government, and how her beliefs guided her decisions are examined in a number of different ways. The most relevant material is in her own personal letters as they outline Anne's aspirations, motivations, and responses to both success and failure. The Blenheim Collection of Papers is an important source of information as it contains letters written by Anne, Sarah Churchill, John Churchill, and Sidney Godolphin. These letters have been studied by previous historians for a range of purposes, but within this

[34] The nature of private letters being read by many people is highlighted by the efforts that were taken to protect the contents of Anne's letters to Mary of Orange as the Glorious Revolution approached. Spencer MSS, Section II, *Letters from Princess Anne to Mary of Orange*, Anne to Mary, 9 May 1687.

thesis they are used to determine insights into Anne's perspectives on the English Church. Their cumulative impression is to reveal her expectation that the voting pattern of the Church in Convocation and Parliament could be changed by growing the presence of bishops sympathetic to her visions in Convocation and on the episcopal bench within the Lords. The nature of the collection's personal correspondence ensures it contains viewpoints of how Anne influenced the Church and led the State, and on the political, personal and religious factors that guided her ability to influence the bishops and their votes in Convocation and the Lords. The Churchills and Godolphin were three people who, at one time, were as close as anyone ever was to the Queen. Their perspectives need interpretative caution due to their changing attitudes towards Anne and her aspirations, but their views are often candid and their declarations on Anne's feelings, thoughts and fears provide insight into her mindset that cannot be ignored.

The British Library's Harley Papers includes Robert Harley's letters and diaries. Documents within the collection of his correspondence permit the examination of the factors that affected Anne's ability to direct the Church to her satisfaction and to safeguard it. As Harley remained a primary figure in Anne's governance for almost the entirety of her reign, his papers include detailed assessments and concerns of her political and religious aspirations, achievements and failures. The archival collections that house a significant portion of material relating to Anne are familiar to historians of the early modern period. However, this thesis uses Anne's letters and archival material from the personal, political, and religious figures closest to her for the rarer purpose of establishing perspectives of her religious and political beliefs. These sources also allow for an examination of how Anne thought politics should relate to the Church's place in society and government, and what she hoped to achieve as monarch.

Various points emerge that can be combined to re-evaluate a queen who may not be as well-known as other early modern monarchs, but who has nevertheless received a substantial amount of historical attention. The thesis takes areas of Anne's life discussed to differing degrees by previous historians to examine her use of power, her loss of power, and her need to override much of her personal and regnal preoccupations with her desire to see the Church influence society and government how she believed it should. It also assesses the private beliefs that were a guiding force in her public life and her perspective of the political and religious events that unfolded around her.

Anne's religious convictions were once so strong that during the Revolution she believed she had chosen the Church over her father's life and risked her own. Yet as queen, parliamentary politics and episcopal polity left her as an almost powerless voice among many concerning the Church of England's well-being and governance. This shift is representative of the marginalisation of royal power and prerogative after the Glorious Revolution.

CHAPTER TWO - Queen Anne in Historiography

Three hundred years of polemical views and historical examinations have shaped the contours of current understandings of Queen Anne. These understandings include interpretations both of how she thought about herself and the role she played in relation to politics and religion, and of how she understood politics and religion's function in English society. While Anne may often be an afterthought to the writing of the history of this period, nonetheless a variety of controversialists, historians, novelists, and diarists have produced works about her and her reign. For the first 250 years following Anne's death, literature accumulated to comprise a variety of works written from social, political, and religious perspectives in a variety of genres. Scholarship of Anne in the last five decades then divided further to include views that analyse the impact of her gender. This chapter highlights the fact that historians have reviewed the events of Anne's life and reign with her featuring as part of the process of the major occurrences prior to her rule, and the political and religious occurrences during her reign. However, fuller attention is yet to be paid to Anne as a central participant in the dynamic and controversial religious and political developments of the period. Indeed, evidence reveals that Anne's contemporaries thought of her as an essential element of the politics of religion in the era. This thesis positions Anne as a central figure in England's politics and the politics of religion. While scholarship also directs attention to her rule of the British Isles and her burgeoning presence in the Americas, the focus of the present study is her interaction with and participation in events related to the Church of England. By taking this perspective, the religious developments during her reign are shown not to be coincidental to her rule, but part of her attempts at protecting the Church and guiding Parliament during her reign.

This review of the literature establishes two points. First, the review and the remainder of the thesis takes the separate events of Anne's life that have been studied by scholars (such as her involvement in the Revolution, the debates over the Occasional Conformity bills, the appointment of Charles Spencer to her cabinet, the Bishoprics Crisis, and Henry Sacheverell's trial) to show that there was a trajectory of how and why her political and religious beliefs were shaped, and later guided her interactions with Parliament and the Church. Secondly, these political events determined how Anne, once she was queen, led her country and attempted to influence the direction of its national

Church while operating within a mind-set that was shaped by strong but not exclusively Tory sympathies. She was subsequently forced to campaign against, bargain with, compel, and compromise with the Whig-majority in Parliament and the Whig-supportive bishops in the episcopate if she hoped to have an impact on political and religious decisions.

Assessment of Anne's treatment in modern historical writing also reveals that comparatively little study has been given to how parliamentary politics was often the defining factor in her ability to influence the Church to the extent that archival evidence suggests she had hoped. Anne has also not attracted as wide or as large a number of works as other Tudor and Stuart monarchs (including Tudor queens regnant) and this relative paucity reveals scholarly thought that her reign was 'settled' or was defined by inherited circumstances.[1] Since Anne's birth, writers and historians of different eras who have had contrasting sets of priorities and interests have written about her. Such interest began with the personal accounts from her contemporaries like Abel Boyer, Sarah Churchill, Jonathan Swift and Henry St John, continued via the substantial nineteenth century works including those by Agnes Strickland and Elizabeth Strickland, and then proceeded via modern scholarly assessments by Geoffrey Holmes, Edward Gregg, Anne Somerset, and Robert Bucholz.[2] These works have contributed in their own way to the body of knowledge and types of interpretations regarding Anne's life, her ecclesial priorities, and her reign. Nonetheless, few have focused on how political, personal and ecclesiastical matters affected her ability to exercise her wishes on religious issues, or Anne's perspective on these matters.

[1] Significant works on Tudor and Stuart monarchs include: J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, New Haven, Yale Press, 2011; Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, London, Longman Pearson, 2000; David Loades, *Elizabeth I: The Golden Reign of Gloriana*, London, National Archives, 2003; Christopher Durston, *James I*, London, Routledge, 2006; Pauline Gregg, *Charles I*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984; Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.

[2] Abel Boyer, *History of Queen Anne*, London, J. Roberts, 1722; Sarah Churchill, *Authentick Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Her Grace, Sarah, Late Dutchess of Marlborough*, London, Hooke, 1744; Jonathan Swift and Henry St John, *Good Queen Anne Vindicated*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1743; Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, London, Hambledon, 1967; Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint); Anne Somerset, *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*, London, Harper, 2012; Robert Bucholz, *The Augustan Court*, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, 1993.

Nineteenth and early-twentieth-century assessments of Queen Anne

It is in the nineteenth century that works appeared which can be considered 'historical' texts in the modern sense of following historical methodologies and stringent source analysis. Agnes Strickland wrote one of the first volumes on Anne in her and her sister's series from 1852, *The Lives of the Queens of England*.[3] Strickland declared that she relied on 'facts rather than opinion' and indeed fought to gain access for women to the State Paper Office Works to create a text that chronicled the known events of Anne's life and reign.[4] Prior to Strickland, works in the later-eighteenth century such as Philip Stanhope's *History of England Comprising the Reign of Queen Anne Until the Peace of Utrecht* and Donald Mitchel's *Queen Anne and the Georges*, examined the wider political context and implications of Anne's sovereignty.[5] These texts were frequently cited in the decades following their publication, not least because they made available excerpts from original documentary sources. Charles Overton and John Abbey's *English Church in the Eighteenth Century* had a similar scholarly impact to Stanhope's and Mitchel's work by offering a broad assessment of Anne's place within English society and the Church.[6]

These works represent significant steps in early historiography, but they were superseded in scholarship by works based on extensive research during the early-twentieth century that are now generally viewed as the foundational studies of Anne's life and reign. G. M. Trevelyan was primarily concerned with social progress or the political transformations that led to social change. He provides a description of the development of Anne's relationship with the Church in his works *England Under the Stuarts* (1904) and *England Under Queen Anne* (1930).[7] Trevelyan's study focuses on numerous aspects of the Queen's actions, including the social, political, monarchical and religious repercussions of her decisions as Queen. His detail on ecclesiastical

[3] Agnes Strickland and Elisabeth Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England: From the Norman Conquest, Vol. 8*, London, H. Colburn, 1854.
[4] Rosemary Mitchell, 'Strickland, Agnes (1796–1874)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26663, accessed 30 August 2016.
[5] Philip Stanhope, *History of England Comprising the Reign of Queen Anne Until the Peace of Utrecht*, Leipaiz, Bernhard, 1870; Donald Mitchel, *Queen Anne and the Georges*, London, Scribner, 1895.
[6] Charles Abbey and John Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, London, Longman, 1876.
[7] G. M. Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne*, London, Collins, 1930; G. M. Trevelyan, *England Under the Stuarts*, London, Putnam's, 1904.

matters and Anne's ecclesiology is subsequently small.

In contrast, Norman Sykes primarily focuses on the ecclesiastical history and issues of Anne's reign. Sykes's works are salient to the discussion of this thesis as he discusses Anne's relationship and interactions with the episcopate and members of the clergy. His article, 'Episcopal Administration in England in the Eighteenth Century', examines that topic for the entire eighteenth century but relates most of the discussion back to the administrative practices that began during Anne's reign.[8] He provides a significant foundation for the early study of Anne, the episcopate, ecclesiastical issues, and the Houses of Convocation. His focus on the administration of the episcopate and Houses of Convocation serves to illuminate the political manoeuvring by the clergy, and the issues dealt with between the higher-ranking members of the Church.[9] This occurred at a time when Anne's royal prerogative had declined following the limitative statutes placed on her predecessors including the 1660 Declaration of Breda, 1689 Bill of Rights, and 1701 Acts of Settlement.[10] His study thus demonstrates that monarchy was influential in other areas, but remained on the periphery of episcopal decision-making.

Sykes's assessment still leaves room for the intersection of political standpoints with the ecclesiastical to be considered, an approach this thesis follows to assess how politics affected the Queen's religious decisions concerning bishops' appointments and her attempts to influence Church policy.[11] Sykes's work provides an insight into the administrative processes of the Church and his 1935 publication, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', offers a detailed assessment of Anne's interactions with the Church at an organisational level.[12] Sykes also establishes a chronology of changes and developments in Anne's relationship with the episcopate during her reign. This evaluation reveals her changing attitudes and approach to the Upper House of Convocation as she realised she would be unlikely to gain support from the Whig-sympathetic majority due to its composition; this conclusion remains frequently cited

[8] Norman Sykes, 'Episcopal Administration in England in the Eighteenth Century', *English Historical Review* Vol. 47, No. 187, 1932, pp. 416-446.
[9] In this context, 'various ranking members of the Church' refers to inner divides of the twenty-six members of the Episcopal bench, a matter to be discussed in depth within this thesis.
[10] These acts and bills are discussed at length in Chapter Five.
[11] Sykes, 'Episcopal Administration', pp. 416-420.
[12] Norman Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 50, No. 199, 1935, pp. 433-464.

and supported by historians almost a century later.[13] Sykes states that while Anne was the Supreme Governor of the Church, her power as such was limited as the bishops sitting in the Lords often had different political views from their queen and supreme governor.[14] Sykes recognised the significance of Anne's relationship with the episcopate and Houses of Convocation as this relationship impacted on her reign. He argued that Anne had to consider the consequences of her actions given her minimal influence in both the political and religious arenas.[15] Therefore, Sykes provides an early recognition that she was driven to get advice and support from those who agreed with her point of view or could be persuaded by the Queen's negotiating skills.

Sykes's objective was not to assess the effects of the Queen's upbringing, the impact of the decline in royal prerogative she inherited as she attempted to guide the Church's decisions, or the Parliamentary pressures she faced in her ecclesiastical decisions. For example, Sykes is not concerned with members of the episcopate using their political connections to promote Anne's political objectives that did not pertain to the Church. Such instances did occur including when Anne persuaded John Sharp, Archbishop of York, to campaign against Parliament inviting to England Anne's likely successor, Electress Sophia of Hanover. Anne feared the Electress being in England would lead to Parliament and the Church identifying a second and rival source of authority and patronage.[16]

Sykes's later work, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768,* also addresses a range of ecclesiastical issues.[17] These matters include the aftermath of the Restoration in 1660, the revolution in 1688, and the events that led up to the Hanoverian succession. Nonetheless, his attention is rarely focused on how these events affected Anne and her leadership, which ensures these foci remain largely unexplored even in the twenty-first century.

---

[13] Sykes, 'Queen Anne', pp 433-464; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 238; William Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 9-23; Brett Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2014, pp. 116-117.
[14] *ibid*, p. 435
[15] *ibid*.
[16] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 201-211.
[17] Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1959 [2004], pp. 230-240

Anne's constitutional context

In recent scholarship there has been a revision of the once stable historiographic position on Queen Anne's reign in English and British history. As the last Stuart monarch, in 'standard' comprehensive histories of Tudor and Stuart, or solely Stuart, monarchs, she appears in the final chapters and often as an afterthought. One perception that commonly arises (in part due to her ultimate position in the Stuart dynasty) is that she inherited a 'fixed' monarchy. This view is best expressed in Mark Thomson's chapter 'The Execution of Charles I and Development of the Constitution'.[18] Thomson was one of the first historians to survey Anne's place in the context of the longer history of the Stuarts since G. M. Trevelyan's works in the early-twentieth century, and Thomson's views represent the beginning of a prevailing trend in the modern scholarly literature.[19] He suggests that Anne came to rule England after 99 years of her male ancestors experiencing high and low points in their prestige and authority, but that by her reign England had increased in political, religious and financial stability.[20] He examines how the English political landscape transformed in the aftermath of the Civil Wars, Charles I's execution, Charles II's restoration, and the 1688 Revolution, which were each significant factors in the ever-developing processes of the English government. Thomson subsequently used a quotation from Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon's reflections on past Stuart monarchs to suggest that Anne had the advantage of leading England after the nation had experienced regicide, restoration and revolution. It was Anne who had the benefit of:

> … reviewing all the failings in those times; and whatsoever was wanting at those opportunities of amending past errors, in the management of affairs, for the better establishment of the Crown, and the security of the true old English government.[21]

Thomson contributes to a body of histories of Stuart England that tend to subordinate Anne in the hierarchy of monarchs. Cumulatively, historians can suggest that her reign appears less important than her predecessors' as she did not contribute as much to England's development or contend with the same administrative issues. Subsequently,

---

[18] Mark Thomson, 'The Execution of Charles I and the Development of the Constitution', in K. H. D. Haley (ed.), *The Stuarts*, London, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1973, pp. 28-34.
[19] See footnote 7 for Trevelyan's seminal works in the context of this thesis.
[20] Thomson, 'Charles I', pp. 28-34.
[21] *ibid*, p. 33.

discussion of how Anne ruled despite the limited and further diminishing royal prerogative underpinning her authority remains underexplored. The suggestion that Anne was a beneficiary of the achievements of the earlier Stuarts continues to resonate in the large-scale general histories of the period, something that is a testament to the prevailing modern historical perceptions of her place in early modern history. Thomson's notion that Anne inherited a fixed monarchy is endorsed in Barry Coward's *The Stuart Age*.[22] He suggests that Anne's throne was stable because she inherited a kingdom that had 'steadily grown richer over the previous century' due to the efforts of her forebears.

Interpretations of Anne, however, require greater consideration. More recent studies question the influence of monarchs on financial matters.[23] Coward nonetheless pinpoints the low points of England's seventeenth-century finances due to the long-term aftermath of the war with Spain, the cost of the civil wars, the cost of the plague, the Great Fire of London, and three Anglo-Dutch Wars during Charles II's reign. He then concludes that England in 1700 was generally a less punishing place in which to live for more members of society and that life was less brutish than it had been in 1600.[24] Coward's main point that finances improved faster than inflation for much of the population in the century that preceded Anne's reign is reasonable. Yet his overall view that Anne enjoyed a relatively peaceful reign due to the financial stability that developed during the reigns of the earlier Stuart monarchs overshadows her political, religious and economic achievements. These accomplishments must be viewed in tandem with the fact that she was England's first queen regnant in 99 years since Elizabeth I's death, and was the first married, childbearing, queen regnant who governed the Church of England. These factors should combine to ensure that Anne is not dismissed as an afterthought, but studied as a Queen who represents an entirely new form of English monarch.

A closely related theme to that of Anne inheriting a 'fixed' monarchy is that she can be represented as the closing episode of political events that began with William III and Mary II. As such, Anne is frequently relegated to the final act of someone else's

---

[22] Thomson, 'Development of the Constitution', p. 33; Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: A History of England 1603-1714*, London, Longman, 1980, p. 415.
[23] Thomson, 'Development of the Constitution', p. 33; Coward, *Stuart Age*, p. 415; Richard Brown, *Church and State in Modern Britian 1700-1850*, London, Routledge, 2003, p 36; Pauline Croft, *King James*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002; p. 394.
[24] Coward, *Stuart Age*, p. 415

drama. As Clayton Roberts suggests 'the pattern of politics that emerged in the reign of King William continued to the reign of Queen Anne'.[25] He also elides Anne from historical significance. Roberts was not the first to view her as a nondescript accessory to William's reign. Geoffrey Holmes declares that Anne did not orchestrate the signature events of her reign and instead suggests that her rule was largely dictated by the events, situations and occurrences that were established by William.[26] Furthermore, Holmes's chapter, 'The Managers, the Queen, and the Royal Closet', explains 'how the machinery of politics was constructed and in what way it functioned'.[27] This analysis demonstrates the administration skills Anne employed with the help of her 'managers' to contend with her advisers and Parliament as a monarch with little royal prerogative. Holmes thus excuses Anne's failings rather than attempting to challenge or explore the difficult sovereignty she experienced due to her sex, her education and the lack of royal power she possessed. His conclusions also did not consider the issues that affected her queenship, and subsequently this thesis focuses on the issues that inhibited her rule because of her being at odds with the controlling factions in the House of Lords and in convocation.

Thomson, Coward, Holmes, and Roberts exemplify a scholarly tendency that interprets Anne's reign in a particular way without questioning why her policies and her polity sometimes mimicked William's, but the question of why they did so requires further thought. While characterising Anne's reign as an extension of William's rule, Coward and Holmes fail to acknowledge that William was largely a Whig-supportive king with party politics dominated by the Whigs. Conversely, Anne was a Tory-supportive queen who had to navigate a majority-Whig Parliament in the House of Lords, thus, her situation was quite different. Tim Harris maintains a similar theme regarding Anne as a limited monarch in terms of Parliament and policy in his work, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*.[28] Harris suggests that the importance of Anne's life and reign relates to questions of succession. He states that, after the death of Anne's son (Prince William, Duke of

[25] Clayton Roberts, 'Party and Patronage in Later Stuart England', in Stephen Gaxter (ed.), *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*, London, University of California Press, 1983, p. 196.
[26] Geoffrey Holmes (ed.), *Britain After the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, London, Macmillan, 1969, pp. 1-10.
[27] *ibid*, p. 185.
[28] Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*, London, Longman, 1993, pp. 226-228.

Gloucester) in 1700, 'more questions about the security of the Protestant succession', were raised and these were dealt with not by Anne, but by her ministers.[29]

Anne's constitutional position is an important discussion point in modern scholarship. Ensuring the military had the finances it needed while she attempted to see her policies get passed (such as the Occasional Conformity bills of 1702 to 1704, the formation of her cabinet during 1706, or the Acts of Union) required concessions, compromise and defeat that were shaped by her constitutional capacities. The degree of Anne's political power can be better understood by appreciating that she was heavily guided by her ministers in part because she had not been expected, educated or prepared to become queen regnant. Anne was only heir presumptive for 18 months (following the death of her son in 1700) before William died in early 1702 as the line of succession had gone to Anne's son before it went to her until his death. As heir presumptive, there was also no certainty that she would outlive William (who died suddenly from complications from a riding accident rather than from old age), whereas Anne was known for chronic ill health throughout her adult life.[30] To call into question Anne's leadership on the basis that she received support from her ministers in fact makes it further necessary to consider the repercussions of her not being prepared to lead as her male predecessors had. Of further importance are the consequences of her inheriting a Whig-dominated Parliament and Church. Additionally, as Robert Bucholz concludes in his chapter, 'Queen Anne: Victim of Her Virtues', Anne:

> … was thrifty, prudent, silent, pious, faithful to her marriage, maternal in her instincts. None of these characteristics is particularly exciting, or calculated to win the unqualified approval of the post-Enlightenment […] mind.[31]

The Queen has subsequently been viewed as leading a reign of domestic English peace with few controversies, and she caused no great change to the status quo of the kingdom's politics. Maureen Waller's *Sovereign Ladies: the Six Reigning Queens of*

[29] *ibid.*
[30] Before she became Queen, Anne spent many months at spa towns to recover from her pregnancies, to relax in the hope of falling pregnant, and to benefit from the reported health benefits of the spa waters. See sources, including: British Museum Additional Manuscripts (Add MSS) 17,677, GG, ff. 172-185: Aernout van Citters to The Hague, 23 May 1684; George James Welbore Agar-Ellis Dover (ed.), *The Ellis Correspondence, Vol. I*, London, Colburn, 1828, p. 99.
[31] Bucholz, 'Queen Anne', p. 120.

England discusses how Anne's competence has in part also been responsible for her neglected place in scholarship, and these views have combined to obscure wider aspects of Anne's life and reign from gaining historical attention.[32] Yet her rule came after reigns filled with often calamitous religious change in the sixteenth century, which was followed by civil wars, Charles I's execution, the Restoration, the return of plague, the Great Fire, a series of wars during Charles II's sovereignty, and the 1688 Revolution.

An appropriate historiographic response is not to assert that Anne was central to everything that happened during her reign. Instead, the very limitations on her and the confusion and compromise of her actions in contrast to the clarity of her childhood conceptions of Church and State are aspects of importance to understanding her reign. Consideration should be given to how little ability she had to influence religion or politics compared to those who led before her. The perception that Anne's quiet reign had little impact when matched to the dramatic events of her predecessors' reigns suggests that the monarchs before her had paved the way for Anne's relatively trouble-free leadership. However, the scholarship provides a context to the analysis of her expectations and ambitions, and the way she tried to manoeuvre around the Parliament and the Church. She was perhaps also more settled than many historians imagined due to her lifetime of religious preoccupation and dedication to seeing the Church's role grow in society and government, rather than focusing on political issues concerning England, Great Britain, or the Americas.

Recent assessments of Queen Anne

Following the foundational texts of Agnes Strickland and G. M. Trevelyan, Queen Anne continued to be assessed throughout the twentieth century in biographies by W. T. Morgan, M. R. Hopkinson, and Neville Connell.[33] The publication of these texts demonstrate that historians interested in Anne were always present. However, as the second half of the twentieth century unfolded, the studies of Anne divided to include

[32] Maureen Waller, *Sovereign Ladies: The Six Reigning Queens of England*, London, John Murray, 2007, pp. 293-312.
[33] W. T. Morgan, *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1920; M. R. Hopkinson, *Anne of England: The Biography of a Great Queen*, New York, Macmillan, 1934; Neville Connell, *Anne: The Last Stuart Monarch*, London, Thomas Butterworth, 1937.

biographies, but also works written from religious perspectives, and from within the priorities and methodologies of gender histories and military histories. Such scholarship combines to form a distinct portrayal of the Queen that this thesis builds upon. Biographies of the Queen that have been published within the last five decades are few, but they contribute to the large body of biographies of Stuart monarchs, including as only a small example, those by Ronald Hutton (Charles II), John Miller (James II), Pauline Gregg (Charles I), and Christopher Durston (Charles I).[34] Anne's modern biographies provide overviews of her religious perspectives, ecclesiastical relationships with bishops on the episcopal bench and with the members of the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation, and her view on her status in relation to the Church in the Church.

David Green's biography, *Queen Anne,* was one of the first studies of Anne to appear after the foundational works of the early and mid-twentieth century. Green's work brought a more modern historical perspective to Anne and is subsequently cited often in the later biographies and assessments of the Queen. Green assesses Anne's response to the political and personal issues that she encountered, and he consequently brings new viewpoints to existing assessments of her reign. His conclusions emerge from archival material and include the large amount of printed collections of letters and official documents, and published correspondence and memoirs that became accessible throughout the twentieth century.

Green's work was followed by Edward Gregg's biography, *Queen Anne* with its significant revisionist perspective that past accounts of Anne had relied too heavily on the views of Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough.[35] Previous historical accounts of Anne, including those by Strickland and Trevelyan, used the correspondence that existed between Anne and Sarah Churchill in her memoir. One must nonetheless consider the new source material that was available to Gregg via growing archival collections and printed collections of private documents that were not accessible to historians in the decades and centuries prior to his work.[36] John Miller states in his review of Gregg's biography that Churchill's scandalous opinions (that developed as their relationship soured and after Anne's death) had proved overwhelmingly

[34] Hutton, *Charles II*; John Miller, *James II: A Study in Kingship*, Sussex, Wayland, 1978; Gregg, *Charles I*; Christopher Durston, *Charles I*, New York, Routledge, 2013.
[35] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 136-137.
[36] John Miller, 'Queen Anne by Edward Gregg', *English Historical Review* Vol. 96, No. 371, 1981, pp. 145-146.

influential in works concerning Anne up until Gregg's biography.[37] Gregg focused on the historical debate regarding Churchill's controversial 1742 memoir, *Authentick Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Her Grace, Sarah, Late Dutchess of Marlborough*.[38] Gregg's decision to focus critically on Churchill's memoir and rarely trust her words without considering her motivations and other sources ensured that he established a clearer picture of Churchill's relationship with the Queen. This new perspective placed Anne's thoughts on many topics in a new context and to an extent liberated Anne from the gossipy views of the Duchess, who was writing years after the events and after the breakdown of her friendship with Anne.

Gregg also assesses what Anne worked towards and hoped to achieve rather than focusing solely on what she actually managed to accomplish and the limited scope of these achievements. He discusses issues including her struggle to implement her own policies, to support the Church, and publicly to support the War of the Spanish Succession, which involved England between 1701 and 1714.[39] Gregg also acknowledges the importance of Anne's childhood, the formation of her political beliefs and religious perspectives, and the issues she encountered during her reign, thus paving the way for more detailed research regarding the events that shaped her life. Anne Somerset's *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion* covers similar information to Green's and Gregg's works, but her discussion focuses more on the Queen's personal and political life, and considers Anne with an alertness to the insights gained from the approach of gender studies.[40] Somerset's work subsequently adds new perspectives to the broad view of Anne's life and reign, and asserts the role personal affairs and influences could have on a queen's life and decisions which allows further research to be conducted.

Other research has pointedly assessed how Anne's sex impacted on her sovereignty. Hannah Smith's article 'Last of all the Heavenly Birth: Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship', Elaine Chalus's article 'Ladies are often very good scaffoldings: Women and Politics in the Age of Anne', and Charles Beem's chapter 'I Am Her Majesty's Subject: Queen Anne, Prince George of Denmark, and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', have each explored the implications of women holding

[37] *ibid*.
[38] Churchill, *Authentick Memoirs*.
[39] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 182-198.
[40] Somerset, *Queen Anne*, p. 53.

regnal power.[41] These works represent only a small number of publications produced in recent decades regarding gender and queenship, but they offer the most relevant arguments to this thesis concerning Anne's ability to influence the Church. Smith's article analyses Anne's attempt 'to represent her political authority and how this intersected with prevailing perceptions of female rule'.[42] Her analysis is valuable to this work as it allows greater insight into how others reacted to Anne's rule and faith, the effect this had on interactions with her ministers and clergy, and her ability to guide the Church. Chalus argues that historians should 'consider women's political participation writ large', integrating evidence of other prominent females of the period to demonstrate the circumstances in which Anne operated as queen.[43] Charles Beem's collection discusses the reigns of numerous female monarchs in early modern Europe. However, his chapter on Anne suggests that even before she took the throne, she had demonstrated how a woman could manipulate the structures of male dominance as she was the dominant partner in her marriage to George, Prince of Denmark.[44] Beem's chapter establishes that Anne could operate within the male-dominated arenas of Parliament and the Church, but his assessment allows for additional study into what other aspects impacted on her ability to see her desires successfully executed in Parliament and the Church.

Other works have consolidated these more recent insights regarding the interpretation of Anne in gender history. Jennifer Farooq's article 'Preaching for the Queen: Queen Anne and English Sermon Culture, 1702-1714', discusses sermons addressed or dedicated to the Queen throughout her reign.[45] The author provides an insight into Anne's religious views as head of the Church and kingdom. In looking at

---

[41] Elaine Chalus, 'Ladies are often very good scaffoldings: Women and Politics in the Age of Anne', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2008, pp. 150–165; Hannah Smith, 'Last of all the Heavenly Birth: Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship', *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2008, pp. 137–149; Charles Beem, 'I Am Her Majesty's Subject: Queen Anne, Prince George of Denmark, and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, pp. 101-140.

[42] Chalus, 'Scaffoldings', pp. 150–165; Smith, 'Heavenly Birth', pp. 137–149.

[43] Chalus, 'Scaffoldings', pp. 150–165.

[44] Beem, 'Her Majesty's Subject', pp. 102-105; W. A. Speck, 'George, prince of Denmark and duke of Cumberland (1653–1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10543, accessed 28 September 2015.

[45] Jennifer Farooq, 'Preaching for the Queen: Queen Anne and English Sermon Culture, 1702-1714', *Journal of Eighteenth Century Studies* Vol. 37, No. 2, 2014, pp. 159-169.

the sermons during Anne's reign, Farooq acknowledges that Anne 'took an interest in the selection and advancement of her chaplains', but this thesis expands extensively on this notion and discusses the political consequences of these decisions for Anne's role in the Parliament and Church.[46] The author also notes that just as William III and Mary II used sermons to help legitimise their rule, Anne too commanded the publication of sermons for political gain. Farooq thus highlights the level of Anne's engagement with the Church and parliamentary politics.[47] Farooq's analysis on sermons subsequently demonstrates that the Queen sometimes used the printed material that was produced to spread the word of the Church to promote her political views, just as she sometimes used Parliament to influence the Church. For a Queen with clear religious and political perspectives when she came to the throne, that she could use politics to influence the Church and vice versa is a scenario meriting further investigation.

Many scholarly works discussed in this thesis view Anne as being comparable to her Tudor predecessors as she led the Church and kingdom as a married and childbearing woman; however, counter arguments do exist. For example, Elizabeth Foyster in her chapter 'Gender Relations', suggests that the historical impact of Anne's reign has had little relevance to gender history.[48] Foyster suggests that the repercussions of Anne's accession as a queen regnant should not be viewed as unprecedented. The author declares that Mary I's and Elizabeth I's reigns in the sixteenth century had already established that female rulers could successfully lead politically and religiously in England, nearly 150 years before Anne's reign began.[49] Foyster makes valid points relating to how the kingdom and Church would react to being led by a female leader.[50] There is, however, the additional and significant difference that Mary I was a Catholic who married after her accession, while Elizabeth I was the 'Virgin Queen'. Anne departed from either precedent when she succeeded the throne as the first married Protestant queen regnant who was Supreme Governor of the Church of England. These circumstances saw Anne led England and the Church in circumstances different from those of her female predecessors, which means her

[46] *ibid*, 159.
[47] *ibid*.
[48] Elizabeth Foyster, 'Gender Relations', in Barry Coward (ed.), *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2003, pp. 111-130.
[49] Foyster, 'Gender Relations', p. 122.
[50] *ibid*.

reign cannot be viewed simply as an extension of Mary I's or Elizabeth I's. Foyster's approach is also largely unconcerned with Anne's contributions to leading England at a time when the monarch's constitutional role was curtailed but important sacramental functions remained. Elizabeth I led when royal prerogative was still powerful enough to give the monarch some control over the government and subsequently the Church, even though she and Anne possessed a similar theoretical influence over the Church.

Anne's authority is discussed in literature regarding the Supreme Governorship of the Church and this literature highlights distinctions between her and her predecessors. In part, this circumstance occurs due to Anne's inability to execute her own desire of appointing bishops to sit in Convocation and the episcopate who might vote in ways that promote her views. Subsequently, her inability to shape the Church perhaps made her contribution less worthy of assessment. However, Anne's role as Supreme Governor also came at a very disjointed period in the Church's history. For example, in *The Church of England, 1570-1640*, Andrew Foster analyses the role and ability of the Supreme Governor from the papal excommunication of 1570, thus his analysis begins once the position was established and settled by Elizabeth I.[51] Foster analyses the governorship from Elizabeth to Charles I, but his work ends mid-way through Charles's rule as he states that the English Civil Wars were approaching and the King's religious decisions became based on political need rather than religious aspiration to influence the Church.[52] Foster's focus demonstrates how modern analyses of the Supreme Governorship are greatly interrupted from the second half of the sixteenth century. In Foster's work, the loss of a clear trajectory for the Church occurred due to the suspected Catholic sympathies of Charles II, James II's confirmed sympathies, the Calvinism of William III, and the Lutheranism of George I and II after Anne.

Other historians have also noted how the changing role of the supreme governorship has impacted on the monarch's ability to influence the Church, and one could suggest that different levels of influence make different monarchs more significant to historical research. The notion of supreme governorship emerged more than 150 years before Anne's reign when Henry VIII oversaw the passing of the 1534 Act of Supremacy. Historians from Elton to Loades pinpoint the ecclesiastical and

[51] Andrew Foster, *The Church of England 1570-1640*, London, Routledge, 2014, p. 7.
[52] *ibid*, pp. 67-73.

financial separation of the Church in England from Rome, and peers swearing an oath that recognised Henry as the Church's supreme head as major events in monarchical and Church history.[53] Claire Cross almost five decades ago considered the way Mary I inherited the power of the Royal Headship. The power was one that Mary abhorred but used, and was part of a series of events that related the Church and monarchical influence in a way that was foreign to Anne.[54] Since Cross's work, Wickins notes that Mary can be remembered for restoring the English Church's allegiance to the Pope, but making this change involved the Heresy Acts which resulted in Protestants being executed, with approximately another 800 wealthy Protestants choosing exile. However, the author also declares that while there was a long-term impact to these actions, the effect was far less impactful than the initial executions and exiles that preceded later events.[55] Cross, Loades, and Eppley have also illuminated the major actions Elizabeth I undertook when she came to the throne as a Protestant. Parliament passed the 1558 Act of Supremacy that largely restored the original act and made Elizabeth the Church's Supreme Head, though the title Supreme Governor was used to avoid the claim that the monarch was usurping Christ as the Bible identifies Christ as Head of the Church. This change also gave Elizabeth, the Church, and Parliament the power to direct the structures and doctrines of the Church within England; power that the Supreme Governor would lose by the later Stuart period.[56]

Works from Miller to Harris on the Restoration of the Church provide a clearer picture of why Anne may not feature in literature regarding the Supreme Governorship as much as her predecessors.[57] With the restoration of Charles II also came the restoration of the episcopal Church of England. The Church was restored by Parliament to a form similar to Elizabeth's iteration, but with one primary difference being that the power of the Supreme Governor was largely changed. The Church was

---

[53] G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, p. 344; David Loades (ed.), *Reader's Guide to British History*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2003, pp. 211-247.
[54] Claire Cross, *Church and People: England 1450-1660*, London: Wiley, 1999; Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1969.
[55] P. L. Wickins, *Victoria Protestantism and Bloody Mary: The Legacy of Religious Persecution in Tudor England*, London: Arena, 2012, p. 155.
[56] David Loades, *Elizabeth I: A Life*, London, Bloomsbury, 2006, p. 193; Daniel Eppley, *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013, p. 143.
[57] John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973, p. 94; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms 1660–1685*, London: Allen Lane, 2005, pp. 52-53.

restored with the Clarendon Code and 1662 Act of Uniformity, but the notion of enforcing England to be united under one religious organisation via persecution and violence had been abandoned. All the nation unifying under a single organisation was a fundamental objective of the Tudors and they had on occasion imprisoned and executed bishops and citizens to further this goal. However, by the middle-to-late seventeenth century, the numbers of dissenters, Catholics, Jews and Puritans were deemed too large by Parliament and the Church to ever enfold within one Church. Those who did not follow the Church closely faced penalties, but they were not forced into exile or potential execution as had occurred in England's history.[58] As a consequence of these events, the role of the Supreme Governorship had already been debated, fought, and settled before Anne came to the role. By this point, scholars had already provided a clear sense of the emergence and consolidation of these powers.

Summary

A review of the modern scholarly literature shows the development of several significant points for this thesis. The review establishes how Anne's perspectives on the Church and its place in politics and society were formed, and how politics impacted on her ability to influence the Church's decisions when her royal prerogative had substantially declined compared to her predecessors. The first point is that since the publication of the early-twentieth century's works by Trevelyan and Sykes, study into Anne's rule has frequently taken place from the different perspectives and methodologies of either political or religious history, and this scholarly trend has often continued into the twenty-first century. The acknowledgment of these perspectives and foci enables this thesis to provide a parallel commentary that focuses instead on Anne's views and beliefs towards some of the circumstances that shaped her political sympathies, and expectations of the Church's role in Parliament and society.

The biographies of Anne that have been written since the late-1960s have touched on many issues that this thesis addresses. These works examine Anne's expectations regarding the Church's role in Parliament and society, and how her political viewpoints formed and changed when she became the Queen of England. A further common point of analysis in the modern literature is how difficult political

[58] *ibid.*

situations throughout her reign took precedence over her desire to increase the Church's influence via the Occasional Conformity bills and increasing the number of Tory-sympathetic bishops on the episcopal bench. The genre of biography nonetheless means that while such works intersect with issues discussed within this thesis, the interaction between politics and religion is not evaluated as a clear series of events. Rather, these issues are discussed amongst the myriad factors that were a part of Anne's life and reign such as her personal relationships or efforts to produce an heir. Analysis of the trajectory of the various factors beginning before Anne was born and lasting until the final days of her life has subsequently not yet occurred. Anne's religious and political views, and evaluations of how she could exercise these beliefs against Whig-majorities in Parliament and the Church have also rarely been a point of acknowledgement or concentration of research.

Throughout the forthcoming chapters, the thesis follows the course of Anne's life to establish how and why her expectations of the Church's role and political beliefs formed. The examination also assesses how politics and a Whig-majority in Parliament and the episcopate ensured that the political dynamics of the kingdom shaped the way she could, and sometimes could not, influence the Church as she had desired once she became Queen.

CHAPTER THREE - Lady Anne: A True Daughter of the Church

Anne's upbringing and education are significant factors in understanding her adult interactions with her parliaments and with the Church of England. Her upbringing had unpredictable outcomes that shaped the Queen regnant, yet the relationship between her childhood and her adult rule is a topic rarely assessed by modern scholars. She was born into a kingdom whose people were consumed with anxiety about Catholicism and the putatively subversive actions of recusant Catholics. As a child, she was surrounded by fears of implications of the suspected Catholicism of her uncle, Charles II, and father, James, Duke of York. An assessment of Anne's childhood highlights a striking irony of her education – concerns about perceptions of Catholic royals led to her having a thoroughly Protestant education with tutors chosen by Catholics. Most likely Charles II intended her to be seen to be educated as her robustly Protestant lessons were a public means to display Protestant conformity at the royal court during a time when so many in his court were either Catholic or suspected of being Catholic. However superficial his intention, Anne took her lessons on board with sincerity. Her schooling was governed by expectations and as a female with little chance of becoming monarch, her education contributed little to her preparedness in many attributes of leadership. She was educated as a late seventeenth-century noblewoman who would likely become a princess or perhaps a foreign queen consort, but not a ruler.

As courtiers, churchmen, pamphleteers, and others suspected Anne's uncle and father were Catholic, there was an atmosphere of distrust within the Royal Court. The decisions made regarding Anne's upbringing and education were subsequently designed to alleviate concerns in the governing classes about the monarchy's Catholicism. That motivation may be clear, but the implications merit further analysis. Charles's and James's choices had direct influences on Anne's upbringing which shaped her mature political and religious beliefs regarding what she thought about the Church, its place in English society and government, and its security. In addition, this chapter demonstrates how Anne's childhood education resulted in her having to rely on her advisers, particularly at the beginning of her reign. It also establishes the formation of Anne's religious perspectives before they become the focus of discussion in Chapter Four.

The early formation of Anne's perspectives towards the Church and politics is

an important area for research and evaluation as it was her childhood views regarding religion and the High Tories that were compromised as she dealt as an adult with the Whigs and Whig-sympathetic bishops. Therefore, it is crucial to establish the contours of her upbringing to show the extent of her later deviations from what she valued. When discussing how Anne was educated it is important to note that her education had repercussions for how she later led the kingdom and accepted counsel. Her education was also shaped by tutors who were chosen for reasons of political expediency, but this selection had repercussions for a royal lady who subsequently became a queen regnant. Assessing the factors that guided Anne's early years means the source base for this study does not come from her correspondence. Anne was either too young to have an opinion or the letters of a child were not archived. The sources of information regarding her education and upbringing come from the archived material of those who were connected to her during her childhood. James wrote extensively about his daughter, as did her chaplain, Dr Edward Lake.[1] As the daughter of the heir presumptive, she was also sufficiently prominent to have attracted attention from diarists and writers of the period including Samuel Pepys, Narcissus Luttrell, and Roger Coke.[2]

Anne's own perspectives on politics and the Church become evident as she reached her teenage years when her letters began to survive the period and are mostly held in the British Library's Blenheim and Althorp collections. The collections contain much of the archived correspondence between Anne, her sister Mary (Princess of Orange and later Mary II), and her confidante of the period, Sarah Churchill, later Duchess of Marlborough. Such sources have been used by modern scholars, but this chapter interprets them from the perspective of analysing Anne's upbringing and education, and asks new questions of them. Thus, the weakness of her preparation for the throne when evaluated via Anne's opinions and those closest to her, explains why she allowed herself to be influenced by some of her advisers and confidantes.

---

[1] James II, *An Abridgement of the Life of James II*, F. Brettnonneau (ed.), London, Wilson, 1704; James Stainer Clarke, *Life of James II: King of England, Vols I and II*, London, Longman, 1816; George Percy Elliott (ed.), *Diary of Dr Edward Lake: In the Years, 1677-1678*, London, Camden Society, 1846.

[2] Roger Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns*, London, Bell, 1697; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1857; Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Vols I-XI*, Robert Latham and William Mathews (eds.), London, Bell and Hyman, 1970-1983.

Religion and politics before Anne's birth

When Anne was born on 6 February 1665 and baptised into the Church, she entered a political and religious landscape that was defined by tensions that emerged decades before her birth.[3] Considering the impact of England's religious and political circumstances before her birth that subsequently affected her life, some analysis of the events that preceded 1665 is required. Recent works considering the pivotal actors of the period are naturally focused on the King and James as the heir presumptive. These works give little concern to how the King's and his heir's decisions impacted on their niece and daughter who later unexpectedly became queen.[4] As Curtis wrote: 'In 1665, it would have taken a fortune teller to predict that Anne would become queen'.[5] Studies examining the factors guiding Anne's early life and upbringing include Somerset's biography, where the author speaks of the Queen being born at a time when the kingdom was 'fragile', as Anne was born only five years after the monarchy was restored in 1660.[6] Somerset's focus on social history leads her to concentrate largely on the scandal that surrounded the marriage of Anne's parents, James and Anne Hyde.[7] In discussing the nature of the marriage, Somerset refers to Samuel Pepys's unflattering description of the marriage when he recorded Edward Montagu's, 1st Earl of Sandwich, declaration 'that he [James] doth got a wench with child and maries her afterward, it is as if a man should shit in his hat and then clap it upon his head'.[8] Somerset's use of Montagu's salacious opinion of James and Hyde's pairing sets the tone for the political and social landscape into which Somerset suggests Anne was brought.[9] Edward Gregg's older but still important biography (it continues to be

---

[3] Edward Gregg, 'Anne (1665–1714)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, January, 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/560, accessed 27 December 2015.

[4] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989, p. 426; John Miller, *Charles II*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991, p. 210; John Miller, *James II*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2000, pp. 46-85; Speck, *James II*, pp. 77-78, 139.

[5] Gila Curtis, *The Life and Times of Queen Anne*, London, Book Club Association, 1972, p. 12.

[6] Anne Somerset, *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*, London, Harper, 2012, pp. 1-2.

[7] John Miller, 'Anne, duchess of York (1637–1671)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14325, accessed 31 December 2015.

[8] Pepys, Latham, and William, *Samuel Pepys,* pp. 260-261.

[9] Somerset, *Queen Anne*, pp. 1-7.

reprinted as late as 2014), also suggests that Anne was born into a fragile system of government and religion. He indicates that the rumours surrounding Charles and James's Catholicism had the greatest impact on Anne's early life, declaring from the onset of his work that:

> Queen Anne was born and bred in a civilization deeply scarred by turmoil […] in an age in which the past was a frail and uncertain guide to the future […] the house of Stuart, was overshadowed by a century of warfare between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.[10]

It is now meaningful to examine how the rumours of Catholicism that surrounded Charles and James were factors that directly influenced decisions made during Anne's early years. The impact of the rumours about the brothers on England's political and religious status quo in 1665 establishes why her childhood was so significant in shaping her devotion to the Church of England as an adult and as queen. Her education was also instrumental in determining her understanding of how the Church should influence government and society.

The key factors that guided the early years of Anne's life were England's political and clerical elite's uncertainty about James's loyalty to the Church of England in 1665, and Charles II's awareness that he needed to demonstrate his favour for Protestantism. The decision about the appointment of Anne's governess is at the foundation of her faith not just in religious doctrine but in the institution of the Church, and her steadfast refusal to let James shape her religious beliefs by attempting to convert her to Catholicism. Suspicion concerning James's faith could partly be alleviated following the births of his daughters as royal children could be used to enhance the monarchy's appearance to allay suspicions among Protestant gentry that the monarch and his brother were covert (or not-so-covert) Catholics. Charles I employed this method, although not for identical reasons, during the upbringing of his first son, Prince Charles (later Charles II), during the 1630s. Charles II's life has prompted a significant number of biographies and a large body of research, but the nature of his own governess's appointment merits discussion as it can be seen as a template for the selection of Anne and her older sister Mary's carer.

The Prince was going to be raised by Jan Ker, Countess of Roxburghe, but she was disqualified from the position once her Catholic faith was exposed to members of

[10] Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), p. 1.

Parliament and the Protestant clergy.[11] One of the only sources to discuss this circumstance is a letter sent by John Flower to Viscount Scudmore on 10 July 1630. His letters contain rare information regarding Ker's short-lived appointment and sudden dismissal. Flower's words cannot be verified via other accounts, but for three centuries historians have cited his record that due to the scandal of Ker's religious beliefs, Mary Sackville (wife of Edward Sackville, 4th Earl of Dorset) instead raised Charles in the cradle. In Flower's opinion, Sackville was selected even though she had 'seldome beene a courtier before, but all waies soe much honoured for her virtues, as everie one is glad that she is in her place'.[12] Sackville maintained the confidence of leading politicians and the Protestant clergy that the Prince was being brought up loyal to the Church of England. When it came to Charles's schooling, he was entrusted to William Cavendish, 1st Earl of Newcastle, due to Cavendish's stern faith and 'personal qualities and […] dissociation from political faction'.[13] The Prince's upbringing set a clear precedent of raising and educating royal children. The selection or disqualification of people in terms of their suitability to influence the mind and soul of a young prince or princess was thus a means to demonstrate to anyone who cared to observe the royal family's commitment to bringing up Anglican heirs. The selection of Anne's governess saw the same method employed.

Charles II entrusted Anne (and her older sister, Mary) to Lady Frances Villiers, wife of Colonel Edward Villiers.[14] Lady Villiers was the daughter of Sir Theophilus Howard (2nd Earl of Suffolk, courtier of James I and politician) while Colonel Villiers also came from a long line of courtiers and later became Knight Marshal of the Royal Household.[15] In Edward Lake's view, the Villiers were public upholders of the Church who were cautious of any 'Roman Catholick', that might 'discompose them [Anne and Mary] if they had an opportunity'.[16] That James had no input and was essentially side-

[11] The National Archives – Domestic Records of the Public Records Office (PRO), transcribed by M. Baschet, C, 115/M31/8126, John Flower to Viscount Scudmore, 10 July 1630.
[12] *ibid.*
[13] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 2.
[14] Edward Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia: Or, Present State of England*, London, Tidmarsh, 1669, p. 224.
[15] Stuart Handley, 'Villiers, Edward, first earl of Jersey (1655?–1711)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/28289, accessed 9 September 2016.
[16] Lake, *Diary*, p. 7.

lined in the decision of his daughters' governess is a testament to how important the selection of the governess was to Charles's political machinations and public religious appearances. Villiers's appointment is also the first instance where James's daughters' adult faith in the Church began to be solidified at the later cost of his unsuccessful attempts to convert them to Catholicism.

Accounts of Anne's life such as the biographies by Somerset, Gregg, and Green have acknowledged that the events into which Anne was born shaped her childhood and guided the selection of her governess and tutors. It is nonetheless crucial to note that the formation of her religious and political beliefs was shaped by English politics and religion before her birth. This series of events fostered her later favour for the High Church and Toryism as she turned from adolescent to adult.

The education of male monarchs

Although careful choices were made about Anne's governess, she was educated in the same way as other noblewomen of the period. Her lessons equipped her to become the queen consort to a foreign leader, as happened to her sister Mary when she married William of Orange in 1677.[17] Anne was not groomed to become a queen regnant, and this predicament had clear ramifications on her conduct as queen. Some attention must thus be paid to the instruction received by Anne's predecessors to put into context how she did not receive the education of a royal male, but also how her lessons differed from her female predecessors. The education of Anne's Stuart ancestors and female Tudor and Stuart forerunners has been the focus of much modern historical assessment and appears in the biographies of their lives.[18] However, a rarer assessment comes from examining the circumstances of their education and upbringing to form a comparison between the contrasting education Anne received due to her sex, her place in the line of succession, and personal circumstances. Examinations of Anne's education usually only appear in biographies of her life and reign. Such works may discuss her education, but while her upbringing and education represent major factors

[17] W. A. Speck, 'Mary II (1662–1694)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18246, accessed 13 September 2016.
[18] Linda Porter, *Mary Tudor*, London, Little Brown, 2007; Anne Somerset, *Elizabeth I*, London, Knopf Doubleday, 2010; Christopher Durston, *Charles I*, New York, Routledge, 2013; Hutton, *Charles II*; Miller, *James II*.

in shaping her adult beliefs, the unpredictable outcome that they had on shaping a queen regnant is a topic yet to be considered.[19]

Anne's grandfather, Charles I, was the first Stuart monarch educated primarily in England. Until Charles was twelve-years-old, he was raised in the shadow of his older brother, Prince Henry.[20] When Henry died of typhoid in 1612, Thomas Murray, Charles Guerolt, and John Beauchesne had been tutoring Charles for seven years. The tutors ensured that the Prince was well versed in literature, history, mathematics, and the tutors' understanding of religion, while Charles was also educated in other standard lessons such as music, dance, and riding.[21] Anne received some of these lessons, but literature, history and mathematics were areas of schooling that were largely foreign to her. Anne's uncle and father, Charles II and James, then had their lessons interrupted by the political unrest leading up to and during the English Civil Wars; yet not even civil conflict significantly corroded the teaching afforded to male royals.

When Prince Charles was eight-years-old he was placed in the governance of William Cavendish, and Charles was not given the opportunity of exploring the arts or philosophy (as his father and earlier Tudor monarchs had) as Cavendish declared that 'I would not have you too studious […] the greatest clerks are not the wisest men'.[22] Cavendish's approach was to instruct the heir in studies that were 'confined […] to subjects of obvious importance to a monarch such as the art of warfare', and to 'learn languages only for utility'.[23] Despite the utilitarian beginning of Charles's education, by the time he was fourteen-years-old he was required on the battlefield next to his father.[24] The disorder of the Civil Wars thus interrupted his education, but he still gained a strong foundation in lessons designed for military leadership from his years

[19] David Green, *Queen Anne*, London, History Book Club, 1970, pp. 17-30; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 1-31; Somerset, *Queen Anne*, pp. 1-56.
[20] Pauline Gregg, *Charles I*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984, pp. 17-18; Edmund Lodge, *Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain*, London, Harding and Lepard, 1830, p. 9.
[21] Fredrick Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, London, Rodwell, 1836, p. 17, 34; Durston, *Charles I*, p. 16.
[22] Cited in: Henry Perry, *The First Duchess of Newcastle and Her Husband*, London, Ginn and Co., 1918, p. 118.
[23] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 3.
[24] Edward Hyde and G. Huehns, eds. *History of the Rebellion*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1978, p. 100; for an overview of the events that led to the Civil Wars see: Troy Heffernan, 'Propaganda in the English Civil War: Designing Emotions to Divide a Nation', in S. Broomhall & S. Finn (eds.), *Violence and Emotions in Early Modern Europe*, New York, Routledge, 2015, pp. 173-184.

with Cavendish.

James's lessons were also disturbed by the Civil Wars. Less is known regarding James's education as interest surrounded Charles's childhood as he was heir to the throne.[25] That is not to suggest that James experienced an education secondary to Charles's. The selection of James's tutors Bishop Brian Duppa and in particular William Harvey, a physician remembered for his 'seminal contributions in anatomy and physiology', establish that James's tutors included some of the greatest minds of the early modern period.[26] As both men served under Cavendish, James's lessons also centred on the practical rather than the philosophical.[27] Despite the intellect of the scholars instructing James, he did not display much interest in his lessons and in 1647 Charles I sent word to his son 'to ply his book more and his gun less'.[28] James was not interested in study, but following the Restoration he resumed his role as Lord High Admiral of the Navy. His appointment demonstrates that a royal male, who was not the heir apparent or presumptive and who never developed an interest in academic instruction, was nevertheless prepared for positions of authority in Parliament or the military.[29] Thus, Anne's male predecessors received instruction designed to prepare them to undertake masculine roles of leadership in Parliament, the military, or monarchical influence as they could comment in theoretical terms on royal authority. Few lessons Anne received directly aided in her later accession to the throne, and those that did prove beneficial occurred largely by chance.

Educating royal women

Anne's male predecessors were educated for public office as members of England's

[25] Maurice Ashley, *James II*, London, J. M. Dent, 1977, pp. 15-30.
[26] Ian Green, 'Duppa, Brian (1588–1662)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8303, accessed 9 September 2016; Roger French, 'Harvey, William (1578–1657)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/12531, accessed 9 September 2016.
[27] Miller, *James II*, p. 2.
[28] Cited in: *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 23, 1632-1636*, ed. Allen B Hinds (London, 1921), *British History Online,* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol23, accessed 17 August 2016; G. F. Warner, ed., *The Nicholas Papers*, London, Camden Society, 1897, p. 76.
[29] Ashley, *James*, pp. 15-30.

governing bodies regardless of their likelihood of reaching the throne. A direct comparison between Anne and her female predecessors, Mary I and Elizabeth I, is relevant but is difficult as the nature, standards and expectations of their lessons 150 years earlier contrast to a great extent with Anne's experiences. Gregg states that Anne's education occurred at a time when:

> … the Renaissance principle of providing [English] royal princesses […] with formidable linguistic, philosophical, and historical training was as dead as Mary and Elizabeth Tudor.[30]

Gregg thus suggests that direct comparisons between Anne's education and those of her female predecessors are not relevant. Yet some consideration must be given to the issues that could impact on royal female education, and the lessons royal women received closer in time to Anne's own upbringing. Women's formal academic lessons were rare and, as such, changed very little over time even for elites or royals. The Renaissance and Reformation did have an impact on the education of elite women, with secular thinking being introduced through humanist influences while religious polemics were introduced from the reformed Churches' teachings. It is also necessary to note that it was only by the mid-seventeenth century that the Enlightenment began inspiring many writers, including those concerned about the education of women (not just elites).[31]

Mary I's education bears important points of distinction that can be attributed to the influence of her mother. As Mary was the only living child of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, she was not entirely raised by governesses. Mary's cousin, James Stewart, 1st Earl of Moray, declared that she was 'brought up among the women', with her parents having constant access to her when they were in the same palace.[32] For the first five years of Mary's life she did not receive formal schooling, though during this period Catherine 'taught her [Mary] her ABC, guided her childish pen, ordered her reading and corrected her Latin exercises'.[33] Catherine's education in Spain had prepared her to undertake such tasks as she was, according to one modern view,

---

[30] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 11.
[31] An overview of women's education during the period in question is discussed in the chapter 'Literary and Education' in, Jacqueline Eales, *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*, London, University College London Press, 2005, pp. 35-46.
[32] Porter, *Mary*, p. 27.
[33] Garrett Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon*, Boston, J. Cape, 1941, p. 140.

'astonishingly well-read, far beyond what would be surprising in a woman, and as admirable for piety as she is for learning'.[34]

Catherine of Aragon was the figure leading Mary's education, but the pair could not always be together. Subsequently, the constant element in Mary's life as her lessons turned from informal to formal was her chaplain, Henry Rowle, who also oversaw her tutors Dr Richard Fetherstone, Giles Duwes, and Thomas Linacre.[35] Catherine's determination that Mary would receive the best schooling possible was such that in 1523 she commissioned her Spanish countryman and humanist scholar, Juan Luis Vives, to write a treatise on educating women, though more specifically, on educating Mary, titled *De Institutione Foeminae Christianae*.[36] The results of Vives's instructions was that by Mary's ninth birthday she could 'read and write, both in English and in simple Latin, had some command of French and could probably understand Spanish'.[37]

A supplementary reason that Mary was prepared for leadership in a manner foreign to Anne, was due to Catherine's fundamental belief in what she envisaged for her daughter's life; which was a completely contradictory view to Henry VIII's perspective. From the time of Mary's birth, Henry placed little value on a girl and told Sebastian Giustinian, the Venetian Ambassador to England, that 'the queen and I are both young […] and if it is a girl this time, by God's grace the boys will follow'.[38] Conversely, Catherine believed that 'female sovereignty was compatible with wifely obedience and there was no good reason why Mary should not succeed her father', after she witnessed her mother, Isabella I of Castile, fulfil the male requirement of kingship as queen in her own kingdom while fulfilling the roles of wife and mother.[39] In comparison, when Anne was born there was next to no expectation that she would become monarch. Her sex also meant her birth was met with disappointment as Charles II wrote to his pregnant sister 'I hope you will have better luck with it than the

---

[34] Mark Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1968, p. 17.
[35] Porter, *Mary*, pp. 27-28.
[36] Juan Vives, *De Institutione Feminae Christianae*, C. Fantazzi and C. Matheeussen (eds.), C. Fantazzi (trans.), Leiden, Brill, 1996. [1524].
[37] Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015, p. 203.
[38] Cited in: Sebastian Giustinian, *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*, London, Smith & Elder, 1854, p. 182.
[39] Anne Whitlock, *Mary Tudor*, New York, Random House, 2010, p. 21; Pollnitz, *Princely Education*, p. 203; David Loades, *Mary Tudor*, Oxford, Blackwell, p. 31.

Duchess here had, who was brought to bed, Monday last, of a girl'.[40]

Elizabeth I's early years also demonstrates how personal circumstances could influence the education of a female royal. The uncertainty caused by Henry VIII's six wives meant Elizabeth never underwent formal education for the purpose of sovereignty as Mary had after Catherine ensured Mary's tutors were told they were 'shaping the mind of the heir to the throne'.[41] Elizabeth was two years and eight months old when her mother, Anne Boleyn, was executed on 19 May 1536.[42] Later the same year, Elizabeth's place in the succession altered significantly after the Second Succession Act of 1536 declared that she was 'illegitimate […] and utterly foreclosed, excluded and banned to claim, challenge, or demand any inheritance as lawful heir […] to the King by lineal descent'.[43] The following year on 12 October 1537, Henry and Jane Seymour then produced a child, Edward (later Edward VI).[44] The consequences of Anne Boleyn's execution, Elizabeth being declared illegitimate, Edward's birth, and the probability of Henry producing further male heirs is clear. In 1537, the prospect of Elizabeth reaching the throne may have appeared equally as implausible as Anne's likelihood of wearing the crown seemed in 1665.

Elizabeth may have been declared illegitimate and removed from the line of succession, but she remained the daughter of the King and was educated by some of the kingdom's best minds. Her instruction frequently came from Edward's tutors, a group educating the heir apparent. From 1543, Elizabeth was instructed by Dr Richard Cox and Sir John Cheke, who were tasked with teaching their student 'of toungues, of the scripture, of philosophie and all liberal sciences'.[45] There was a departure from Elizabeth sharing Edward's tutors between 1544 and 1548 when William Grindal took control of her studies. However, Grindal, like many of Elizabeth's and Edward's tutors, was sourced from humanist scholars of St John's College, Cambridge, 'which

---

[40] Cited in: Arthur Bryant, *The Letters and Speeches of King Charles II*, London, Cassell & Co., 1968, p. 178.
[41] Loades, *Mary*, p. 32.
[42] E. W. Ives, 'Anne (*c.*1500–1536)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/557, accessed 13 September 2016.
[43] Royal Society, London, *Letters & Papers*, folio X, p. 926; & Act 28, Henry VIII c 7: Joseph Tanner (ed.), *Tudor Constitutional Documents: 1485-1603*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1930, p. 389.
[44] Richard Grafton, *Grafton's Chronicle*, London, Johnson, 1809, p. 462.
[45] British Library (B.L.), Cotton MS Nero C.x, fol. 11r.

had already acquired a reputation for being in the vanguard of the reform movement'.[46] Grindal schooled Elizabeth in Latin and oversaw her other lessons to confirm that everything she was being taught followed the doctrines of the reformed Church.[47] However, Grindal died of plague in 1548 which resulted in Elizabeth's education returning to the direct control of those who taught Edward, who by now was King.

Elizabeth's new tutors included Roger Ascham and Jean Belmain. The pair have been credited as having 'a major role in forming Edward's Protestant views', and feasibly the same religious doctrines were emphasised in Elizabeth's lessons.[48] A great deal is known about the tutelage Elizabeth received under Ascham as he published *The Scholemaster*, which includes detailed accounts of the lessons he taught Elizabeth and Edward through sections such as 'The bringing up of youth' and 'The ready way to the Latin tong'.[49] Ascham focused intently on teaching Elizabeth the classical and romance languages, and believed that:

> … beside her perfect readiness in Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish, she readeth here now at Windsor more Greek every day than some prebendary of this church doth read Latin in a whole week.[50]

Elizabeth also took lessons in music, and studied the history and politics of the ancient world, although Ascham's primary focus was always on Elizabeth's and Edward's lessons in theology, an area strictly overseen by Henry.[51] By the end of Elizabeth's schooling, Ascham was so impressed by his protégé's achievements that, in a letter to the German educator, Johannes Sturm, he declared:

> She talks French and Italian as well as English: she has often talked to me readily and well in Latin and moderately so in Greek. When she writes Greek and Latin nothing is more beautiful than her handwriting […] she read with me almost all Cicero and great part of Titus Livius: for she drew all her knowledge of Latin from those two authors. She used to give the morning to the Greek Testament and afterwards read select orations of Isocrates and the tragedies of Sophocles. To these I added St Cyprian and Melanchthon's Commonplaces.[52]

---

[46] Somerset, *Elizabeth*, p. 11.
[47] *L&P*, p. 970.
[48] Wilbur Jordon, *Edward VI*, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1968, p. 68.
[49] Roger Ascham, *The Scholemaster*, London, John Daye, 1570.
[50] *ibid*, p. 67.
[51] Louis Weisener, *The Youth of Queen Elizabeth*, London, Hurst & Blackett, 1879, pp. 97-99; David Loades, *Elizabeth I: A Life*, London, Bloomsbury, 2006, pp. 71-75.
[52] Felix Pryor (ed.), *Elizabeth I*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2003, p. 17.

Elizabeth and Edward were educated together, but Edward was not old enough to rule freely after Henry VIII's death. Conversely, when Elizabeth succeeded Mary in 1558 she was twenty-five and as such her decisions and demeanour quickly reflected the education she had received. At the onset of Elizabeth's accession Gómez Suárez de Figueroa y Córdoba, 5th Count of Feria and a Spanish diplomat, wrote that 'she must have been thoroughly schooled in the manner in which her father conducted his affairs'.[53] No such comparisons were made between Anne and Charles II's or her father's leadership.

As the Stuarts came to the English throne, the education of Charles I's sister Elizabeth Stuart (later Queen of Bohemia or 'The Winter Queen') demonstrates how without atypical circumstances, royal women were prepared for diplomatic roles and to become princesses or queens consort, but not queens regnant. When James I and his family arrived in England in 1603, he entrusted his daughter Elizabeth to the care of John Harington, Lord of Exton, and his wife, Anne. Harington was well known for his strict adherence to the Reformed faith, for his anti-Catholic views, and his belief in the value of a solid education.[54] Elizabeth Stuart received instruction in natural history, geography, theology, Italian, and French 'which she spoke with ease and grace'.[55] She was also taught horse riding, music and dancing.[56] Elizabeth's education subsequently prepared her for a diplomatic marriage, and in 1613 she married Frederick V, Elector Palatine and later King of Bohemia.[57] This was perhaps an expected marriage of an English princess during the period and was the role for which her lessons prepared her. Like Anne's education, no contingencies were in place regarding Elizabeth Stuart's lessons to prepare her for rulership.

This overview of the lessons that some of Anne's female royal predecessors received determines how personal circumstances could dictate a royal woman's education. There is little need to compare Anne's lessons to other noble females during

---

[53] M. J. Rodrquez Salado and Simon Adams, 'The Count of Feria's dispatch to Philip II of 14 November 1558' in *Camden Miscellany* Vol 28, 1984, pp. 331-332.
[54] Ronald G. Asch, 'Elizabeth, Princess (1596–1662)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, April 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8638, accessed 10 September 2016.
[55] Cited in: Elizabeth Ogilvy Benger, *Memoirs Relating to the Queen of Bohemia, Vol.1,* London, Longhurst, 1825, p. 83.
[56] Antonia Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-Century England, part Two*, London, Phoenix, 2002, p. 71.
[57] Asch, 'Elizabeth, Princess', *ODNB*.

the Restoration period as she was taught activities 'typical of the late seventeenth century's expectation of women'.[58] Thus, one can examine Anne's lessons knowing that they reflect noble and royal educations of women from the period. While the general subjects she studied are noted in her biographies, an evaluation of her education is significant from the perspective of establishing the religious and political viewpoints she exhibited as an adult, queen, and the Supreme Governor of the Church of England.[59]

If not mathematics, languages or history, what Anne was taught included music and singing by Henrietta Bannister. During a conversation with political writer Roger Coke, Bannister declared that Anne's 'ear was very exquisite', while Henry Delauney taught her guitar.[60] Richard Gibson instructed Anne in drawing, though she did not take to the craft and failed to enjoy the lessons.[61] Singing, playing guitar and drawing were the expected activities of women during the period and had been taught to royal children of both sexes since at least 1400. However, for Anne, these talents were not supplemented by lessons in spelling, grammar, history, politics or warfare, nor the solid classical education (which included reading major political theorists, theologians, and historians) that Tudor royal girls received.[62] The customary activities of dancing and theatre performances did, nevertheless, enable Anne to become familiar with some protocols at court. For example, diarist John Evelyn recalled Anne and Mary performing in John Crowne's *Calisto, or the Chaste Nymphye* before the court.[63] Thus, Anne would not have arrived at court as an adult oblivious to the procedures of royalty or social structures of royal power, even if these were not aspects of royal life that were explicitly taught to her.

Anne's lessons also began at a time when women's education had been a topic of polemical literature for much of the early modern period. Both positive and negative

---

[58] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 14-18.
[59] Anne's lessons are assessed in such sources as: Curtis, *Queen Anne*, pp. 18-30; Green, *Queen Anne*, pp. 17-24; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 14-18; Somerset, *Queen Anne*, pp. 8-15.
[60] Coke, *Court and State*, p. 480; British Museum Additional Manuscripts (Add MSS), 38.863 ff 6-6v; Anthony Hamilton, *Memoirs of the Comte de Gramount*, trans. Peter Quennell, London, Literary Licensing, 2013, p. 171.
[61] Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England, with Some Account of the Principal Artists, and Notes on Other Arts*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1849, pp. 534-535.
[62] The consequences of Anne's education are discussed in: Troy Heffernan, 'Never the Queen: Anne Stuart's Formative Years' in *Unexpected Heirs*, edited by Valerie Schutte. London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, (forthcoming).
[63] See '15 December 1674' in John Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn Vol. IV*, E. S. de Beer (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1955, pp. 49-50.

views of female education exist, from Juan Luis Vives's treatise on educating women written for Princess Mary, Baldesar Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier* to John Knox's *First Blast of the Trumpet*.[64] These works and views have regularly been assessed by historians, but a lesser known work that specifically references Anne demonstrates that the differing standards of male and female education had been noticed during the late-seventeenth century. In 1673, the aspects of thought (later called the Enlightenment) had started to influence writers and Bashua Makin, a former school mistress, published a treatise that highlighted how women were being failed by private tutelage in the late-seventeenth century.[65] The treatise was a political piece, but Makin does point to genuine limitations when she declared that women finishing their lessons could only 'polish their hands and feet […] curl their locks […] dress and trim their bodies'.[66] She hoped that women would be educated equally to men and therefore routinely instructed in the areas of ancient languages, mathematics, and philosophy.[67] As Makin's complaint would indicate, Anne was given an education dictated by her sex. Nonetheless, the equality Makin argued for may have better prepared Anne to become a princess or queen consort, but it would not have prepared her to become a sole ruler.

Anne did excel in two areas which proved to be beneficial as Queen and Supreme Governor. Firstly, she mastered French easily, though this was perhaps less about the instructional quality she received and more indicative of her family's long-term relationship with the French court.[68] Anne's own time spent in France between the ages of four and five (to rectify 'a kind of defluxion in the eyes' that resulted in constant watering) was also potentially favourable to her grasp of the language during a period where diplomacy with France was constant.[69] Regardless of how Anne

---

[64] John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women,* New York, DeCapo Press, [1558] 1972; Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull, London, Penguin, [1528] 2004; Vives, *Institutione Foeminae Christianae.*
[65] Bashua Makin, *An Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen in Religion, Manners, Arts, and Tongues*, London, Tho Parkhurst, 1673.
[66] *ibid*, pp. 22-24.
[67] *ibid.*
[68] Miller, *James II*, pp. 6-25; Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 74-112; Caroline M. Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria (1609–1669)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/12947, accessed 30 December 2015.
[69] Abel Boyer, *History of Queen Anne*, London, J. Roberts, 1722, p. 715.

perfected her French, her immersion in the language was significant. Her proficiency is demonstrated in archived letters written by her minister Robert Harley, 1st Earl of Oxford (as during her reign relations with France remained constant) which feature Anne's corrections to his attempts at writing in the language.[70]

Secondly and arguably more importantly, Anne's devotion to the Church likely increased significantly after Henry Compton, Bishop of London, was appointed by Charles II to guide her (and Mary's) religious instruction. Compton in conjunction with Anne's chaplain, Dr Edward Lake, devised her lessons and guided her religious education from 1675. The impact the pair would have on Anne's religious perspectives was clear to James who believed Compton to be 'more like a colonel than a bishop' and who was also an 'enemy to the Papists'.[71] James's concerns were merited. Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury and seventeenth-century historical writer, wrote of Compton's reputation that he was 'the great patron of converts from Popery', at a time when James did not hide his Catholicism.[72] During the years leading up to Compton's appointment, James had made his conversion from Protestantism clear. In 1673, he relinquished his position as Lord High Admiral of the Navy after refusing to take the oath mandated by the Test Act, an oath designed to 'test' an individual's membership of the Church of England.[73] Following the death of his first wife, Anne Hyde, in 1671, James married the Catholic Italian Princess Mary of Modena (Mary Beatrice) the same year. James's brother and father had also married Catholic princesses, but as Mary Beatrice was regarded by some as an 'agent of the Pope', the union did little to improve James's social and political standing with the Protestant members of Parliament and the clergy of the Church.[74] Despite his conversion to Catholicism and his obvious disapproval of Compton's staunchly anti-Catholic influence over his daughter, James had no means of rectifying the matter. It was on Charles's order that Compton controlled Anne's and Mary's education.[75]

James's fears of the outcome of Compton's tutelage were warranted as Anne

---

[70] PRO 31/3/201, d'Aumont to Louis XIV, 19 January 1713; HMC, *Bath*, Vol. I, p 210, Anne to Harley, 13 September 1711.
[71] Clarke, *James II*, pp. 502-503; Gilbert Burnet, *History of His own Time*, London, Thomas Ward, 1724, p. 392.
[72] Burnet, *History,* p. 392.
[73] J. R. Tanner, *Samuel Pepys and the Royal Navy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1920, p. 18.
[74] Cited in: David Loades, *Tudor Queens of England*, New York, Continuum, 2009, p. 228.
[75] *ibid*.

excelled in scripture and divinity studies. Perhaps her greatest equal in the Stuart dynasty on the subject of the Church was her great-grandfather, James VI and I, who wrote several works on religion.[76] However, as he was raised in Scotland and according to the Church of Scotland's teachings, not even James I could claim to 'know my heart to be entirely English', as Anne announced during her first speech to Parliament in 1702.[77] As Anne's preceptor, Compton controlled what she was exposed to, but as he was also the Bishop of London his time was limited. Anne's sub-preceptor Dr Edward Lake was thus her day-to-day tutor who oversaw her other lessons, and read prayers and passages of the Bible with her.[78] Lake's diary records his regular meetings with Anne, but he rarely provides details of the lessons he conducted or oversaw. Nonetheless, his diary does reveal that Anne's affinity for religion and for Lake himself was so great that when she contracted smallpox and was in quarantine as a twelve-year-old adolescent, she requested him 'to come often to her', so they might 'read prayers', as soon as she recovered.[79] The understanding of history she received thus stemmed from religious lessons, and consequently she imbibed Compton's and Lake's High Church and essentially Tory viewpoint.[80]

Implications of Anne's upbringing: princess and queen

Anne excelled at the French language and formed an understanding of the Church taught to her by her tutors concerning its role in society and government. Yet as previous sections of this chapter indicated, many of her predecessors received lessons more conducive to creating ruling monarchs such as English history, European history, warfare, and politics. The factors concerning how her education resulted in problems as Anne rose in the line of succession and became queen is an area that has not received significant investigation or assessment.

Anne knew she was at least in need of further lessons regarding her knowledge

[76] James I, *Dæmonologie, in Forme of a Dialogue, Divided Into Three Books*, Edinburgh, Hatfield, 1603; James I, *The True Law of Free Monarchies*, Edinburgh, Robert Walde, 1598.
[77] Cited in: William Hazlitt, *The Eloquence of the British Senate*, London, T. Kirk, 1810, pp. 146-147.
[78] Lake's diary, 12 November 1677, p. 9.
[79] Lake's diary, 12 November 1677, p. 9; for an overview of the event see: Troy Heffernan, '21 Days Later: Lady Anne and the Death of Charles Stuart' in *The Seventeenth Century Journal*, Vol. *31*, no. 1, (2016), pp. 57-70.
[80] Lake's diary, 12 November 1677, p. 9.

of English history. The eighteenth-century writers Nicolas Tindal and Paul de Rapin noted that 'it was an unhappiness to this Queen that she was not much acquainted with our English history and the reigns and actions of her predecessors'.[81] Tindal and de Rapin suggest she made attempts to educate herself further. As she undertook this task after becoming queen and without the assistance of tutors, they state that she did not have the time needed to dedicate herself to becoming as knowledgeable in history as she would have liked.[82] The effect Anne's lack of understanding of English history and the history of her predecessors' reigns had on her rule is difficult to gauge because every monarch received different lessons. For example, Charles and James experienced lessons interrupted by war, and James never exhibited a great interest in his schooling.[83] Thus, not all royal children had impeccable educations which makes it unwise for this thesis to make direct comparisons between Anne and her predecessors. Nonetheless, some links can be made regarding the consequences of what Anne did understand about England's history. Even before Anne became queen, it was stated by the former chaplain to Charles II, Richard Kingston, that 'the Princess discoursing her sufferings often made a parallel betweene her self and Queen Elizabeth'.[84] Anne also adopted Elizabeth I's motto of *Semper Eadem*, or 'always the same', in what her contemporaries thought was an attempt to portray herself as comparable to the enduring figurehead of Protestant queenship.[85] During Anne's first speech to Parliament on 11 March 1702, as reported by Johann Wratislaw, Imperial Ambassador Extraordinary, she selected a costume of red velvet robes edged in gold galloon with the badge of St George and the ribbon of the Garter on her left arm that was modelled from a portrait of Elizabeth.[86] The evidence suggests that Anne believed there was a nostalgic regard for Elizabeth in the early eighteenth century and that she was eager to have as many connections drawn as possible between herself and Elizabeth.

While there was not a formal curriculum in rulership, there were lessons to be

---

[81] Nicolas Tindal and Paul de Rapin, *The continuation of Mr. Rapin's History of England: from the revolution to the present times, Vol. VI*, London, Osborne, 1763, p. 244.
[82] *ibid*.
[83] Warner, *Nicholas Papers*, p. 76.
[84] HMC, *Finch*, Vol. IV, pp. 452-453, Kingston to Nottingham.
[85] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 96.
[86] The connection between Anne's dress being inspired by Elizabeth is recorded in Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 152, who cites: Winston Churchill, *Marlborough: His Life and Times Vol. I*, New York: Scribners, 1948, p. 499.

learnt in statecraft and leadership, though in the views of Anne's contemporaries, these were areas where she was limited. Sarah Churchill recorded in her 1742 biography that her husband, John Churchill, and Sidney Godolphin (an adviser to Anne since the early 1680s) had 'the principal direction of affairs' in the opinion of Parliament and the Royal Court due to Anne's unpreparedness to lead.[87] Churchill's words are only one opinion but few historians have questioned the influence Churchill and Godolphin had over Anne for much of her reign. However, Sarah Churchill's words also originate from a source who responded with 'venomous vindictiveness when Anne would not allow her the role(s)… Sarah demanded', in later years.[88] Churchill's words nonetheless indicate that Anne's education, at least by the beginning of her reign, led to her relying on others when traversing the complexities of government; a reliance of which her advisers would later take advantage.

Summary

Anne's education was formative in the sense that it would later impact on her political beliefs, ecclesiology, patronage, exercise of policy, and her aspirations for influencing the Church's role in government and society. The suspicions of Catholicism that surrounded Charles and James ironically meant that their Catholic sympathies made them orchestrate a Protestant education for Anne that was controlled by an anti-Catholic bishop. The governess and preceptor selected for her ensured she reached her adult life having received a High Church and Tory upbringing and such lessons had strong ramifications in influencing her religious relationships and policies. However, one must question: what was she not taught? As a girl, Anne learnt some of the courtly requisites. She could sing, perform on an instrument, speak French and she had courtly manners. Her male predecessors could do the same, but with harder lessons learned from men in the saddle. Yet even Anne's Tudor female predecessors had learnt more. The robust classical education of both Tudor daughters eclipsed Anne's lessons in depth, and was taught by university divines who exposed them both to religious but also classic political and historical texts. Mary Tudor was also brought up by a mother

[87] Henry Snyder, *The Marlborough Godolphin Correspondence Vol. I*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 49.
[88] John Miller, 'Queen Anne by Edward Gregg', *English Historical Review* Vol. 96, No. 371, 1981, p. 147.

who had seen the rightness of female rule. These points were not part of Anne's intellectual inheritance.

Anne was not educated or groomed with the expectation that she would ever reach the crown, a factor which would guide her adult perspectives, confidants, and advisers. The result of her insignificant place in the line of succession and the type of education this status prompted was that she was required to seek substantial support from those around her as she came to the throne; and these relationships often impacted heavily on her success in influencing the Church and Parliament. Past works have assessed some of the immediate implications of Anne's education. However, the repercussions of her education being guided by her sex and unremarkable place in the line of succession continued to exercise influence in her adult life and during her reign as Queen and Supreme Governor.

CHAPTER FOUR - Anne, Catholic Conversion, and the Revolution

This chapter examines Anne's self-expressed religious identity and the way it was perceived by others during the three years her father spent trying to convert her to Catholicism, and then during her role in the events leading up to the Glorious Revolution. Both episodes establish her already strong views on religion and politics and demonstrate that in the later 1680s, Anne's adherence to the Church of England and her understanding of what its influence should be in society and government had developed from the religious instruction she received as an adolescent. Her religious and political perspectives as an adult and queen can thus be ascertained not only before she came to the throne, but even before William III's reign.

It is possible to ascertain how the religious conditions under which Anne was born and raised shaped her adult views by examining the evidence of her religious beliefs after her father became king in 1685. That she favoured the Church of England and disdained Catholicism is clear from her responses to James's continued efforts to coerce, bribe and blackmail her into converting to the religion.[1] James's intentions for his family and his kingdom were clear by the end of 1685. While his actions in the lead up to the Revolution have been extensively studied, the three years before the Revolution can be explored from the unfamiliar historical perspective of focussing on Anne's role after she entered into what she termed a 'treasonable' correspondence with William and Mary.[2] Her participation, in her father's views on her religion, and Anne's contemporaries' views about her, provide fresh insights into the period and the princess. Although contemporaries thought this staunchly Protestant princess was a

[1] Spencer MSS, Section II, *Letters from Princess Anne to Mary of Orange*, Anne to Mary of Orange 29 April 1686.

[2] Major works regarding the Glorious Revolution include: John Childs, *The Army, James II and the Glorious Revolution*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1980; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms 1660–1685*, London: Allen Lane, 2005; Geoffrey Holmes (ed.), *Britain After the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, London, Macmillan, 1969; Jonathan Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991; Steven Pincus, *1688: The First Revolution*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2014; Scott Sowerby, *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution*, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2013. That Anne declared her letters to be 'treasonable' is recorded by Everaard van Weede. See: James Muilenbury, 'The Embassy of Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykevelt, to England in 1687', in *University of Nebraska Studies* Vol. 20, 1920, p. 55.

key player, historians have paid little attention to what Anne said and thought during these years and what importance her contemporaries placed on her participation in the revolution

As such, this chapter assesses how Anne's religious commitments were implicated in the events that led to the potential conflict that would end in war between James's and William's forces. Her responses to the increasing likelihood of conflict establishes that her devotion to the Church was such that she participated in events that were leading England to war. Anne's commitment to the Church subsequently encouraged a situation that could have ended in the death of her father in the event of William's successful invasion, or placed herself in danger had the Dutch attack failed.

The archival material that casts light on Anne's opinion of James's attempts to convert her to Catholicism and her role in the Revolution includes the British Library's Blenheim and Althorp Collections. The Blenheim collection contains many of Anne's letters to her confidante Sarah Churchill. The personal nature and significant number of letters sent between Anne and Churchill provide information concerning Anne's religious and political perspectives. The Blenheim collection also includes early drafts of Churchill's memoirs that offer her personal evaluations of many of Anne's reactions to the events of 1685 to 1689. The Althorp papers contain many Anne's letters to her sister, Mary of Orange. Certain letters between the sisters amplify Anne's favour for the Church of England, her simultaneous fear of the Church of Rome, and of their father's Catholic toleration. Assessing this material reveals that almost two decades before Anne became queen, her perspectives regarding the importance of the Church to English society and government were well established, but the strength of her opinions also made her a participant in major political crises. Historians have never had reason to doubt these points, but the evidence and what it yields in this analysis ascertains the strength of Anne's stance on the Church's position in government and society well before she acceded the throne. This chapter therefore provides a baseline for her beliefs which is necessary for understanding the extent of the mismatch between the ideals and the reality she experienced during her reign regarding her beloved Church of England.

Princess Anne's religious beliefs during the reign of James II

Henry Compton and Edward Lake provided an education that produced a strongly

Protestant young princess. Events in Anne's early lifetime reveal the strength of her beliefs. Following the Exclusion Crisis and Titus Oates's allegations of a Popish Plot she displayed little sympathy towards any Catholic person who was identified or subsequently executed.[3] These events took place when Anne was between fourteen and sixteen years old. Her reactions as James became king and was then usurped by William III nonetheless prefigure her adult loyalties towards the Church and Tory politics. Due to their mostly chronological focus, the biographies of her life comprise the majority of modern scholarship to focus on Anne's religious views between the beginning of James's reign and the aftermath of the Revolution. David Green, Edward Gregg, and Anne Somerset have each noted Anne's political grievances against her father's rule and the strength of her loyalty to the Church, though these issues emerge in the context of the Princess's marriage, pregnancies, and relationships.[4] The impact that Anne's childhood lessons had on what became her religious views also had likely outcomes with unpredictable consequences as she increased in royal importance. That is to say, the strongly Protestant background to the lessons given to a young royal led to a devoutly Protestant adult with uncompromising views; however, the wider repercussions of those lessons were unpredictable when the young royal unexpectedly became queen regnant.

Modern scholarship on the opening months of James II's reign tends to look elsewhere than at Anne. Understandably it is focused on the King and his concerns. He faced an uprising in Scotland led by Archibald Campbell, 9th Earl of Argyll; then a more difficult task came in defeating Charles II's eldest illegitimate son, James Scott, 1st Duke of Monmouth.[5] The rebellions forced James into a defensive military position. In the months between his coronation on 23 April 1685 and Parliament sitting on 9 November, he nonetheless gave Anne, Parliament, the Protestant clergy, and Mary and William at The Hague a clear indication of how he intended to rule. James first increased the size of the army to assist in suppressing the rebellions against him, but after the uprisings were subdued he maintained a standing army.[6] This was an

[3] Gila Curtis, *The Life and Times of Queen Anne*, London, Book Club Association, 1972, p. 31.
[4] David Green, *Queen Anne*, London, History Book Club, 1970, pp. 31-50; Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), pp. 32-73; Anne Somerset, *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*, London, Harper, 2012, pp. 57-111.
[5] Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, London, Allen Lane, 2006, pp. 74-76.
[6] John Miller, *James II*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2000, p. 143.

alarming situation for Members for Parliament as James's actions mimicked Charles I's behaviour before the outbreak of the English Civil Wars.[7] James also gave a number of high-ranking military positions to Catholic soldiers in direct violation of Parliament's Test Act of 1673; this was the act that twelve years earlier had forced James to relinquish his position as Lord High Admiral of the Navy.[8]

Members of the House of Commons were the first to challenge the King's decisions regarding the army and Catholic appointments on 16 November 1685. The most detailed recordings of the House of Commons' proceedings comes from the diarist John Evelyn and in the memoirs of Sir John Reresby, Member for York.[9] Both chronicled how the Commons declared to the King that his appointment of Catholic officers was illegal as it contradicted the Test Act.[10] James's increasing alienation from both houses of Parliament is apparent from the contemporary opinions, and is much discussed in modern works concerning the Revolution and biographies of his life, although the growing divide between him and some members of Parliament warrants further focus.[11] The need for further study is because the King's decisions impacted on some of those close to Anne, which partly initiated the series of events that led to an almost complete estrangement between her and her father.

James refrained from a debate with the Commons by retorting that 'he did not expect such an address from the House of Commons'.[12] The failure of the Commons to make any headway with James regarding his Catholic officers ensured the issue became a topic of discussion in the House of Lords three days later on 19 November. James made no attempt to alleviate the Lords' fears or concerns regarding his appointments. Instead, he removed officers of the army who supported the Commons' address. He also dismissed two parliamentary members from sitting in session and declared that 'all persons that should hereafter offend', could expect the same treatment.[13] One of those James dismissed was Compton, who as Bishop of London sat in the House of Lords. James also dismissed Compton from the Privy Council and

---

[7] *ibid.*
[8] *ibid.*
[9] John Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn Vol. IV*, E. S. de Beer (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1955, p. 488; Andrew Browning (ed.), *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*, London, Speck, 1991, p. 397.
[10] *ibid.*
[11] See footnote number 2.
[12] de Beer, *John Evelyn*, p. 397.
[13] Cited in: Childs, *James II*, pp. 46-47.

his position as Dean of the Chapel Royal, positions that Compton had held since his appointment as the Bishop of London a decade earlier. Reresby suggested that many took the view that Compton was dismissed for 'freely speaking in the House of Lords'.[14]

Compton's treatment is also a reminder that Anne was a participant in these events. Many believed James removed Compton as punishment 'for his being industrious to preserve the Princess Anne in the Protestant religion, whom there were some endeavours to gain to the Church of Rome'.[15] It may have been thought that James was punishing Compton for his diligence in seeing Anne raised as a devout member of the Church of England, but his actions could not disrupt the private relationship between Anne and Compton; by now they had known and trusted each other since 1675. Even when she was queen, Compton remained so influential that numerous sources cite him as being the reason she disbanded William's ecclesiastical commission and exercised her rights 'relating to her [royal] prerogative'.[16]

James's attack on Compton is familiar to modern scholars, but the three-year lead up to the Revolution can be explored from the less familiar vantage point of the role Anne played in the events that culminated in the Revolution. In the midst of crisis on multiple fronts, James's thoughts turned to his daughter but so did those of other major participants. By late 1685, James believed Anne had significant influence on how English people might react to his attempts to reintroduce Catholicism, or at least diminish the legal penalties against it and introduce more Catholics into public office. Paul Barillon, French envoy since 1673 and James's confidant, outlined his thoughts regarding James and Anne in a letter to Louis XIV.[17] In fact, between 1685 and 1688, Barillon's letters frequently provide the only personal assessments of James available from a Catholic confidant. It must be remembered that diplomatic letters could have large audiences and were normally written with this caveat in mind, thus the content of these letters may not always reflect objective assessments or genuinely confidential

[14] Cited in: Browning, *John Reresby*, pp. 402-405.
[15] *ibid.*
[16] 9 December 1706, cited in: Thomas Sharp, *The Life of John Sharp: Archbishop of York Vol. I*, London, Rivington, 1825, p. 300-301; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1857, p. 157.
[17] The National Archives – Domestic Records of the Public Records Office (PRO), transcribed by M. Baschet, C, 31/3/161 f. 163v Paul de Barillon to Louis XIV, 28 October 1685.

insights. Nonetheless, on 28 October 1685, Barillon declared to Louis that James believed Anne was the defining factor in how many of England's politicians and clergy would react to the King's approach to Catholicism.[18] James's fears resulted in him insisting that Anne's new lady of the bedchamber should be his selected candidate, Lady Anne Spencer. In the tense and fraught atmosphere now surrounding Anne, she believed the King was forcing a Catholic spy on her.[19] The Princess had requested Rachel Bence, Countess of Westmorland, as the two had a longstanding relationship with Bence being married to Vere Fane, 4th Earl of Westmorland, her long-term courtier.[20] The King's insistence on Spencer led to Anne telling her sister in a letter in 1686 that 'one must always be careful both of what one says and does before her [Lady Spencer], knowing from whence she comes'.[21]

Anne may well have had cause to be paranoid. Although James as king was busy on many fronts, he remained wedded to the possibility of gaining Anne as a convert. Barillon noted repeated conversations with James on this topic.[22] One of James's tactics to convert Anne was to rely on the influence of the opinions of others she knew and may have trusted. In early 1686, he gave her a volume of letters promoting the Catholic cause said to be penned by Charles II and Anne's late mother, Anne Hyde.[23] James also published the work as a printed collection for public consumption to demonstrate that Charles II, England's monarch for twenty-five years, was a convert to the Catholic Church.[24] Anne remained unmoved and she wrote to Mary at The Hague on 29 April 1686 that she believed the letters 'have no greater influence on other people than they have had on us'.[25] Anne also assured her sister that their father's attempts to convert her to Catholicism were wasted by declaring:

> I hope you don't doubt but that I will ever be firm to my religion whatever happens. However since you desire me to write freely on the subject, I must tell you that I abhor the principles of the Church of Rome as much as

[18] *ibid*.
[19] Spencer MSS, Section II, *Letters from Princess Anne to Mary of Orange*, Anne to Mary, 10 August 1686.
[20] British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers (Blenheim) E 19, Anne to Sarah, 1 October 1685; PRO 31/3/161 f. 163v Paul de Barillon to Louis XIV 28 October 1685;
[21] Spencer MSS, Anne to Mary, 10 August 1686.
[22] PRO 31/3/166; PRO 31/3/168.
[23] *Copies of Two Papers Written by the Late King Charles II together with a Copy of a Paper written by the late Duchess of York*, London, H. Hills, 1686.
[24] *ibid*.
[25] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 29 April 1686.

> it is possible for any to do, and I as much value the doctrine of the Church of England. And certainly there is a greatest reason in the world to do so, for the doctrine of the Church of Rome is wicked and dangerous, and directly contrary to the Scriptures, and their ceremonies – most of them – plain, downright idolatry […] I do count it as a very great blessing that I am of the Church of England, and as great a misfortune that the King is not. I pray God his eyes may be opened.[26]

James also tried corroding Anne's beliefs in the legitimacy of the Church of England by other means, including trying to win over Anne's husband. James's Jesuit confessor attempted to persuade her husband, Prince George, of Catholicism's doctrinal legitimacy.[27] James made no progress in this endeavour as George was as stubbornly Protestant as his wife. The confessor concluded after engaging in conversation with Prince George that:

> He is a Prince with whom I cannot discourse about religion. Luther was never more earnest than this Prince […] He has naturally an aversion to our society and this antipathy does much to obstruct the process of our affair.[28]

James made efforts to educate and convert Anne with Catholic writings and persuade her husband of Catholicism's legitimacy, but the fact remained that James's efforts of reintroducing Catholicism would be lost with his death unless he had a son or converted his daughter. This scenario partly meant that between 1685 and 1688, Anne occupied an increasingly important place in James's thoughts. One reason was the continued absence of a male heir (allied with his wife's generally poor health). The other was that Anne remained accessible, whereas Mary was overseas. James's heirs presumptive, Mary and then Anne (and their Protestant husbands), would also likely overturn any progress he made. For James, the birth of a new son was the highest priority, as a father-to-legitimate-son succession was the most undisputable method to carry on his Catholic legacy. At the beginning of James's reign that seemed unlikely as James and Mary Beatrice had been married for almost fifteen years and the only children to survive past infancy were Catherine, who died at 10 months old of

[26] *ibid*.
[27] E. Grew and M. Grew, *The Court of William III*. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1910, p. 194.
[28] *ibid*.

convulsions, and Isabel, who died of an unknown infection at 5 years old.[29] The last child Mary Beatrice had delivered had been a daughter in 1682 who lived only two months.[30] In 1683, she had fallen pregnant but suffered a miscarriage.[31] Between 1683 and 1686 there are no records of Mary being pregnant in any historical sources. Barillion had reported to Louis XIV in 1685 that Mary Beatrice's health was so generally poor that she was unlikely to reach old age.[32] The hope that James might sire a son was subsequently growing more improbable as each year passed, which made converting Anne or Mary increasingly the more critical option for a king in a difficult circumstance.

Any hope of Mary converting to Catholicism was a lost cause in James's view. By 1686, she had lived in the Netherlands for almost a decade which made her difficult to influence. William's public dislike of both the French and Catholicism (he regarded Louis XIV as his 'mortal enemy', due to his perception that Louis controlled much of Europe) also meant attempts to convert Mary rarely extended beyond sending her Catholic reading material.[33] James instead regarded Anne as the daughter most likely to convert. In 1686, the strength of Anne's convictions was clear but James persisted in tactics to shake her faith in the Church of England, even if by frightening her with the threat of being displaced in the line of succession. One rumour that circulated through the court was that James intended to execute the difficult legal manoeuvre of legitimising his Catholic sons from his mistress, Arabella Churchill. These were James FitzJames, Duke of Berwick, and Henry FitzJames, and once legitimised, both sons would outrank Mary and Anne due to primogeniture.[34] If the plan was intended to

---

[29] Andrew Barclay, 'Mary (1658–1718)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18247, accessed 7 Feb 2017.

[30] PRO 31/3/155 ff 20v, 50, 53, 55v – Barillon to Louis XIV 27 August, and 12, 14, 21 October 1682.

[31] PRO 31/3/156, f. 39 Barillon to Louis XIV, 1 November 1683.

[32] PRO 31/3/161, Barillon to Louis XIV, 16 April 1685, 15 October 1685.

[33] A. Lossky, 'Political Ideas of William III', in H. Rowen and A. Lossky, *Political Ideas and Institutions in the Dutch Republic*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1985, p. 43; Comtesse Bentrinck Mechtild, *Lettres et memoires de Marie, Reine d'Angeleterre*, The Hague, 1880, pp. 4-9; Elizabeth Hamilton, *William's Mary*, New York, Taplinger, 1972, p. 179.

[34] Richard Griffin (ed.), *The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*, London, Camden Society, 1845, p. 283; Martin Haile, *Mary of Modena*, London, J. M. Dent and Co., 1905, p. 36; Marquise Campana de Cavelli, *Les Derniers Stuarts a Satin-Germaine-en-Laye Vol. II*, Paris, Didier and Cie, 1871, p. 74.

panic Anne into conversion, the strategy backfired and the rumour caused no reaction from Anne or Mary. Possibly there is no clear reaction from the sisters as they knew their father could not legally make the change. Such an act would also potentially result in many politicians and clergy taking up the fight to prevent the King's rumoured illegal action.

Further meddling with the line of succession nonetheless ensued, once again showing that Anne was occupying the attention and the energies of the King and his allies. In March 1686, Louis XIV and his envoy Francois de Bonrepaux conspired to motivate Anne to convert. Bonrepaux claimed he had convinced the Danish envoy who was constantly by Anne's husband's side to inquire if she would consider converting if the line of succession was altered so Anne bypassed Mary's claim. Bonrepaux states that Anne did not dismiss the idea and he declared that 'I know certainly that the Princess […] wishes to be instructed. I arranged to give her books of controversy, which she welcomed'.[35] Anne accepted the books, but besides Bonrepaux's optimistic opinion there is no evidence to indicate that she was considering conversion. Anne routinely received literature of a similar nature from her father such as the collection of letters from Charles II and her mother.[36] More than a century earlier, the Lady Elizabeth had adopted a similar stalling strategy, accepting Catholic books from her older sister Mary Tudor and using them as a means to delay any public adherence to the Church of Rome by asking for more time to read them.[37] Also, much like James's possible intention of legitimising his sons, the point remains that the King did not possess the legal ability to alter the line of succession and Anne had access to sound sources of constitutional advice from her sister, William of Orange, Compton, and Lake. For James's actions to occur would have to involve significant defiance of English laws before any change to the line of succession occurred. During this time of uncertainty, Sarah Churchill (who was already Anne's greatest confidante) also recorded that James once again 'had given the Princess of Denmark some books and papers to read that looked towards changing her religion'.[38] The practice of Anne receiving unsolicited material from those who hoped she would convert thus continued even if the impact on the recipient was never more than

[35] PRO, 31/3/165 Bonrepaux to Seignelay, 28 March 1686.
[36] *Copies of Two Papers*.
[37] Linda Porter, *Mary Tudor*, London, Little Brown, 2007, p. 246.
[38] PRO, 31/3/166 Barillon to Louis XIV, 27 June 1686.

superficial.

The attempts to make Anne convert were so relentless that efforts were even made to employ Sarah Churchill (in the capacity of someone who had possible influence over her) to act as a potential mediator to make Anne see the legitimacy of the Catholic Church. The choice suggests a level of desperation as Churchill claimed to feel no connection to any religion, Catholic or otherwise, yet in mid-1686 her brother-in-law, Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, enquired as to whether Sarah would suggest to Anne that she convert to Catholicism.[39] The reward for conversion was again the highly questionable incentive that Mary would be dismissed from the line of succession.[40] However, Talbot's proposition met with no favour from Churchill or Anne, and Churchill's words regarding all of the attempts to convert Anne reflect an assessment of the Princess's character that points to her devotion to the Church of England and the impact of Compton and Lake on her education:

> During her [Anne's] Father's whole Reign, the Princess kept her Court as private as could be consistent with her Station. When the designs of that Bigotted Unhappy Prince came to be barefaced, no wonder there were attempts made to draw His daughter into the measures of that Court. Lord Tyrconnel took some pains to Engage Her, if possible, to make use of that great Favour which He knew she enjoyed, for this End. But all his endeavours were in vain. The Princess had Chaplains, indeed, put about her, who could say but little in defence of their own Religion, or to secure Her against the Pretences of Popery, recommended to Her by a King and a Father.[41]

Churchill's words and her reference to Compton and Lake reiterate what is already clear; Anne had no intention to alter her faith in 1686 and in a figurative sense was a daughter of the Church of England even above being the literal daughter of the King. Even if it remained unlikely that she would convert to Catholicism, the situation around Anne was constitutionally changing as James was having some success increasing Catholic toleration. In 1686, it was decided in the Court of King's Bench (a tribunal over which the King had already exerted influence), that the King had the power to repeal laws.[42] The first law James removed was the Test Act of 1673 that had officially prevented Catholics from holding office, and he then appointed four

[39] Blenheim, G I 9, Sarah Churchill's 'Character of Princes'.
[40] *ibid.*
[41] *ibid.*
[42] Harris, *Revolution*, p. 192.

Catholics to the Privy Council.

His efforts in this area are familiar in modern scholarship that examines the events leading up to the Revolution, but less familiar is Anne's response as the constitutional situation around her changed and, from her point of view, became more alarming.[43] James's change to the law and appointments frustrated her. She believed any advancements her father made in securing Catholics in government and the Royal Court would be the first in a series of manoeuvres by the King to increase Catholic influence throughout the body politic. She expressed her views to Sarah Churchill on 19 July:

> I was very much surprised when I heard of ye four new privy councillours and am very sorry for it for it will give great countenance to those sort of people and me thinks it has a very dismall prospect.[44]

Anne was also clear in what the consequences of James's actions were when she wrote to her sister:

> I am very sorry the King encourages the Papists so much; and I think it is very much to be feared that the desire the King has to take off the Test, and all other law against them, is only a pretence to bring in Popery.[45]

As James was repealing the Test Act and introducing Catholics to office, Anne gave birth to a daughter, Anne Sophia. The infant's birth reinforces that Anne was living in an atmosphere of paranoia. On James's first viewing of the child he was accompanied by a Catholic priest. Only one account of the meeting exists which was written by Sir Samuel Howe who declared that when Anne saw the priest she 'fell a crying' as she believed James was about to have her child forcibly christened into the Catholic Church.[46] Though 'the King seeing it [Anne's tears] told her he came only as a fatherly visit and sent the priest away'.[47] Despite James dismissing the priest, the incident demonstrates the lengths Anne believed her father would go to, and the fear she had of his actions if it meant securing his Catholic dynasty.

James's attempts to convert Anne had largely ended by early 1687. Such was

---

[43] *ibid.*
[44] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah, 19 July 1686.
[45] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 31 January 1687.
[46] Sir Howe to Countess of Rutland, 2 June 1686, HMC, *Belvoir Castle*, Vol. II, 109.
[47] *ibid.*

her determination to protect and remain loyal to the Church of England that after the numerous attempts by her father to convert her, Gilbert Burnet concluded in his summary of the period that Anne was:

> … very early to declare to the bishops and several others that she was resolved never to change, so she seemed to apply herself more to devotion, and to be more serious in receiving the sacrament than formerly, and has ever since that time behaved herself so worthily in all respects that now all people trust as much to her as ever they were afraid of her.[48]

James still had other lines of inquiry to pursue for Anne's conversion. The first concerned the repercussions of Prince George possibly dying as Barillon and John Ellis, administrator and Member of Parliament for Harwich, knew his death could mean Anne being re-married to a Catholic prince.[49] Foul play was not being considered, rather early 1687 marked the beginning of a long period of ill-health for Anne's husband. Their two daughters, Ladies Anne and Mary, died of smallpox on 2 February and 8 February, respectively (see Table 1), but George also contracted the disease.[50]

---

[48] Gilbert Burnet, *A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time*, H. C. Foxcroft (ed.), Oxford, Clarendon, 1902, pp. 153-154.
[49] J. F. to Ellis, 5 April 1687, George James Welbore Agar-Ellis Dover (ed.), *The Ellis Correspondence, Vol. I*, London, Colburn, 1828, p. 269; PRO 31/3/168 Barillon to Louis XIV, 11 May 1687.
[50] PRO 31/3/168 Barillon to Louis XIV, 17 February 1687; CSPD, *James II*, Vol. II, pp. 361-362, Newsletter to John Fenwick, 8 February 1687; Prince George's smallpox and difficulty recovering is recorded in a letter from Lady Russell to Dr Fitzwilliam, 18 February 1687. See: Rachel Russell, John Russell and John Martin (eds.), *Letters of Rachel, Lady Russell*, London, Parry and McMillan, 1854, p. 212.

Table 1 – Anne's Conceptions and Results

Pregnancy	Child	Birth	Death
1	Stillborn Daughter	12 May 1684	
2	Mary	2 June 1685	Smallpox, 8 February 1687
3	Anne Sophia	12 May 1686	Smallpox, 2 February 1687
4	Miscarriage	21 January 1687	
5	Stillborn son	22 October 1687	
6	Miscarriage	16 April 1688	May have been pseudocyesis
7	Prince William, the Duke of Gloucester	24 July 1689	Pharyngitis, with associated pneumonia, 30 July 1700
8	Mary	14 October 1690	Lived only hours, 14 October 1690
9	George	17 April 1692	Lived only minutes, 17 April 1692
10	Stillborn Daughter	23 March 1693	
11	Stillborn Son	21 January 1694	
12	Miscarriage	17/18 February 1696	
13	Miscarriage	20 September 1696	
14	Miscarriage	25 March 1697	
15	Miscarriage	December 1697	No accurate date recorded, pregnancy may have been twins.
16	Stillborn Son	15 September 1698	
17	Stillborn Son	24 January 1700	

George had somewhat recovered from the disease by late February, but he failed to return to perfect health. His increasing difficulties in breathing, combined with the 'unwholesomeness of his looks' was reason enough for Barillon's and Ellis's scheming to continue.[51]

Throughout these years, the political and religious situation around Anne changed as her father brought Catholics into office. Anne remained a fixed point as the world shifted around her, loving the Church of England, detesting Catholics, and resisting her father. Yet in other ways Anne shifted as well and in particular her identities changed according to necessity. There was some display of dutiful daughtership as she kept her scathing opinions to her (mostly) private letters and politely accepted her father's gifts of Catholic dogmatical writing. Yet another identity

[51] PRO 31/3/169 Barillon to Louis XIV, 11 May 1687; John Fenwick to John Ellis, 5 April 1687, Dover, *Ellis Correspondence*, p. 269.

was as the dutiful wife, an identity which in fact gave Anne some control over her life as a married princess who sat high in the order of the line of succession. She mobilised her respect of the tradition of husbandly refusing; with a husband who was Protestant, she could refuse to convert to Catholicism in obedience to his wishes. Though had Prince George died and Anne become a young widow of only 22-years-old, marriage would be one area where she might have had little control. Few people knew of the political and diplomatic nature of royal weddings better than Anne. She had seen Mary be told of her planned marriage to William of Orange by their father, and then the wedding take place despite Mary's tears of protest.[52] When Anne was told of her intended marriage to Prince George she accepted the wedding with a 'debonair demeanour', in the view of Sir Thomas Clarges, Member of Parliament for Southwark, and one of the few to record Anne's reaction to her arranged marriage.[53] She seemingly knew that as a royal lady a betrothed marriage was her duty and that politics and her father would dictate the choice of her husband. Anne's understanding of royal obligation probably meant she also understood that she would be under immense pressure from her father to marry a Catholic if George died. In this instance, her identity as a loyal daughter of the Church of England would also lose clarity.

The threat of re-marrying Anne to a Catholic defused as George recovered and a new period began wherein James abandoned hope in the possibility of Anne converting to Catholicism. The King's focus instead turned to how he could limit the Church of England's influence in government and society. In May 1687, James forbade the Church of England's clergy from making controversial statements.[54] Previous monarchs such as Elizabeth I and James I, had made similar demands.[55] However, James II used the manoeuvre to stop the clergy from using their prominent positions in the state and their pulpits to arouse public opinion against his aspirations of increasing Catholic toleration. James's hopes were part of his Declaration of

---

[52] *Lake Diary*, p. 5.
[53] Sir Thomas Clarges to Unknown Recipient, 30 July 1683, HMC, *Laing*, Vol. I, p. 434.
[54] PRO 31/3/168, Barillon to Louis XIV, 3 May 1687.
[55] Patrick Collinson, 'Elizabeth I (1533–1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8636, accessed 18 September 2016; Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I (1566–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2014, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14592, accessed 18 September 2016.

Indulgence issued a month earlier.[56] The Declaration was immediately defied by John Sharp, Dean of Norwich, who attacked Catholics and their faith in a sermon for which he was subsequently suspended from preaching by the King's ecclesiastical commission.[57]

James could subdue clergy with the threat of suspensions from preaching or charges of seditious libel for speaking out against him, but Anne remained one of the King's greatest challenges to increasing Catholic influence over the court and more widely over the kingdom.[58] As she recovered from the physical trauma of her first miscarriage and George recovered from smallpox, the pair decided to travel overseas. George hoped to return to Denmark while Anne planned to visit Mary at The Hague. They requested permission from James and Anne wrote to Mary on 17 March that 'he granted [their request] immediately without any difficulty, but in a few days after he told me I must not go'.[59] There is no explanation in Anne's letter why James accepted and then revoked his permission; the King did not deny George's request as the invitation came from George's brother, Christian V of Denmark, James's fellow monarch. Anne had her own perceptions of James's actions and saw herself as a central element in his current religious concerns. She believed religious tension was the reason for James's refusal, a belief that becomes clear from her correspondence with Mary when she wrote that 'things are come to pass now that, if they go on much longer, I believe in a little while no Protestant will be able to live here'.[60] Anne's words exaggerate how quickly James could quash the Church of England in favour of Catholicism within England, but the extremism of her point makes clear her perception of herself as a Protestant bulwark.

Regardless of why James decided not to allow Anne to visit Mary, his refusal began a period of estrangement between father and daughter that would never be repaired. Anne returned to Richmond Palace while George travelled to Denmark; she was pregnant again and unable to accompany him. She planned that they would relocate to Hampton Court when George returned and before she gave birth. Anne lived at Richmond unless specifically summoned to James's Court, claiming that the

[56] PRO 31/3/168, Barillon to Louis XIV, 3 May 1687.
[57] *ibid*.
[58] Browning, *John Reresby*, pp. 402-405.
[59] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 13 March 1687.
[60] *Ibid*., 13 March 1687.

air outside London was 'better for her and Prince George's health'.[61] In October 1687, however, James ordered her back to her apartments at Whitehall. Contemporary observers felt the King was concerned about how Anne's actions could be interpreted and what it would make an informed public think of him. Barillon believed the public perception of Anne's estrangement from James was that she showed her displeasure for Catholicism and Catholic toleration by avoiding the King.[62] Plausibly the King's order was intended to suggest a union between father and daughter, even if it was clear that she was compelled to remain closer to her father's side. Barillon nonetheless noted how she 'affects on every occasion to demonstrate her firmness for the Protestant religion'.[63] The French envoy also recorded that Anne attended highly anti-Catholic sermons. When John Sharp (the Dean of Norwich, who had been suspended by the King's ecclesiastical commission for his anti-James and anti-Catholic sentiments) returned to the pulpit, Anne was in the congregation with no regard for the consequences.[64]

The process of Anne resisting her father's attempts to convert her, and her disregard for his religious aspirations as she attended anti-Catholic sermons, merits further assessment. This is because between 1685 and mid-1687 when the relationship between father and daughter turned toxic, Anne supported events that she knew might lead to the overthrow or death of her father. Equally, such actions might well have ended in her imprisonment or execution for treason as she colluded with Mary and William had their plans not been executed with precision. One must also remember that Anne has 'traditionally been depicted as a weak monarch', and one who was largely inconsequential to Stuart and English history.[65] Both perceptions of her weakness and relegated place in history are challenged significantly by her pivotal role within the events that risked her or her father's lives, and altered the direction of English history as revolution approached.

---

[61] PRO 31/3168, Barillon to Louis XIV; 3 April 1687; PRO 31/3/169, Barillon to Louis XIV 29 May 1687; Luttrell, *Historical Relation*, p. 287.
[62] PRO 31/3/173, Barillon to Louis XIV, 13 October 1687.
[63] PRO 31/3/169, Barillon to Louis XIV, 11 May 1687.
[64] PRO 31/3/168, Barillon to Louis XIV, 24 March 1687; de Beer, *John Evelyn*, p. 545.
[65] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 136-137; Clayton Roberts, 'Party and Patronage in Later Stuart England', in Stephen Gaxter (ed.), *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*, London, University of California Press, 1983, p. 196; Holmes, *Revolution*, pp. 1-10; Harris, *Later Stuarts*, pp. 226-228; Mark Thomson, 'The Execution of Charles I and the Development of the Constitution', in K. H. D. Haley (ed.), *The Stuarts*, London, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1973, pp. 28-34.

The first steps to revolution

The breakdown of the relationship between Anne and her father led her to engage in an entirely new type of dialogue with Mary and William, and with those within her own circle whom she trusted. This circle included Sarah Churchill and her husband, John Churchill, later Duke of Marlborough. The result of this dialogue fed into the events that precipitated the Revolution. Anne's religious identity was at the core of these events.

Current research concerning Anne's early role in the Revolution is minimal. Certain biographies discuss her initial correspondence with her sister and the Church of England's defenders regarding how James's Catholic intentions might be prevented.[66] However, a significantly less assessed area of Revolution history occurs as Anne entered into what she termed 'treasonable' discussions in her conversations with Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykevelt and a Dutch diplomat, and in coded letters with her sister.[67] Anne was particularly anxious and guarded about these events as she was aware that if her conversations or correspondence were uncovered, her life might be at risk.[68] Her paranoia is evident from a letter she sent to Mary on 22 July 1687 where she reiterated that Mary should only show her letters to William 'for it is all treason that I have spoke'.[69] The beginning of this dialogue between Anne, her sister, and William was one of the opening events that led to the revolt.

Anne was aware by early 1687 that William had started gathering intelligence on the political and religious landscape of the Royal Court, London, and the entire kingdom. The surveillance was largely conducted by van Weede, William's envoy to London.[70] There are no existing documents detailing what van Weede recorded and sent to William. What is known about his mission is that Anne was privy to the nature of his work and that John Churchill spoke with van Weede and William on her behalf. This scenario is evident from Churchill's letter to William on 17 May 1687 where he explained that:

> The Princess of Denmark having ordered me to discourse with Monsieur

[66] Green, *Queen Anne*, pp. 31-50; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 32-73; Somerset, *Queen Anne*, pp. 57-111.
[67] Muilenburg, *Everaard van Weede*, p. 55; Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 22 July 1687.
[68] *ibid*.
[69] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 22 July 1687.
[70] Muilenburg, *Everaard van Weede*, pp. 85-155.

> Dyckvelt, and to let him know her resolutions, so that he might let your Highness and the Princess her sister, know, that she was resolved, by the assistance of God, to suffer all extremities, even to death itself, rather than be brought to change her religion.[71]

As the circle of people opposed to James and Catholicism began to expand and mobilise, Anne was determined to aid in this task. Careful security ensured her letters to Mary were no longer delivered by means that were susceptible to bribery, intervention or censorship, but they could still be intercepted. Her letters were delivered by hand to The Hague via a trusted network of messengers to counter this risk.[72] The content of Anne's letters was so treasonous that when van Weede returned to The Hague in June 1687, he devised a list of pseudonyms she and Mary should use to continue their communications.[73]

James was not blind to his daughters' changing relationship. Barillon's letters suggest that the King realised that William and the Churchills were behind Anne's and Mary's newfound closeness. Barillon also indicated that James suspected William had bribed the Churchills into convincing Anne to request travelling to The Hague in early 1687, the request James had originally permitted before revoking his approval.[74] James was also not alone in his suspicions as one of Louis XIV's other envoys, Bonrepaux, recorded that John Churchill:

> … exerts himself more than anyone for the Prince of Orange. Lord Godolphin, who is in all the secret councils, opposes nothing, but plays the good Protestant and always keeps a back door open for access to the Prince of Orange.[75]

Despite the suspicions that James and Bonrepaux held regarding Anne and her supporters, their uncertainties lacked any proof. This was particularly an issue for James as by January 1688, Anne was in constant contact with her sister, William, and the Churchills. Barillon assumed this group reinforced her beliefs as they all shared the same objective of preventing the restoration of a Catholic state.[76] James did not

---

[71] Cited in: John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, London, J. Bell, 1790, pp. 62-63.
[72] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 9 May 1687.
[73] *ibid*, 22 June 1687.
[74] PRO 31/3/168, Barillon to Louis XIV, 24 March 1687; PRO 31/3/170, Bonrepaux to Seignelay, 4 June 1687.
[75] PRO 31/3/171, Bonrepaux to Siegnelay, 21 July 1687.
[76] PRO 31/3/175, Barillon to Louis XIV, 26 January 1688.

react to his daughter's new political circle, though he had few avenues of objection to pursue. It is also evident that Anne continued to grow as a pivotal element in any hope of increasing Catholic toleration in England not only from James's view, but also from the French envoy's and King's perspectives. Anne's growing role was subsequently matched by her central function as the revolt against James began to gain momentum.

Anne's faith and the Glorious Revolution

How Anne reacted to the events of 1688 is significant to understanding the outcomes of her upbringing in the Church and the role she believed the Church should play in English society and government. The 'Glorious' Revolution provoked one of the most explicit displays of her devotion to the Church before she became Queen. Scholarship concerning the Revolution continues to appear in the twenty-first century, but it is dominated by the political, religious and physical threats of confrontation between England's Parliament, James, and William. There is little attention to the key role Anne played. Tim Harris limits Anne's importance to the fact that her husband defected from James's to William's side, and that she abandoned her father by fleeing Whitehall when news of the defection reached the palace.[77] Tony Claydon's reference to Anne is a rare comment that serves to show how easily the constitutional history of this period can leave her out.[78] The same point can be made regarding Jonathan Israel's evaluations of her role.[79] It is not that her actions are neglected or overlooked; they are simply not a focus of analysis. The exception to this trend is Rachel Weil who suggests Anne's and Mary's letters regarding their stepmother's pregnancy was a major instigator of the Revolution.[80] However, Anne's religious prejudices before Mary Beatrice's pregnancy and her continued part in the growing movement towards rebellion extend beyond her letters regarding the 'warming-pan' conspiracy. The conspiracy was the event where James's enemies suggested that a live newborn from another mother was slipped into Mary Beatrice's bed in a warming pan to replace her

[77] Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms 1660–1685*, London: Allen Lane, 2005, pp. 284-285.
[78] Claydon, *Godly Revolution*, p. 67.
[79] Israel, *Anglo-Dutch Moment*.
[80] Rachel Weil, 'The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-Pan Conspiracy', in Lois Schwoerer (ed.), *The Revolution of 1688-1689*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 65-82.

own stillborn child.[81] The major works to provide an account of Anne's involvement in the Revolution are the biographies of her life from Green, Somerset, and Gregg.[82] Thus, while her participation in the Revolution is acknowledged by some scholars, Anne is not analysed as someone whose Protestant upbringing led her to envisage the overthrow or possible death of her father, or her own execution if her actions failed.

Anne's fears of the political unrest during her father's reign became more pronounced in October 1687 after she received the news that Mary Beatrice was pregnant. James was so certain that he would become the father of a boy that Barillon informed Louis XIV that 'at court, a Prince of Wales is spoken of as though he were ready to come into the world'.[83] As already noted, the consequence of Mary Beatrice's pregnancy was that if she produced a male child, primogeniture meant the infant would displace Mary and Anne as heir to the throne. News of the pregnancy infuriated Anne. The clearest sign of her anger comes from Francesco Terriesi, a Tuscan envoy, who on 23 December 1687 recorded that:

> No words can express the rage of the Princess of Denmark at the Queen's condition, she can dissimulate it to no one; and seeing that the Catholic religion has a prospect of advancement, she affects more than ever, both in public and in private to show herself hostile to it, and to be the most zealous of Protestants, with whom she is gaining the greatest power and credit at this conjuncture.[84]

The Catholic envoy was perhaps prone to exaggerate the Protestant Princess's anger, and there is no further evidence of Anne's response. Anne certainly did know of Mary Beatrice's gynaecological history and the possibility that the unborn child would survive the gestation period, let alone become a healthy adult, was remote; she also had first-hand experience of the possibility of such difficulties.[85] However, that notwithstanding, what is evident is that Anne's fear that Mary Beatrice would produce a son who would then be heir apparent was such that she began believing her step-mother was lying about the pregnancy and studied her step-mother's body closely for signs of fakery. Anne suggested in a letter she wrote to her sister on 14 March 1688:

---

[81] *ibid*.
[82] Green, *Queen Anne*, pp. 31-50; Somerset, *Queen Anne,* pp. 57-111; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 32-73.
[83] PRO 31/3/173, Barillon to Louis XIV, 13 November 1687.
[84] Terriesi to Grand Duke, 23 December 1687, Haile, *Mary of Modena*, p. 173.
[85] PRO 31/3/155 ff 20v, 50, 53, 55v – Barillon to Louis XIV 27 August, and 12, 14, 21 October 1682.

> It is true indeed that she is very big, but she looks better than ever she did, which is not usual. Her being so positive it will be a son, and the principles of that religion being such that they will stick at nothing, be it never so wicked, if it will promote their interest, give some cause to fear there may be foul play intended.[86]

Anne was not alone, and rumours propagating the suggestion that Mary Beatrice falsified her pregnancy soon grew.[87] The prospect of a Catholic heir was also enough motivation for James to continue his strategy of removing the legal and constitutional prejudices that Catholics faced in England with extra vigour.

In April 1688, the King reissued his Declaration of Indulgence and insisted it was read aloud on specific Sundays in every church throughout England. What happened next is familiar to scholars but from scholarly angles overlooking Anne's actions at this time. The demand alienated the clergy and on 18 May 1688, the King was presented with a petition from seven bishops. The petition stated that the clergymen could not participate in an action that contravened the law and was signed by William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and six others; collectively they became known as the 'Seven Bishops'.[88] Henry Compton (Anne's childhood tutor) was a pivotal component in the formation of the petition but he was not one of the protest's seven signatories as he had been suspended and was unable to function as a bishop.[89]

James's response to the petition and his decision to have the Seven Bishops summoned to the Privy Council on 8 June is much discussed, but not its influence on Anne. The bishops were notified that they would be charged with seditious libel for creating a petition against the King, and after they failed to provide sureties they were sent to the Tower of London.[90] As the bishops awaited their trial, Anne's view of their situation is evident from her correspondence with her sister. On 9 June 1688, Anne stated 'one cannot help having a thousand fears and melancholy thoughts' for what

---

[86] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary 14 March 1688.
[87] Weil, 'The Politics of Legitimacy', pp. 65-82.
[88] The Seven Bishops were: William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury; Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells; John Lake, Bishop of Chichester; William Lloyd, Bishop of St Asaph; Jonathan Trelawny, Bishop of Bristol; Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely; and Thomas White, Bishop of Peterborough.
[89] Robert Milne-Tyte, *Bloody Jeffreys: The Hanging Judge*, London, Carlton, 1989, p. 189.
[90] Sowerby, *Making Toleration*, pp. 178-181.

might happen to the bishops if found guilty.[91] Her fears were ultimately unwarranted as they were acquitted several days later, and she declared to Mary that the verdict was met with 'wild huzzas and acclamations'.[92]

Despite Anne's feeling of relief regarding the bishops, the landscape of the Royal Court changed substantially on 10 June when Mary Beatrice gave birth to a son named James Francis.[93] Anne and Mary concluded that James Francis was not Mary Beatrice's infant, instead believing he had been smuggled into her bedchamber before being presented as hers, beginning the infamous rumours surrounding the 'warming-pan' baby.[94] Anne declared 'tis possible it may be her child; but where one believes it, a thousand do not. For my part […] I shall ever be of the number of unbelievers'.[95] Once again, Compton's spiritual daughter showed her implacable faith and opinions.

The threat of Catholic continuity on the throne posed by the newborn provided some of England's anti-Catholic party with a situation they could exploit, and this led to the well-known series of actions that culminated in the Revolution. These events merit mention as they provide the context for Anne's reactions to the unfolding circumstances and how contemporaries interpreted her participation in them. On 30 June, Compton and six other influential men of politics and the Church came together in what became known as the 'Immortal Seven' to invite William of Orange to invade England.[96] William was asked to do so with the necessary force for the purpose of re-establishing the laws and freeing Parliament, or more precisely, to prevent James from altering the established laws to increase Catholic toleration.[97] The Immortal Seven did not include Anne, but the event is significant to understanding her approach to religion and politics two decades before her rule began. Anne's letters confirm that from at least March 1688 she was in regular contact with Henry Sidney, one of the main

---

[91] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary 9-15 June 1688.
[92] *ibid*.
[93] Edward Gregg, 'James Francis Edward (1688–1766)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14594, accessed 1 January 2016.
[94] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 18 June 1688; Mary to Anne, 21 July 1688; Bentinck, *Marie Reine D'Angleterre*, pp. 45-48.
[95] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 18 June 1688.
[96] The Immortal Seven included: William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Devonshire; Henry Compton, Bishop of London; Richard Lumley, 1st Earl of Scarbrough; Thomas Osborne, 1st Duke of Leeds; Edward Russell, 1st Earl of Oxford; Henry Sidney, 1st Earl of Romney; Charles Talbot, 1st Earl of Shrewsbury.
[97] John Van Der Kiste, *William and Mary*, Gloucestershire, Sutton, 2006), p. 105.

orchestrators of the invasion and England's strongest connections to The Hague as he was a primary contact point for William.[98] The secrecy surrounding the event ensured that Anne did not become aware of the specific details of the invitation until after the draft that had been signed by the Immortal Seven was delivered. It is difficult to ascertain whether this was done to protect her, or whether the pace of the situation surrounding the invitation evolved too quickly to keep her informed. The latter is more feasible considering Compton's central involvement and Anne's earlier connection in the events.[99]

One factor that must be considered in assessing how Anne fits into the landscape of England during 1688 is that as plans were being made by the Immortal Seven, safeguards regarding her protection were also being put in place. Immortal Seven members William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Devonshire, and Thomas Osborne, 1st Duke of Leeds, undertook the task of providing a safety net around Anne and they planned her escape from London if security became a concern.[100] Cavendish's and Osborne's role reveals that Anne was potentially in physical danger due to her symbolic importance as she continued to be England's greatest symbol of staunch devotion to the Church. On 8 July, Evelyn recorded in his diary that she had attended a sermon preached at the Chapel Royal. The congregation heard an exegesis of the text of Exodus 14:13 and that they should 'stand still and behold the salvation of the Lord'.[101] According to Evelyn, this sermon pointedly aimed at denouncing the Catholic Church and uncompromisingly 'applied so boldly to the conjuncture of the Church of England, as more could scarce be said to encourage disponders'.[102]

The pace of the Revolution continued unabated during August and September. Meanwhile, Anne acted as if everything were normal and she and Prince George visited Tunbridge Wells to benefit from the reported health assistances of its spas and waters during conception and pregnancy.[103] In London, Anne's supporters and fellow conspirators continued with their preparations. In Sarah Churchill's published memoir, she declared that her, her husband's, and Anne's involvement in the Revolution was

[98] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary, 20 March 1688.
[99] *ibid.*, 9 May 1687.
[100] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 59.
[101] Evelyn diary, 8 July 1688, de Beer, *John Evelyn Vol. IV*, p. 545.
[102] *ibid*.
[103] Unknown to John Ellis, 2 August 1688, Dover, *Ellis Correspondence*, p. 99.

'a thing sudden and unconcerted'.[104] Unpublished drafts of her memoir and John Churchill's correspondence contradict this claim and indicate that the couple had a decidedly more purposeful involvement in William's invasion.[105] From Sarah Churchill's memoir draft:

> The attempt of succeeding in the Revolution was subject to such a Train of Hazzards and Accidents, that before the Duke entered into the design, he made settlements to secure his family in case of Misfortunes.[106]

Her statement indicates that Anne and the Churchills knew the implications of their actions and they realised the dangers several months before the outbreak. John Churchill's 'settlements' which Sarah Churchill referred to, was dated 27 July 1688.[107] Less than a week after setting his affairs in order, John Churchill wrote to William, via Henry Sidney, with an open declaration of support:

> Mr Sidney will let you know how I intend to behave my selfe; I think itt is what I owe to God and my Country, my honor I take leave to put into your Royalle hinesses hands, in which I think it safe, if you think ther is anny thing else that I aught to doe, you have but to command me, and I shall pay an intier obedience to itt, being resolved to dye in that Religgion that it has pleased God to giv you both the will and power to protect.[108]

Thus, in July and August of 1688, the Churchills were preparing for future events several months before William's invasion. Gilbert Burnet also later claimed that every action John Churchill took to prepare his family for success or failure regarding the Revolution was also done with contingencies for Anne's and George's safety.[109] Details on the specific actions John Churchill undertook are nonetheless scarce as Burnet often wrote retrospectively and subjectively, rather than objectively chronicling the events that he witnessed or in which he participated.

The plans for revolution were wide-ranging and international in scope and certainly ranged far beyond Anne. Nonetheless, the various identities she projected, or that people saw in her, testify to the significance of her and her religion during these

---

[104] Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 18.
[105] *ibid*.
[106] Blenheim, G I 9, Sarah Churchill's 1704 draft of *Conduct*.
[107] Althorp, Marlborough MSS, Box III, in Sarah Churchill's will of 18 August 1690 she refers to her previous will as being formed on 27 July 1688.
[108] Churchill, *Marlborough*, p. 420.
[109] Burnet, *His Own Time,* pp. 282-283.

crises. One of these identities relates to the care of the Church and the very act of its leadership. Anne, as it transpired was anything but a dutiful daughter to her father, but then Anne could well have pointed out responsibilities which James in turn had neglected. James II was the Supreme Governor of the Church of England as there was no constitutional means to have someone who is not an Anglican as the monarch, yet his actions tended to the derogation of the Church, the harassment and prosecution of its leaders and the humiliation of its pastoral and institutional authority. In these ways, he left vacant the responsibilities of being the Supreme Governor. This scenario left the Church in need of symbols of authority and reassurance, and it left Anne publicly attending divine service as a figurehead of the Church of England. Even during her time in Tunbridge Wells her role as an unofficial leader led clergy and politicians to travel from London to join her there.[110] Some of Anne's visitors during her months away were Sir John Trevor, the parliamentary speaker, and Dr John Tillotson, the Dean of St Paul's, who recorded that 'I left the good Princess very well and I think much better than ever I saw her'.[111] That Anne could attract visitors leading up to what became the Revolution even while 50 miles from London is further evidence of the role some felt she played as a royal essential to the continued security of the Church.

That people looked to Anne is also an indication of how people during the Revolution's formation connected the security of the Church with her. Ultimately, one could suggest that Anne attracting visitors and attention indicates the reassurance people found in her. While the evidence for this claim is perhaps only circumstantial, as England came closer to possible conflict, a pattern emerges (discussed throughout the forthcoming analysis) of people turning to Anne for support, advice, or clarity in how events might unfold. That politicians and clergy alike would seek Anne's views as a woman without a direct claim to the throne and who had no control over politics or the military, further illuminates that James was correct when he believed Anne had become the figurehead of Protestant England.[112]

Anne and George returned to London on 17 September after which George was informed by Frederick Gersdorff, the Danish envoy to London, that the beginnings of

[110] PRO 31/3/161, f. 163v, Barillon to Louis XIV, 28 October 1685. On Barillon reporting to Louis that Anne 'affects on every occasion to demonstrate her firmness for the Protestant religion', see: PRO 31/3/169, Barillon to Louis XIV, 11 May 1687.
[111] Dr Tillotson to Lady Russell, 6 September 1688, Russell, *Russell Letters Vol. I*, p. 248.
[112] PRO 31/3/161, f. 163v, Barillon to Louis XIV, 28 October 1685

a Dutch flotilla were being assembled and were destined for English shores.[113] The most relevant source concerning the information Anne gained at this time (and her assessment of it) comes from the diary of Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of Clarendon and her uncle. Clarendon's diary dedicates more pages to Anne in the two months before the Revolution than at any other point in her life, which is symbolic of the turbulence of the period and the interest she aroused in high ranking observers during this time. Following Hyde's visit to Anne's apartments at Whitehall on 23 September, he recorded that 'she seems to have a mind to say something; and yet, is upon a reserve and, in effect, says nothing'.[114] Anne was not in the habit of releasing information she possessed or circulating her opinions, and when the conversation turned to news of the assembling flotilla in the Netherlands 'she said very drily I know nothing but what the Prince tells me he heard the King say'.[115] Anne's response again establishes that any notion of her as a weak or unintelligent princess (and later queen) must be offset by these actions that show her to be a calm, strategic, and integral part of how the Revolution unfolded. That she responded 'very drily', at a time when she knew that some combination of conflict, revolution, her father's death, or her own lay in England's future, suggests that she had a complete grasp of the events unfolding around her, and her position within them.[116] Hyde's diary on 27 September reveals information suggesting the building Dutch force was destined for England and that a potential war had become public knowledge and filled the Royal Court with panic.[117] This was a panic in which Anne did not share; in September 1688, she had for almost four months been aware of the pending invasion since the Immortal Seven sent their invitation to William of Orange.[118] News of the imminent invasion nonetheless forced immediate plans to be made over which Anne did not have complete control as her and Prince George's alliance with William was not publicly known. In fact, James had decided that he and George would fight against the Dutch in the field while Mary Beatrice, the infant James Francis, and Anne would be sent to Portsmouth so they could be evacuated to France if the political climate turned dangerous.[119]

---

[113] Christian Brasch, *Prins Georg af Danmark I Hans Aegteskab med Dronning Anna af Storbrittannien*, Copenhagen, C. A. Reitzel, 1938, p. 32.
[114] 23 September 1688, *ibid*, p. 189.
[115] *ibid*.
[116] *ibid*.
[117] 27 September 1688, *ibid*, pp. 190-191.
[118] Van Der Kiste, *William and Mary*, p. 105.
[119] Unknown to John Ellis, 29 September 1688, Dover, *Ellis Correspondence*, pp. 228-229

That James, the King of England, knew the safest place for his family was France defines his political and religious status quo aptly even before he left for battle. The King's actions also repeated his father's arrangements when James and Charles were sent to the continent when the Civil Wars became too dangerous.[120] The plan of evacuating Anne to France is presumably based on James's assumption that despite his and Anne's differing opinions on religion, she would remain loyal to him because of daughterly affection. However, keeping Anne close could also ensure James kept control of someone he believed to be highly influential with the Protestant population. Anne never opposed her father's plans; she had no need to counter the suggestion as she knew her true alliance would become clear before any evacuation occurred. That she could predict events solidly enough not to be concerned by the potential move to France is evident from two occurrences in her discussions with Henry Hyde. In late September and as news of the invasion spread, Hyde urged Anne to consult with James in the hope of seeing a truce with William reached to avoid war. However, she had little interest in seeing peace brokered between the two:

> … she never spoke to the King on business. I said her father could not but take it well to see her Royal Highness so concerned for him; to which she replied, he had no reason to doubt her concern […] The more I pressed her, the more reserved she was.[121]

Despite Hyde's continued efforts to convince Anne to speak with her father, he suggests that there was never a time she considered his suggestion of attempting to involve herself in the conflict between William and James.[122] Instead, Hyde recorded that she instructed him to recommend to the leading clergy that they leave London and return to their dioceses. Hyde declared that Anne proposed this as she believed that 'it is plain they can do no good. The King will not hearken to them, and they will but expose themselves by being here'.[123] There is some validity in Anne's words. The

---

[120] Paul Seaward, 'Charles II (1630–1685)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5144, accessed 10 October 2016; W. A. Speck, 'James II and VII (1633–1701)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14593, accessed 10 October 2016.

[121] 27 September, Samuel Singer (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon*, London, Coburn, 1828, pp. 190-191.

[122] 11 October 1688 - 22 October 1688, *ibid*, pp. 194-195.

[123] 12 October 1688, *ibid*, p. 194.

confrontation between William and James was as much religious as it was political which ensured the members of the Church of England could quickly become James's enemies. Intentional or not, her suggestion that the clergy leave London also portrayed the message that the Church did not support the King even if he was its Supreme Governor.

Hyde's letters during October continue to discuss his and Anne's exchanges as England came closer to war with the Dutch. The extent of her dedication to the Church of England became clear on 5 November 1688 when William landed at Torbay in Dorset with 15,000 troops. Hyde again requested Anne to speak with James in the hope of brokering peace after news of William's arrival had reached London.[124] He tried to persuade Anne that she should speak with her father because she owed him for never attempting to force Catholicism on her. Anne reportedly agreed with Hyde, but refused to speak with James and declared that 'the King did not [think] she should meddle in anything', thus suggesting that she did not believe that James would accept her opinion even if she spoke to him.[125] Hyde then noted that Anne 'grew uneasy at the discourse' and ended the conversation.[126] Anne's decision not to speak to James presents several interpretations, such as she was stalling, but also that her mind was on seeing England remain a nation committed to the Church of England rather than Catholicism. At that moment, it was entirely possible that her father could lose his life or crown, or Anne could lose her own life if the invasion was not executed as planned, circumstances that make her dry calmness even more remarkable.

Anne's argument was at the least her stalling and for several months, her actions had aided in William's invasion and her father's downfall. The conflict between James and William was not only about two political enemies, it was a conflict between the Catholic Church and Protestantism. Throughout October, the King made many concessions that weakened his earlier actions that increased Catholic toleration; his concessions ended his long-term goal of reinstating Catholicism as England's national religion.[127] Most notably, James dismissed the Catholics he had appointed to the army and public offices who had gained their positions following his abolition of the Test Act. The King's dismissal of Catholic officers did little to aid in negotiations to

[124] G. W. Keeton, *Lord Chancellor Jeffreys and the Stuart Cause*, London, Macdonald, 1965, p. 499.
[125] *ibid*.
[126] *ibid*.
[127] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 63.

preserve his crown.[128] When the King's final efforts to secure his position failed to prevent William's invasion, he accepted that conflict was inevitable. On 17 November, he and George (whom James still believed to be loyal) departed London with James's army for Salisbury where they made camp in preparation for battle with William's forces. Before departing London, James also had a new will written in case he did not return which left his estate to his wife and son, James Francis.[129] That the King's first-born son would inherit his estate (and crown in the case of James Francis) was expected due to primogeniture, but the will is also telling of his relationship with Anne. James may have organised for her to be evacuated to France if England became too dangerous due to his religious war. However, if the King died he did not leave in his will anything for the security of the Protestant daughters.

Anne also ensured that her and her husband's future plans were in place with their strategies being determined by how they assumed the forthcoming conflict would end. On 18 November, as James and George were travelling to Salisbury, Anne's planning was evident as she wrote to William that 'you have my wishes for your good success in this so just an undertaking'.[130] She declared her allegiance to him and her sister, but her specific plans in mid-November were unsettled as she informed William that she was 'not yet certain if I shall continue here, or remove into the City, that shall depend on the advice my friends give me'.[131] This ambiguity arose from uncertainty concerning the result of the two armies facing each other rather than indecision on Anne's part. She subsequently wholly reassured her brother-in-law of her husband's actions and stated that 'just as soon as his friends thought it proper', Prince George would abandon James to side with the Dutch army.[132] Anne was providing confidential updates, plotting for the future, betraying her father and, as her comments about moving into the depths of the City indicate, part of a network of supporters and agents.

The events that transpired as James and George reached Salisbury are very familiar in modern scholarship, but also provide a context for Anne's response to the unfolding events. James and George reached their destination on 19 November where the army established itself temporarily while William and his forces rested

[128] *ibid*.
[129] Keeton, *Chancellor Jeffreys*, p. 499.
[130] Anne to William 18 November 1688, John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, London, J. Bell, 1790, pp. 249-250.
[131] *ibid*.
[132] *ibid*.

approximately 90 miles west in Exeter. Despite having the superior numerical force and having access to supplies and reinforcements, the King had already had defectors leaving his camp to join William's side.[133] Even a small number of common soldiers defecting had unnerved the King and he believed that this sign of disloyalty was significant of larger questions of devotion to him. The defectors had shaken James's confidence to such an extent that on the night of 23 November he announced that his forces would return to London.[134] However, his decision came too late. On the morning of 24 November, the King discovered that two of his most influential supporters, Prince George and John Churchill, had defected to William's side.[135] George left James a letter explaining his defection which justified his actions by declaring that he felt he must adhere to Protestant religious beliefs that he thought should guide much of Europe.

> Whilst the restless spirits of the enemies of the reformed religion, back'd by the cruel zeal and prevailing power of France, justly alarm and unite all the Protestant princes of Christendom and engage them in so vast an expense for the support of it, can I act so degenerate and mean a part as to deny my concurrence to such worthy endeavours for disabusing of your Majesty by the reinforcement of those laws and establishment of that government on which alone depends the wellbeing of your Majesty and of the Protestant religion in Europe.[136]

The immediate consequence was that James realised how involved Anne had been in the events leading up to his trusted officers abandoning him. The King subsequently sent orders to London to have Anne and Sarah Churchill confined to Whitehall Palace. The letter with the King's orders also stipulated that 'none [should be] admitted to her [Anne] except her servants'.[137] James also sent instructions that the wife of another defector, John Berkeley (a colonel who was regularly employed in Anne's household) should be placed under house arrest with 'strictness'.[138] That James chose to place the wives of the defectors under arrest was what John Churchill, Prince George, and Colonel Berkeley had expected. Plans were thus in place to see Anne and her ladies flee London as soon as their husbands had defected. However, due to an unexplained

[133] Singer, *Henry Hyde*, pp. 205-206.
[134] Brasch, *Prins Georg af Danmark*, p. 33.
[135] *Ibid.*
[136] *ibid.*
[137] Middleton to Preston, 25 November 1688, HMC, 7th Report, p. 418.
[138] *ibid.*

confusion in timelines, the women remained in London when both news of the men's defection and James's orders to confine the wives to the palace reached the city.[139]

The women's arrest caused some panic, although Sarah Churchill offers the only record of Anne's concerns of how events had unfolded. Churchill wrote that the events 'put the Princess into a great fright. She sent for me, told me her distress, and declared, that rather than see her father, she would jump out a window'.[140] James's instructions were not carried out quickly enough to prevent Sarah Churchill from reaching Henry Compton's home to inform him of the unfolding events.[141] On the first evening of the house arrest, James's return to London was imminent and Anne retired to her bedchamber early and gave strict instructions that she did not want to be disturbed. She, Sarah Churchill, and Colonel Berkeley's wife then escaped Anne's bedchamber down a set of back stairs that had been built to provide an escape route from the palace.[142] The fugitive women were met by Compton and Charles Sackville, 6th Earl of Dorset, who waited in a carriage, before the group travelled 65 miles to Castle Ashby, the home of Compton's nephew, George Compton, 4th Earl of Northampton.[143]

Anne's actions made her devotion to the Church and her reliance on her tutor clear, but she also left a letter in her bedchamber that expressed her views on the religious divide that existed between her and her father:

> I see the general feeling of the nobility and gentry who avow to have no other end than to prevail with the King to secure their religion, which they saw so much in danger by the violent counsels of the priests, who to promote their own religion, did not care to what dangers they exposed the King.[144]

No explanation by Anne would counter the effect the desertion of James's daughter had on him. It was even suggested that Anne's disloyalty 'disordered his understanding', and that he declared 'God help me! Even my children have forsaken

---

[139] 3-5 December 1688, Singer, *Henry Hyde*, pp. 214-216.
[140] Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 16
[141] John Horton to Lord Hatton, 2 December 1688, Edward Thompson (ed.), *Correspondence of the family of Hatton, chiefly letters addressed to Christopher first viscount Hatton, A.D. 1601-1704 Vol. II*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1878, pp. 118-119.
[142] Back stairs were not entirely out of place as they were a common palace addition, *ibid.*
[143] *ibid.*
[144] Spencer MSS, Section II, Anne to Mary Beatrice, 25 November 1688.

me'.[145] For more than a decade, her allegiance to the Church of England and its continued prosperity was just as significant to her life as the growth of Catholicism had been to his. John Sheffield, 3rd Earl of Mulgrave, concluded that the loss of the army and its officers meant little to James compared to the desertion of Anne and his realisation that her and Mary's devotion to the Protestant faith had brought the Protestant heirs together to see him be overthrown.[146]

Summary

Anne's loyalty to the Church was a consequence of her childhood, but a factor in adult involvement in the most drastic political crises of the age. Throughout James's attempts to convert and persuade her, and the imminent violence that potentially lay in England's future if James's and William's forces entered battle, Anne's loyalty never wavered. Even after it became apparent that her religious convictions and refusal to attempt to broker peace between James and William might in part lead England to war and the possible death of her father, Anne's belief that England must remain a Protestant nation remained unchanged.

This chapter has evaluated the results of Compton and Lake raising a High Church and Tory princess by looking at the unfamiliar events of Anne's role in the Glorious Revolution. Her childhood lessons can thus be seen to result in her clear favour for the Church and England remaining an anti-Catholic nation in the decades before she unexpectedly became the Queen. As the thesis moves forward to Anne's years during William's reign and her time as queen, the analysis thus far illuminates how her religious perspectives were solidly in place for several decades before she came to the throne. Some aspects of her religious and political perspectives were augmented and consolidated during William's reign, but this chapter has established that Anne's views princess during the reign of her father made her many things. She was a fugitive relying on her childhood tutor, but she was also a calm, alert conspirator and source of intelligence, a disloyal daughter to her earthly father but a loyal daughter of the Church. The significance of examining Anne as a young adult is that her perspectives will be shown in future chapters to have remained largely unchanged even as she unexpectedly inherited the throne. Thus, the Queen and Supreme Governor of

[145] Browning, *John Reresby*, p. 550.
[146] *ibid.*

a kingdom politically and religiously divided attempted to bring to fruition views and aspirations that she had held since her adolescent years.

CHAPTER FIVE - William's Reign and Anne's Sovereignty

When Anne came to the throne in 1702, the sovereignty she inherited was determined by the political decisions and ecclesiastical choices of William's reign. She also had to contend with England's involvement in European politics, and the reactions of her subjects, Parliament, and the Church to a female monarch. Evaluating these circumstances provides context for the issues that she encountered following her coronation and throughout her reign and manner she responded to them. This chapter investigates how William's rule impacted on the power Anne inherited, due to the long-term changes to royal prerogative during his reign, and the religious and political circumstances that limited Anne's ability to exercise her royal prerogative. The chapter argues that Anne, in reaction to what she inherited, came to negotiate power in an entirely new way for the kingdom, and that she was compelled to do so by the circumstances she inherited and the qualities she possessed when she acceded. Assessing the beginnings of her regnal interactions with Parliament establishes the significance and nature of the matters she faced concerning parliamentary policy and her ministers when she was a sole ruler who had not been intended or groomed to lead the kingdom or hold a role in Parliament.

Anne's letters, the correspondence of those close to her, and the historical works, diaries, and memoirs of the period reveal how she operated during William's reign, and how people reacted to a new queen. These sources include Thomas Tenison's Low Church and Whiggish tone in his memoirs, and John Sharp's High Church and Tory perspectives in his diary which have both been studied, but infrequently, to determine the political circumstances that Anne inherited. The perspectives of historical writers Gilbert Burnet and Narcissus Luttrell, diarist John Evelyn, and political writer Roger Coke are also sources commonly used in recent studies of the period. In this chapter, however, these works are used to provide insights into the narrower interpretations of the political and religious landscape Anne inherited, her subsequent actions, and their repercussions on how she attempted to influence Parliament and the Church.

The impact of William's reign on Anne's rule

A brief overview of Anne's and William's personal associations demonstrates why William's lingering influence on Anne was related to his politics and the religious

choices the king made. As James and Prince George travelled to Salisbury on 19 November 1688 to face battle against William, an unknown factor is if either of the men or Anne knew she was pregnant. There is no mention of her being pregnant in any material of the time that has survived in an archive, but since she gave birth in July the next year, she was likely pregnant when war seemed imminent.[1] Nor is there any evidence that as George defected to William's side on 24 November and Anne escaped from Whitehall Palace with Compton's aid, that Anne realised she was carrying a child.[2] The normal biological signs of pregnancy might have meant Anne was aware she was three months pregnant when Mary arrived victorious in London during mid-February to join her, though her pregnancy is not mentioned in her correspondence.[3] Several months later and after the drama of the events surrounding William's and Mary's arrival in England had subdued, Anne returned to Hampton Court and on 24 July 1689 she gave birth to a son, William Henry, elevated to the dukedom of Gloucester by the new King.[4]

The birth of a living male heir was critical to the kingdom as an English heir with divine right to the crown to follow William's reign represented increased security as Jacobite retaliation remained possible. The Duke's birth was followed by another pregnancy in April 1690, but Anne's letters already suggest a growing divide was forming with her and George on one side, and William and Mary on the other. The tensions over power between the two couples resulted in Mary concluding that William's sovereignty was threatened by a republican party, a Jacobite party, and 'I have reason to fear that my sister is forming a third'.[5] Mary potentially feared her sister's influence over the kingdom as Anne continued to be a rallying point of the Church of England as Parliament had replaced a Catholic king with a Dutch Calvinist, who was a better but still far from ideal ruler.[6]

---

[1] Christian Brasch, *Prins Georg af Danmark I Hans Aegteskab med Dronning Anna af Storbrittannien*, Copenhagen, C. A. Reitzel, 1938, pp. 33; John Horton to Lord Hatton, 2 December 1688, Edward Thompson (ed.), *Correspondence of the family of Hatton, chiefly letters addressed to Christopher first viscount Hatton, A.D. 1601-1704 Vol. II*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1878, pp. 118-119.
[2] *ibid.*
[3] London Country Council, *Survey of London Vol. XIII, 1689* (London, P.S. King & Son, 1966), p. 105.
[4] Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), p. 76.
[5] Queen Mary, 13 March 1690: Comtesse Bentrinck Mechtild, *Lettres et memoires de Marie, Reine d'Angeleterre*, The Hague, 1880, p 95.
[6] *ibid.*

Anne gave birth to a daughter, Mary, who was born 'two months before her time', in October 1690. Nonetheless, Sarah Churchill's memoir establishes that during this period Anne was troubled by the disrespect the King had shown her husband. Sarah recorded Anne's irritation at William failing to acknowledge George's participation in the military efforts following the Battle of the Boyne as 'the King never took more notice of him [Prince George] than if he had been a page of the back stairs'. Churchill also recorded the Princess's anger at William refusing to allow George to ride in the royal coach.[7]

The divide between Anne and William grew during the 1690s. Anne was now the mother of the heir presumptive during the 1690s rather than being the heir presumptive herself, a circumstance which led to some distance between her and the King and few of his decisions were made with his undetermined successor in mind. Furthermore, in the last months of Mary II's life, Anne's relationship with her sister and the King continued to sour. The issues included William's apparent disrespect towards George as the pair returned from the Battle of the Boyne, but also William's decision to dismiss John Churchill from his military position, and subsequently John and Sarah Churchill (at that point still Anne's favourites) from the royal court.[8] William did this as he 'had very good reason to believe that [John Churchill] had made his peace with King James and was engaged in a correspondence with France'.[9]

After Mary's death on 28 December 1694, it was Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, whom Anne asked to deliver a letter of sympathy she had written to William that began:

> I beg your Majesties favourable acceptance of my sincere and hearty sorry for the great affection in the loss of the Queen and doe asure your Majestie I am as sensibly touched with this sad misfortune, as if I had never been soe unhappy as to have fall'n into her displeasure.[10]

The King was unsure whether to accept the olive branch Anne had offered, but it was Tenison who reminded William that 'those Members of either House of Parliament,

---

[7] Sarah Churchill, *Authentick Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Her Grace, Sarah, Late Dutchess of Marlborough*, London, Hooke, 1744, p. 38.
[8] *ibid*.
[9] H. C. Foxcroft (ed.). *A Supplement to Burnet's History of my own Time*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1902, pp. 373-374.
[10] Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), Bath, Vol. II, pp. 175-176, Anne to William III, 29 December 1694.

who had Places under their Highnesses, had always appeared forward in promoting His Majesties Interest'.[11] Tenison's words suggest William's primary fear was losing power to Anne's higher claim to the throne following Mary's death. However, Tenison's assurance proved enough to convince William to repair, at least publicly, his relationship with Anne and in early January the Archbishop had arranged for Anne to attend William's rooms for a meeting.[12] In Sarah Churchill's opinion (accessed in the 1704 manuscript for her memoir, a work written before Sarah and the Queen's major differences became evident) the result of Tenison's efforts was that those closest to Anne believed it was Tenison's diplomacy that publicly brought Anne and William to a reconciliation.[13] For Anne's reign after her son's and William's death, the importance of William's reign was far less about their personal relationship impacting her rule, and much more about the circumstances the King left for her to inherit.

Royal prerogative

The decline in the royal prerogative over the seventeenth-century is a much-discussed aspect of English monarchical history, but merits fresh analysis from the historical perspective of how Anne enacted, or attempted to enact, her rule. The sovereign's powers over Parliament and the Church altered throughout English and British history. Nonetheless, relevant assessments of these alterations regarding Anne begin following the concessions made to pass the Declaration of Breda that preceded Charles II's restoration to the throne in 1660.[14] The Declaration represents a milestone after which the monarch's prerogative altered substantially within a short period. Charles made concessions to Parliament during the Restoration to gain the throne and secure his accession. For example, he promised to increase religious toleration for Protestants while the kingdom remained at peace, and this assurance was executed via an act 'granting of that indulgence'.[15] The concessions of the Declaration of Breda from decades earlier may appear minimally related to Anne, but they resulted in powers once held or influenced by the monarch passing to Parliament, and directly impacted

[11] White, *History of England*, p. 674.
[12] Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 930, f. 198, Tenison to William III, 6 January 1695
[13] British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers (Blenheim), G I 9 Sarah Churchill's 'Conduct', f. 11.
[14] The Declaration of Breda can be found at The National Archives, see: HLRO HL/PO/JO/10/1/283A.
[15] *ibid*.

on her inheritance in 1702. Similar events occurred leading up to William III's accession. The Bill of Rights of 1689 ensured the monarch could not interfere with Parliament's process of making laws, and that taxes could not be introduced or raised by royal prerogative.[16] The Bill of Rights also declared that subjects were free to petition the monarch without fear of retribution, and no standing army could be maintained during a time of peace without Parliament's consent.[17] The Bill of Rights also referred to Anne's place in the line of succession. Anne was married but this was not mentioned, instead the bill mirrored the Tudor statutes and declared Anne and her children as William and Mary's heir. In this regard, the bill treated the married princess as a single woman ensuring Prince George's influence (in any political sense) was side-lined by Parliament.[18] The Act of Settlement of 1701 also included stipulations that all matters within the Privy Council's jurisdiction had to be signed and transacted before Parliament so its members could see who was voting for which decisions.[19] William had little choice but to accept all these changes as he came to and sat on the throne. At first, conforming to these conditions was necessary for him to gain the throne, and later he did not object because he was a king in sympathy with the Whig-dominant Parliament (a sympathy Anne's actions had already demonstrated she would not share as a High Church and Tory-sympathetic princess).[20] Thus, the introduction of the bills and passage of the acts continued the trend of Parliament taking on powers once held by the monarch.

The erosion of royal prerogative had repercussions for Anne when she came to power in 1702. Primarily, she had to rely on her ministers and bishops when attempting to see her favour for such parliamentary decisions as the Occasional Conformity bill or Acts of Union pass through Parliament. The Whig majority apparent in the Upper House of Convocation under William and Thomas Tenison meant the only ecclesiastical prerogative Anne held was the power to issue the *Congé d'Elire* (permission to appoint bishops) to the deans and chapters of cathedrals; a power possessed by all post-reformation Supreme Governors since Elizabeth I.[21] Anne was

[16] The Bill of Rights at HLRO HL/PO/PU/1/1688/1W&Ms2n2.
[17] *ibid*.
[18] Beem, *The Lioness Roared*, p. 119.
[19] 'Act of Settlement 1700', legislation.gov.uk (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2, accessed 24 Nov 2014.
[20] HLRO HL/PO/PU/1/1688/1W&Ms2n2; 'Act of Settlement 1700', legislation.gov.uk (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2, accessed 24 Nov 2014.
[21] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 146.

also only one of the various voices within the Lords and among the Church leaders. Thus, she had to either convince or compromise with them if she hoped to influence any decisions as both featured Whig-sympathetic majorities, but her views were often at odds with the Lords and the episcopate.

Anne also differed from her predecessors because she wanted to make choices concerning ecclesiastical matters and she wanted to make them for what she believed was the good of the Church. Anne subsequently differed in expectations and actions from actions over several decades of recent history, which saw James attempt to increase Catholic toleration and William allow ecclesiastical choices to be expediently guided by his ecclesiastical commission.[22] Anne's lack of impact thus enables this study to illuminate her new methods of governance and their resulting effect over the Church and her role in government.

When Anne came to the throne the immediate reactions to a queen regnant without a male co-equal were negative. Her accession occurred concurrently with fears of a Jacobite rebellion being led by James II's son, James Francis (or James III to the Jacobites as James II had died in 1701).[23] William had been a battle-hardened ruler who had invaded the kingdom, taken the throne through military means, and later led effective defensive campaigns against the Jacobites during his reign.[24] Many ignored the military capacities then evident in England's generals and instead believed that Anne's sex and ill-health, as she literally could not lead on the battlefield, created an opportune time for the Jacobites to attack. This view is evident from diarist John Evelyn who recorded that William's death signified an:

> … extraordinary disturbance to the interest of the whole nation in this dangerous conjuncture without God's infinite mercy; matters both abroad and at home being in so loose a posture, and all Europe ready to break out into the most dangerous war that it ever suffered, and this nation especially being so unprovided of persons of the experience, conduct and courage […] to resist the deluge of the French.[25]

Another contemporary, Anthonie Heinsius, a Dutch diplomat (a factor that warns of

---

[22] Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1857, p. 157.
[23] John Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn Vol. IV*, E. S. de Beer (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1955, p. 491.
[24] Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms 1660–1685*, London: Allen Lane, 2005, pp. 74-76.
[25] de Beer, *John Evelyn*, p. 491.

some bias in his account), was puzzled by the 'tranquillity of spirits' within London following the death of a king who had proven himself capable of 'safeguarding their laws and liberties', even though some did not mourn his death as they had Mary's.[26] Despite Evelyn sensing people's fear, he also noted that 'several expressions of joy publicly spoke in the streets – of having one of their own nation reign over them', after the Dutch William had ruled England since 1689 and Mary II had died in 1694.[27] Meanwhile, an unnamed courtier recorded of William's death that 'no King can be less lamented than this has been'.[28] Anne's Englishness and her Anglicanism were both unsullied in comparison.

The political landscape that Anne inherited explains the factors that guided her leadership. Anne came to the throne not just with a husband but a close circle of advisers. Sidney Godolphin and John Churchill (known as the Duumvirs) benefitted in terms of patronage and appointment from a pre-existing relationship with the new queen and some consideration must be given to their prior relationship with Anne. Godolphin had been a part of her life and inner-circle since at least 1685 when he assisted her in securing a financial loan from her father.[29] John Churchill had joined Anne's circle from as early as 1683 when his relationship and marriage to Sarah Jenyns ensured he had a prominent role in Anne's adult life, including the lead up to the Revolution.[30] The Duumvirs' influence over government ensured that from Anne's accession they were, according to a letter penned by Sarah Churchill in 1702, 'so united that the two of them are regarded as having the principal direction of affairs'.[31] As always, Sarah Churchill is a far from reliable source, but when William died, the Duumvirs had already been loyal to Anne for almost two decades and they were

---

[26] Cited in: Anne Somerset*, Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*, London, Harper, 2012, p. 173.
[27] de Beer, *John Evelyn*, p. 493.
[28] Cited in: Somerset, *Queen Anne*, p. 173.
[29] Gilbert Burnet, *History of His own Time*, London, Thomas Ward, 1724, pp. 125-126; for evidence of the loan being fulfilled, see: The National Archives, Historical Manuscript Commission (HMC), *3rd Report*, p. 267.
[30] Blenheim, E 18 and E 19, for the letters of Anne to Sarah Churchill that detail John Churchill's inclusion into their circle, dated from approximately 1683; for details concerning Sarah Churchill's early life and marriage to John Churchill, see: James Falkner, 'Churchill, Sarah, duchess of Marlborough (1660–1744)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5405, accessed 9 June 2015.
[31] John Russell (ed.), *Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough Vol. II*, London, Colburn, 1838, p. 117.

promptly appointed to the Privy Council.[32] Robert Harley, later 1st Earl of Oxford, held a similar position of prominence in Anne's cabinet to Godolphin and Churchill. Throughout Anne's reign Harley featured as her Tory adviser when the Duumvirs routinely represented the Whig perspective.[33] He was so skilled at conducting business away from the public view that he earned the nickname 'the Backstairs Dragon'.[34]

Anne also inherited a kingdom that had been divided since at least the English Civil Wars of the 1640s. Charles II's restoration had returned the monarchy to England, but it did little to repair political divides. The breakdown of parliamentary relationships during Charles I's reign is much discussed by modern scholars, but remains relevant to this analysis as Anne inherited a divided Parliament within which each party also included factional groups.[35] These divisions took shape in the decades before her rule and were based on ideological, personal and religious beliefs, and the patronage and influence of individual men. The divisions that existed within her new kingdom were a challenge for her, and came in addition to the religious and political issues that she faced in Scotland, Ireland, and the Americas. However, Anne's focus was largely on England, where she had the opportunity to negotiate her rule and enact a new manner of queenship. Mary I officially led alongside Philip II for most of her reign whereas Elizabeth I was the 'Virgin Queen'.[36] When Mary II was queen regnant she took a secondary role to William III. She made this stance clear after Parliament asked her to lead in front of William, after which she replied 'my heart is not made for a kingdom and my inclination leads me to a retired, quiet life'.[37] Mary's choice was also demonstrated to the public as the coinage during her time as queen positioned her

---

[32] *ibid.*
[33] Blenheim, E 20, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 14 September 1706; Blenheim, E 20, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 18 September 1706; Blenheim, A1-14, Godolphin to Robert Harley, 20 November 1706; Blenheim, E 19, Anne to Godolphin, 21 September 1706; Blenheim, E 19, Godolphin to Anne, 25 September 1706.
[34] Elizabeth Hamilton, *The Backstairs Dragon: Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford*, New York, Taplinger, 1709.
[35] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989; Christopher Durston, *Charles I*, New York, Routledge, 2013.
[36] The witticism *rex fuit Elizabeth, nun est regina Jacobus*, or 'Elizabeth was King, now James I is Queen' significantly demonstrates the ability of Elizabeth to fulfil the male role of kingship, see: Montgomery Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak its Name*, London, Heinemann, 1970, pp. 43-44.
[37] Maureen Waller, *Sovereign Ladies: The Six Reigning Queens of England*, London, John Murray, 2007, p. 273.

silhouette behind William's figure.[38] Anne subsequently led England not like a queen who filled the male gendered role, or one who stood beside or behind her husband.[39] Instead, after being known as a true daughter of the Church for two decades during the late seventeenth century, she emphasised her female role to lead as a queen who was a mother.[40]

One passage read at the sermon Archbishop Sharp preached at Anne's coronation was Isaiah 49:23, 'kings shall be thy nursing-fathers, and queens thy nursing-mothers'.[41] The verse from Isaiah was regularly used in both music and text in coronation ceremonies but in reference to the queens consort; John Sharp's use of it emphasises the importance of how 'nursing mother' represented Anne.[42] Sharp declared that queens 'would look upon the whole kingdom as their own family, and concern themselves as much for the welfare of their subjects as mothers do their children'.[43] This was a novelty in 1702 as England had not been led by a queen regnant for 99 years. Both Sharp's decision to base his sermon on the words of Isaiah 49:23 and the fact that Anne chose to refer to herself as a 'nursing mother', gives a strong indication of how she imagined her rule.[44] In addition, it indicates how she wanted her rule to be perceived. Considering the divisions that existed within the kingdom, Anne's decision to 'nurse' England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and the Church of England is indicative of the gentler and indeed motherly approach she took to her sovereignty. The power the monarch had lost through the Declaration of Breda, the Bill of Rights, and the Act of Settlement ensured that ruling with any official influence over Parliament or the Church was a level of control unavailable to Anne. Leading as the gentle 'nursing mother' who quietly consulted her ministers may have ensured relative civil peace as she spoke and compromised with the kingdom's political and clerical

[38] Robert Maccubbin and Martha Hamilton-Phillips (eds.), *The Age of William III & Mary II: power, politics and patronage, 1688-1702*, Virginia, College of William and Mary, 1989, p. 141, 397.
[39] Robert Bucholz, 'The 'Stomach of a Queen' or Size Matters; Gender, Body Image, and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne', in Caroline Levin and Robert Bucholz (eds.), *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, London, University of Nebraska Press, 2009, pp. 242-271.
[40] Edward Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia: Or, Present State of England*, London, Tidmarsh, 1669, p. 108.
[41] *ibid.*
[42] John Sharp, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Coronation of Queen Anne*, London, H. Hills, 1708.
[43] *ibid*, 5.
[44] John Sharp, *Coronation*; Matthias Range, *Ceremonials at British Coronations from James I to Elizabeth II*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 112.

leaders, but it was also one of the few options Anne had available to her by which to configure her rule. Her achievement was to seize imaginatively upon the possibility and meaningfully act it out. Past works have acknowledged the circumstances that Anne inherited as she became queen regnant, but fresh insights are provided by examining these conditions with consideration of the trajectory of her upbringing as a female who most assumed would never become monarch.

This evaluation illuminates how from the day of William's death, Anne had to lead England in an entirely new manner due to the bills and acts passed in the years before her accession that reduced her prerogative. How the opening years of Anne's reign unfolded were also determined by personal reasons including her sex, how people reacted to her, and the fact that she relied on her ministers due to how she had been prepared for queen regnancy. These factors combined had significant repercussions on how she led Parliament and influenced the Church.

Anne's political views

Anne's goal of gaining at least symbolic or figurative power was possibly less problematic with the Tories since she had been known since childhood to support the Tories while her High Church beliefs also more generally aligned her with the Tories rather than the Whigs.[45] Anne may have been aware that the Tories and at least some of the Whigs would have to unite on the floor of the House of Lords if a majority was to form to pass the legislation that she and the Tory party generally favoured. She became acutely aware of this fact a year later as she declared to Sarah Churchill that she believed the Revolution and Act of Settlement would not have occurred if 'the Church party had not Joyne'd with the Whigs'.[46] Anne also knew that the Tory party would have to be joined by some of the Whigs to form a majority if she hoped to see the Occasional Conformity Bill of 1702 come to pass; the bill would require public office holders to attend at least one Church of England service per year. At this time, a Tory majority of 298 to 184 existed in the Commons, but the members of the House of Lords were decidedly more swayed towards the Whigs.[47] Anne was also aware of

[45] Roger Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns*, London, Bell, 1697, pp. 477-481.
[46] Blenheim, E 19, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 11 June 1703.
[47] Geoffrey Holmes, *Politics, Religion and Society in England: 1679-1779*, London, Hambledon, 1986, p. 215.

the threat of the Whigs' increasing power to her influence in the Lords, and in her mind, anxiety about Whigs was inextricably associated with the Church of England. On 21 November 1704, Anne outlined to Sarah Churchill that her greatest fear was that the Whigs might use parliamentary supremacy to undermine the power and prosperity of the Church:

> … as to my saying the Church was in some danger in the late Reigne, I can not alter my opinion; for tho there was no violent thing don, every body that will Speak impartially must own that every thing was leaning towards the Whigs, & when ever this is, I shall think the church is beginning to be in danger.[48]

The Whigs were led by the Junto, a group of five members with each overseeing an aspect such as finance or dealing with electoral issues.[49]

There is little known about Anne's early reaction to the Junto, and what impact she thought it would have on her leadership. The Junto's success in pressing legislative agenda contrary to the Queen's wishes was high. There were unavoidable limitations and restrictions Anne experienced due to her sex. This view is evident when she felt the Junto were trying to intimidate her into not appointing Tory bishops during the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707. When the Junto hoped to use bishopric selections as a political tool, she told Sidney Godolphin that:

> … whoever of ye Whigs thinks I am to be Heckter'd or frighted into Complyance tho I am a woman, are mighty mistaken in me. I thank God I have a Soul above that & am to much conserned for my reputation to do any thing to forfeit it.[50]

Despite the Queen's determination not to allow her sex to limit her rule, realistically as a woman who few could have predicted would become queen, she had not been prepared for the throne, as argued in Chapters Three and Four.[51] In the early years of her reign (as per Sarah Churchill's memoir), it was Godolphin who assisted Anne in

---

[48] British Library Althorp Papers, Marlborough MSS, Book B, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 21 November 1704; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 219.
[49] The Junto included John Somers, later Baron Somers, Charles Montagu, later Earl of Halifax, Thomas Wharton, later Marquess of Wharton, Edward Russell, later Earl of Orford, and Robert Spencer, 2nd Earl of Sunderland, see: Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 134.
[50] British Museum Additional Manuscripts (Add MSS), 52,540 L, Anne to Godolphin, 12 September 1707.
[51] Gila Curtis, *The Life and Times of Queen Anne*, London, Book Club Association, 1972, p. 12.

undertaking a role she had not been expected to fill:

> Lord Godolphin conducted the Queen, with the care and tenderness of a father […] and faithfully served her in all her difficulties before she was Queen, as well as greatly contributed to the glories she had to boast of after she was so.[52]

Sarah Churchill's depiction of Godolphin acting in a fatherly role towards Anne provides a contrast to the dialogue of Anne being viewed as a daughter of the Church while she was princess, and viewing herself as the kingdom's mother as queen. That the Queen needed 'fatherly' advice gives credence to the initial support Anne required, but also shows that while Anne considered herself a 'nursing mother', Churchill viewed her as being a helpless child.[53] It must also be noted that Churchill states that Anne needed such guidance, but it is unknown if Anne requested the advice, or benefitted from it. Burnet provides a statement that suggests that the image of Anne as helpless benefitted the Churchills. He wrote:

> She [Anne] was not made acquainted with public affairs, she was not encouraged to recommend any to posts or trust or advantage, […] her only pains had been taken to please the Earl of Marlborough.[54]

Burnet did not suggest that the Churchills were intentionally keeping information from Anne, but he did indicate that she was not given all the information she required to perform effectively as a queen regnant who held a role in Parliament. Churchill's and Burnet's views on Anne's relationship to the kingdom illuminate the changing perceptions from daughter to mother that existed throughout Anne's life and reign. Godolphin might have aided the Queen, but she had no intention of relinquishing any of the control she still possessed to another, a view Anne made clear when she declared to Sarah Churchill that:

> … I have no thought but what is for ye good of England. I ame sure I have no other nor never can but will always to ye best of my understanding promote its true interest, & serve my country faithfully, which I took upon to be as much ye Duty of a Sovereign, as of ye meanest Subject.[55]

---

[52] Cited in: Russell, *Duchess of Marlborough*, p. 117.
[53] *ibid*.
[54] Burnet, *His Own Time, Vol. III*, p. 345.
[55] Pierpoint Morgan Library, Rulers of England, Box XI, Queen Anne #7, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 27 September 1705.

Anne's words highlight that her priority was England even though she ruled over Scotland, Wales and Ireland, and had an increasing role in the Americas. Her determination to play a significant part in England's government is also evident in the way she remained connected with the kingdom's leaders. J.H. Plumb studied Anne's governing routine including the nature of Anne's administrative schedule, but her daily routine can also be reconstructed as her means of overcoming the limitations of her sex and under-preparation for leadership. She had conferences with her ministers almost every day to stay abreast of foreign news through her secretaries of state.[56] She regularly met with foreign envoys, and attended cabinet meetings several times a week. She averaged more than one cabinet meeting per week, more than any other monarch of the Stuart period.[57] Despite the early concerns about Anne's sex and her unpreparedness to lead, she remained busy governing as a central figure as much as her royal prerogative allowed. Her determination not to let her sex impact on her leadership is clear through her documented attendance of cabinet meetings and conferences with her foreign secretaries.

Her administrative approach also makes it clear that she aspired to be a significant figure in England's leadership that stretched beyond her title of queen. These factors suggest that she turned to the Duumvirs in the hope of using them to gain every opportunity of influence possible to further the authority of her rule. However, it is Godolphin's and John Churchill's slow turn to the Whigs throughout Anne's reign that shaped many aspects of her ability to influence the Church, and take Parliament towards the policies and appointments she hoped to make.

Summary

Anne's reign was influenced by the constitutional developments of William's rule rather than the king's direct actions. Rather, William's invitation to become king also continued the implementation of the acts and bills that had started with Charles II's restoration and the Declaration of Breda. The decrease in the royal prerogative that William experienced continued into Anne's reign and she had less authority, and

[56] J. H. Plumb, 'The Organisation of the Cabinet in the Reign of Queen Anne', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Vol. 7, 1957, pp 137-157.
[57] *ibid*, p. 153.

needed to gain parliamentary support if she hoped to see her political aspirations met. William further influenced the throne Anne inherited as, when he realised Parliament consisted of a Whig majority, he sided with them and aided in their increase in parliamentary power. When Anne became Queen with clear favour towards the Tories, she was subsequently confronted with a parliament that heavily favoured the Whigs. Thus, Anne may have had a clear view on the Tories and Whigs, but she had inherited a government that was not compelled to listen to her and where her own party of choice were the minority. Yet even in the Church, where she became the Supreme Governor, Anne was not free of Whiggish influence or the repercussions of William's rule.

CHAPTER SIX – Anne's Relationship with the Church

This chapter surveys the religious environment surrounding Anne when she acceded the throne. The chapter examines the power play and fighting over the Church both in Parliament and Convocation, and illustrates that part of Anne's political armoury was a claim to actual sacerdotal power. The chapter then addresses power in the political realm (including in Convocation and the House of Lords) and in the spiritual (as the Queen used her divine power to heal) to illuminate Anne's relationship with the Church before later chapters examine her reign as a political and clerical leader. The state of the Church of England that she inherited is a discussion that cannot always take place in chronological order as political and clerical issues must be examined separately to outline clearly the priorities she faced concerning her clergymen and Church divisions. This assessment establishes the parameters Anne operated in regarding the Church; as she held little authority, she instead frequently had to manoeuvre around the obstacles of a Whig-sympathetic majority to have her aspirations met.

Thomas Tenison's Low Church and Whiggish sympathies in his memoirs, and John Sharp's High Church and Tory perspectives in his diary, are important sources of information regarding the Church as Anne inherited it. These works have regularly been studied by modern scholars, but are infrequently used to determine the religious and political circumstances that Anne inherited. This chapter begins with an analysis of Anne's reaction to the divisions that existed within the Church, and her perspective and responses to the power Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, had accrued as a Whig-supportive Low Church bishop during William's rule. The analysis establishes the background of the religious circumstances Anne experienced as she acceded the throne, a necessary examination for understanding her actions as Queen and Supreme Governor, which will be discussed in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine.

An important contextual point is that Anne also inherited a religious organisation that was divided into nebulous factions that broadly fit into the High and Low Church parties. Thus, some attention must be paid to what these terms meant to contemporary users and how they impacted on religious and parliamentary politics. The High Church was generally loyal to the Stuart monarchy and Anne was, in the view of political writer Roger Coke, 'bred up [by Henry Compton and Edward Lake] in High Church

principles, they were believed to be always predominant in her'.[1] However, Anne was no fan of any type of faction or grouping and it was also suggested that she took the throne with an 'acid dislike for factious clergymen, or of any discord in religion'.[2] Despite Anne's views, she became Supreme Governor at a time when the clergymen in the Upper House of Convocation had grown to favour Low Church and Whig-sympathetic bishops. The Low Church clergy were less concerned with episcopal privilege. Indeed, the Low Church bishops did not intervene in the removal of the non-jurors who refused allegiance to William; it was in fact the Low Church Bishops who took the non-jurors' positions after they were vacated.[3] William aided in the creation of a distinctly Low Church episcopal bench because it suited his Whiggish rule, political priorities, and his limited interest in the English Church, especially any claims for sacerdotal authority.[4] Reviewing this element of rule subsequently assists in further clarifying the ecclesiastical situation inherited by Anne.

Anne's relationship with Tenison and Sharp

Anne inherited a throne but also many pre-existing conditions, including an incumbent archbishop of Canterbury. Many of Anne's frustrations involving the Church occurred due to the personal influence Thomas Tenison (Archbishop of Canterbury since 1694) gained during William's reign.[5] Just as Anne inherited issues when dealing with Parliament and its parties, factions and ministers, her position as Supreme Governor of the Church of England also meant dealing with difficulties concerning clerical and Church factions. Examining what Anne's religious views were as she came to power is a neglected area in modern historical research, but the analysis of her perspectives is significant as it establishes the issues that shaped her decisions and motivations as her reign began. An assessment of the exact parameters under which Anne operated at her accession illuminates the difficulties she faced regarding division in the Church as

[1] Roger Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns*, London, Bell, 1697, pp. 480-481.
[2] G. V. Bennet, 'Conflict in the Church', in Geoffrey Holmes (ed.), *Britain After the Glorious Revolution*, London, Macmillan, 1984, p. 167.
[3] *The Distinction of High-Church and Low-Church*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1705.
[4] William Belsham (ed.), *Memoirs of the Reigns of William III and Queen Anne Vol. II*, London, G. G. and J. Robinson, 1803, p. 197.
[5] Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times*, London, S.P.C.K., 1948, pp. 167-168.

her reign continued. For many years before her rule, she had been recognised as a rallying point of the Church; even James acknowledged her position as a true figurehead of the Church in the 1680s.[6] In 1702, however, Anne moved from being a symbolic daughter to being a titular head. She became the Supreme Governor of an institution comprising many factions that were not united by common objectives or beliefs.[7] As the 'nursing mother' she had gained 'children' who could not get along and, as she had no major influence over them, there was little she could do to reconcile the disagreements.

The Revolution's repercussions in part caused the divisions she inherited. William, a Dutch Calvinist, had little interest in settling English Anglican religious issues that arose from his seizure of the throne. His indifference resulted in Anne inheriting challenging circumstances. Primarily, she inherited the aftermath of the non-juring schism that divided the Church of England by raising debate over whether William and Mary could legally be anointed sovereigns.[8] The non-jurors were the clergy who felt unease at William's and Mary's crowning. These clergy included bishops of prominent sees including William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, Robert Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester, and William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich.[9] They felt legally bound by their previous oaths of allegiance to James II and though they accepted William as regent, they could not accept him as the King and Sancroft would not crown him. It was not necessarily a schism on matters of religious doctrine, but a political issue and a matter of conscience. The non-jurors' refusal to swear allegiance to William and Mary created friction within the Church and resulted in the non-juring bishops abandoning their bishoprics and creating an alternative hierarchy.[10]

Anne attempted to repair some of the damage when she became queen by trying to reinstate non-jurors to their former positions. She encouraged Thomas Ken to come out of retirement and return to the bishopric of Bath and Wells, which he had occupied

---

[6] The National Archives – Domestic Records of the Public Records Office (PRO), transcribed by M. Baschet, C, 31/3/161 f. 163v, Barillon to Louis XIV, 28 October 1685.
[7] Edward Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia: Or, Present State of England*, London, Tidmarsh, 1669, p. 108.
[8] James Smith, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Later Nonjurors: A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth-century Usages Controversy*, Michigan, University of Michigan Press, 2000, pp. 39-40.
[9] *ibid.*
[10] J. H. Overton, *The Non-Jurors*, London, Smith, 1902, pp. 65-73.

before William's reign, but he refused.[11] She also offered Robert Frampton the bishopric of Hereford, but he refused.[12] Her attempts to repair the Church were not successful, but her actions are demonstrative of the 'nursing mother' of the kingdom attempting to heal the wounds of the Revolution and William's accession that scorned the non-jurors. A reconciled Church could have been the first step to the Supreme Governor gaining some influence, yet despite her long-term devotion to the Church, she was unsuccessful in her attempts.[13] Her effort to reconcile the lost bishops with the Church may have been ineffective, but it is one example (of many throughout her reign) of Anne using every avenue open to her to try to gain some influence over the Church and Parliament. Anne also stepped into the aftermath of the 1689 Toleration Act, which had a significant impact on the power she held as the Church's titular leader.[14] The Act granted freedom of religious worship to Protestants, but greatly reduced the power of the Church by decreasing the requirements for Church attendance to hold public office.[15] Thus, as Anne became the Supreme Governor, the Church was less influential, powerful, and self-governing than it had been even during Charles II's reign.

William had also appointed an ecclesiastical commission of bishops that spared him from involvement in Anglican clerical decisions since he was a Calvinist. The commission included the two archbishops and four bishops, and Tenison held an unofficial senior position over the commission which reflected his status as the highest appointed member of the Church. Tenison subsequently not only advised the King on matters concerning the Upper House of Convocation, he also guided William's selection of ecclesiastical appointments.[16] Anne therefore became Supreme Governor after a period when Tenison and the commission had exercised their discretion over ecclesiastical appointments and based their decisions on Low Church and Whig-supportive advantages for most of William's reign. The Convocation was the

---

[11] E. H. Plumptre, *The life of Thomas Ken, Vol. II*, London, W. Isbister, 1888, p. 233.
[12] Robert D. Cornwall, 'Frampton, Robert (*bap.* 1622, *d.* 1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10061, accessed 1 January 2016.
[13] Chamberlayne, *State of England*, p. 108.
[14] His Majesty's Stationery Office, 'House of Lords Journal Volume 14: 24 May 1689', *Journal of the House of Lords,* Vol. 14, 1685-1691, pp. 217-218.
[15] Bennet, 'Conflict in the Church', pp. 161-163.
[16] Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1857, p. 157.

synodical assembly of the two Provinces of the Church of England. Convocation was divided into an Upper House (the bishops) and a Lower House (the remaining members) and in Francis Atterbury's view (later Bishop of Rochester), 'Convocation was a realm of the state like Parliament'.[17] During the later-Stuart period, the Whig-supportive Upper House of Convocation could also veto any motion put forward by the Lower House of Convocation which remained dominated by clergy with Tory-sympathetic views.

On coming to the throne in 1702, Anne became a reluctant participant in a conflict caused by infighting from both political parties and the bishops attempting to guide the Church.[18] She also inherited an episcopate dominated by Whig bishops who supported Whig policy in the House of Lords and controlled ecclesiastical votes in the Upper House of Convocation regardless of the Supreme Governor's intentions or priorities. This voting dynamic was apparent from Anne's first Parliament when the Occasional Conformity bill of 1702 resulted in a Whig majority voting against the bill.[19] Anne thus held a role in a Church which was greatly influenced by Whigs who could thwart her Tory-supportive desire for shaping the Church's authority in society and government.

Anne had little capacity to alter this situation compared to many of her predecessors. For example, during Elizabeth I's reign legislation allowed her to deprive and imprison her bishops, and during William's reign his religious wishes effectively occurred because the non-juring bishops left of their own accord, which allowed the King to fill the sees with bishops who shared his Whig sympathies.[20] Anne also differed from her predecessors because she did not share a similar objective for

---

[17] Cited in: William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, New York, Routledge, 2012, p. 71.
[18] William Belsham (ed.). *Memoirs of the Reigns of William III and Queen Anne: Vol. II.* London, G. G. & J. Robinson, 1803, pp. 106-107.
[19] 'The first parliament of Queen Anne: First session - Act preventing occasional conformity - begins 20/10/1702', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Vol. III, 1695-1706*, London, Chandler, 1742, pp. 212-217, accessed September 24, 2015, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol3/pp212-217.
[20] Patrick Collinson, 'Elizabeth I (1533–1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8636, accessed 18 September 2016; Tony Claydon, 'William III and II (1650–1702)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/29450, accessed 9 Feb 2017.

the Church to the Archbishop of Canterbury as Charles I and William Laud had done during the early seventeenth century. Anne and Tenison had a difficult relationship as she was a High Church and Tory-sympathetic queen, and Tenison a Low Church Whig-sympathetic archbishop.[21] The only power Anne had where bishops were concerned was in being able to select the candidates for translation as bishops died or moved sees. One option Anne did have was to follow Compton's advice (as reported by Tenison) and dissolve William's ecclesiastical commission when she became queen.[22] The commission's disbandment allowed her ecclesiastical intentions to be carried out with at least one less avenue of objection preventing her from exercising her rights 'relating to her [royal] prerogative'.[23] However, she still could not combat the collective power of the Low Church bishops' majority vote in the Upper House of Convocation as she did not have the power to dismiss them.

In addition to this analysis are the decisions she made (or tried to make) about the appointment of bishops. It is one sphere of operations which provides tangible traces of her supreme governorship in operation as she had stringent rules for selecting bishops regardless of their religious and political alliances. The first stipulation was that her bishops should be men of what she termed 'quality'.[24] The Queen never expanded on this requirement specifically, but her future actions aid in understanding this prerequisite which she made no attempt to hide. Sarah Churchill aimed to use Anne for Churchill's benefit by having the Queen reward the grandson of Churchill's ally, Edward Stillingfleet, with an appointment to a bishopric in 1708. However, Anne replied:

> … as to what dear Mrs Freeman [Sarah Churchill] desires concerning Dr. Stillingfleets Grandson, I shall be glad to do any thing for him when I can […] I should be glad to know what his name is & whether he is a gentle-man (for Clergy men do not often consider what aliances they make).[25]

---

[21] Paul Seaward, 'Charles II (1630–1685)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5144, accessed 10 October 2016.
[22] Carpenter, *Tenison*, p. 177.
[23] Cited in: '9 December 1706', Sharp, *John Sharp*, pp. 300-301; Luttrell, *Historical Relation*, p. 157.
[24] British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers (Blenheim), E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 1 October 1708.
[25] *ibid*.

Churchill's attempt to have her ally rewarded also demonstrates how a lay person could influence the Church while also using the Church to further their political and personal connections, but this was typical during a period where courtiers and clergy were close friends.[26] Anne was also robustly practical and determined to ensure that potential candidates could perform the tasks required of their positions such as travelling from their diocese to London for Parliament and Convocation.[27] Accordingly, she rejected the suggestion (from an undetermined source) that Dean William Hayley be translated to the bishopric of Chichester. Anne rejected the suggestion not because she believed Hayley was undeserving of the promotion, but because he was incapable of carrying out the work of the see as he was, in her view, 'a cripple and without hopes of remedy'.[28]

A study of Anne's and the Church's relative positions in society and Parliament when she became queen demonstrates two points. The first is that the Whig-majority that William and Tenison created in the episcopate ensured Anne was quite powerless to overrule the Whig-bishops' decisions in the Upper House of Convocation or episcopal bench in the Lords. Despite her lack of authority, she was not completely powerless. However, she instead adopted different methods of leadership which included compromise and seeking small victories – not ideal, but the necessary tactics of a queen with a clear vision of what she desired. Secondly, as she came to the throne having been dedicated to the Church for most of her life, it should not be a surprise that she had clear criteria for ensuring that only bishops of 'quality', who could carry out the required tasks, were appointed or translated.[29]

Anne's ecclesiastical advisers

At Anne's accession, she inherited bishops and archbishops, however she also already

[26] For example, as a vicar, William Nicholson campaigned for the Member for Parliament for Carlise, Sir Christopher Thomas Musgrave, in return, Musgrave campaigned for Nicolson to be given a bishopric when one became available, see: D. W. Hayton, 'Nicolson, William (1655–1727)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/20186, accessed 2 September 2015.
[27] Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), pp. 145-146.
[28] Cited in: Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1934, p. 136.
[29] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 1 October 1708.

had a body of ecclesiastical advisers in place who were well-established prior to her coming to the throne. Anne's primary adviser was John Sharp, Archbishop of York since 1691. She and Sharp had known each other since James II's reign when Sharp was Dean of Norwich. James's Declaration of Indulgence in 1687 marked the beginning of Sharp preaching a series of anti-Catholic sermons.[30] John Evelyn recorded that Anne frequently attended Sharp's sermons and while James's ecclesiastical commission suspended Sharp for his anti-Catholic views, Anne attended Sharp's first sermon after his suspension was revoked.[31] Sharp described his relationship with the Queen by stating that she believed he 'should be her confessor, and she would be mine', on all political and ecclesiastical matters.[32] Their mutually-dependent relationship was not a secret. After reviewing surviving evidence, Norman Sykes concludes that when it came to ecclesiastical appointments, 'she would rarely give her promise without his advice and, generally speaking, consent first obtained'.[33] After Anne came to the throne, Sarah Churchill raised the question of whether Sharp was an adviser to the Queen or simply confirmed the choices she had already made, a comment found in the draft of her memoir in 1704:

> He [Sharp] had now free access at all times to the Queen: & by that means came quickly to know Her Sentiments, & her Restoration; to which He seem'd immediately to conform his own.[34]

Some caution must be taken with Sarah Churchill's judgements as her opinions were likely driven by her frustration with not being able to exercise control over the Queen.[35] Churchill's closeness to Anne nonetheless means hers is one of the rare insider accounts of the Queen's relationship with Sharp. Yet, in Sharp's diary, he wrote of Anne asking him 'earnestly to be on her side in all matters that came before the Parliament', though she also stipulated that 'she desired I would never promise my vote, til I had acquainted her with my objection'.[36] His words thus provide some

[30] PRO, 31/3/168, Barillon to Louis XIV, 3 May 1687.
[31] John Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn Vol. IV*, E. S. de Beer (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1955, p. 545.
[32] Sharp, *John Sharp*, pp. 317-318.
[33] Norman Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 50, No. 199, 1935, p. 433.
[34] Blenheim, G 19, Sarah Churchill, *Character of Princes*, p. 44.
[35] Cited in: G. M. Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne Vol. I*, London, Collins, 1930, pp. 170-171.
[36] Cited in: Sharp, *John Sharp*, pp. 300-301.

indication that Anne hoped to be challenged by her ecclesiastical adviser. Sharp also recorded that after he suggested Anne ask Godolphin to assist in rallying Tory support in the Commons during the 1704 Occasional Conformity bill, she dismissed his proposal and asked him to use his connections to gain further Tory support.[37] She may have hoped to have her views challenged by Sharp, but in ecclesiastical matters there were instances where she never lost sight of her objectives of seeing the number of Tory-sympathetic bishops in the episcopate grow and causing the Church's role in government and society increase. In 1706, Sharp wrote that on parliamentary matters Anne 'desired I would not be governed by my friends in my votes in Parliament', and that he would instead be influenced by her.[38] His apparent subservience to the Queen should not be considered unusual as the pair's power dynamic was heavily in Anne's favour as Queen and Supreme Governor. In addition to Churchill's claims of Sharp's powerlessness, she too confessed in a letter to an acquaintance in 1704 to having little influence over the selection of bishops and how Anne hoped to guide the Church:

> I must own to you that I have less opinion of my solicitations of that sort than any other, because whoever speaks to the Queen upon that subject she does always consult with the Bishops before she disposes of the thing; and besides Her Majesty has so many Chaplains who are always importuning her for preferment, that I think they had the advantage of everybody else.[39]

Indeed, Churchill noted that bishops and chaplains were 'always importuning [Anne] for preferment', but it was Sharp who primarily benefited in royal influence due to Anne's attention after she became queen.[40]

John Sharp was also lord almoner in the royal household, a position that allowed him to appoint the clergymen who preached before the Queen in the Chapel Royal. Her reliance on his advice also led to the rumour (at least as reported by Sarah Churchill) that select High Churchmen 'had now free access at all times to the Queen: & by that means came quickly to know Her Sentiments' as they came to gain influence with Anne.[41] High churchmen thus had access to the Queen during Anne's reign, which differed significantly to the prior two decades when James's and William's reigns ensured the monarch was focused on Catholic and Whiggish sympathies,

[37] *ibid.*, p. 306.
[38] *ibid*.
[39] Cited in: Trevelyan, *Queen Anne*, pp. 170-171.
[40] Blenheim, G 19, Sarah Churchill, *Character of Princes*, p. 44.
[41] *ibid*.

respectively. Churchill also recorded that the Whigs feared Anne would use the episcopate to increase the High Church presence in the House of Lords.[42] The Whigs' fear must be put into its proper context as the episcopal bench only comprised around ten per cent of the ever-changing population of the Lords whose numbers could decline, for example, following deaths if a male heir was not in place, or increase as peers were created.[43] As Anne could only select bishops following deaths and translations, it would possibly take decades for her to create a Tory-majority.[44] Thus, Anne may have inherited a parliament where the Lords was dominated by Whigs and an episcopate with a Whig-supportive majority, but Churchill's words make it clear that the Whigs believed Anne would use every option available to her to increase Tory and High Church representation. Churchill raised this concern with the Queen in late 1702, less than a year into her reign. Anne responded by explaining that the clergy would only remain influential on matters of episcopal polity:

> I am intirly of my dear Mrs. Freemans mind that ye heat & ambition of Church men has don a great deale of hurt to this poor Nation, but it will never do it any harm in my time, for I will never give way to theire governing in any thing, only sometimes it is necessary to ask theire advice in church matters, there is but one of all our bishops that I have any opinion of, & he I take to be a very reasonable as well as a good man, & I'm sure if my dear Mrs. Freeman knew him she would be of that opinion to.[45]

Anne believed that sacerdotal matters needed sacerdotal advisers who were more likely guided by the Church's best interests rather than the more secular Parliament's benefit. Anne largely adhered to this principle after becoming queen as her reliance on ecclesiastical advice concerning Church matters meant she rarely took lay advice from Sarah Churchill, John Churchill, Robert Harley, or Sidney Godolphin. Godolphin realised that his influence with Anne on Church matters was minimal by early 1703 when he reported to Sarah Churchill on the issue of Anne having two suitable candidates in the running for the bishopric of St Asaph that:

> I think whoever had spoken to the Queen for either of these worthy persons would but have lost their labour, for though she did not positively say who

[42] *ibid.*
[43] That the episcopal bench on average consisted of only ten per cent of the population of the Lords is based on my own examination of the House of Lords' records of 1702-1714.
[44] *ibid.*
[45] Blenheim, E 17, Anne to Sarah Churchill, late 1702 (precise date not recorded).

should, she seemed very well resolved who should not have it.[46]

Despite Robert Harley's long-term service to Anne, he too never gained substantial influence over Church matters. His impact was so little that even after more than a decade of his devotion, she made the significant Church appointment (due to the prestige of the see involved) of translating William Dawes from Chester to the archbishopric of York in 1714 without any recorded consultation with Harley.[47]

Anne's decision to accept clerical advice but not lay counsel on clerical appointments demonstrates that she was particularly eager to prevent lay or political advice influencing the direction of the Church. However, Anne's clerical decisions attracted immediate attention from her political allies and opponents, and ultimately led to the Whig-majority seeking ways to lower her ecclesiastical influence.

Sharp and Tenison during Anne's reign

As already established, the Church's leading hierarchical figures in 1702 were John Sharp, Archbishop of York, who had Tory ideals, and the Whiggish Low Churchman Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury. Tenison was the Church's highest-ranking bishop, having gained power during William's reign. From the onset of Anne's rule, bishops with Tory sympathies were at the forefront of those from whom she received clerical advice. Surveying how she interacted with the bishops at her accession as Queen and Supreme Governor establishes her early approach to Whig and Tory politics, and to her fostering the prosperity of a Tory-sympathetic High Church. The political significance of episcopal appointments has been examined, but the importance of the Queen as a key player, and the repercussions of her appointments during her reign is a more rarely encountered assessment. In the decades-old, but still cited, studies of the bishops' lives, the focus is on the bishops, which means Anne is ancillary to their clerical careers. Edward Carpenter's 1948 biography of Tenison discusses how the Archbishop operated without Anne's support.[48] Arthur Tindal Hart's 1949 biography of John Sharp similarly features an assessment that focuses on

[46] Blenheim, E 3, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 15 May 1703.
[47] British Library, *Stowe Manuscripts*, f. 225, 3/14 March 1714.
[48] Carpenter. *Thomas Tenison*, pp. 176-193.

how Sharp interacted with the Queen.[49] Establishing the motivating factors of Anne's relationship with Tenison and Sharp, however, merits exploration in order to understand the dynamics that influenced her rule. The only works to acknowledge her interactions with the Church's leading bishops are the modern biographies which rely heavily on Carpenter and Tindal Hart, as well as the near century-old works by Norman Sykes.[50]

Tenison, as Archbishop of Canterbury, was the spiritual leader of the Church, but Anne as temporal leader relied on Sharp's Tory-supportive advice. Anne's relationship with Tenison and Sharp before her accession also affected her decisions for ecclesiastical advice once she became queen. Tenison's dedication to William combined with the Archbishop's Whiggish outlook ensured that she rarely sought guidance from him, a circumstance indicated by Sarah Churchill who declared that Anne:

> … had from infancy imbibed the most unconquerable prejudices against the Whigs, having been taught to look upon them all not only as republicans who hated the very shadow of royal authority but as implacable enemies of the Church of England.[51]

Churchill's summary must be read with caution not least because her memoirs were published long after the Queen's death and when Churchill's strong alliance with the Whigs had been evident for decades. Churchill's view on Anne's beliefs may also be an example of what John Miller called the 'venomous vindictiveness' towards Anne since Churchill had not received all of the preferments and influence to which she believed she was entitled.[52] However, Churchill reported that the Queen said 'I know the principles of the Church of England, I know those of the Whigs, and it is that and no other which makes me think as I do of the last'.[53] Anne's views on the Church and politics made several of her early decisions unsurprising to some. On 26 March 1702,

---

[49] Arthur Tindal Hart, *Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*, London, S.P.C.K., 1949, pp. 233-246.
[50] Gregg, *Queen Anne*; Anne Somerset*, Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*, London, Harper, 2012; Norman Sykes, 'Episcopal Administration in England in the Eighteenth Century', *English Historical Review* Vol. 47, No. 187, 1932, pp. 416-446; Sykes, 'Queen Anne', pp. 433-464.
[51] Sarah Churchill, *Authentick Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Her Grace, Sarah, Late Dutchess of Marlborough*, London, Hooke, 1744, p. 133.
[52] John Miller, 'Queen Anne by Edward Gregg', *English Historical Review* Vol. 96, No. 371, 1981, p. 147.
[53] Churchill, *Authentick Memoirs*, p. 133.

almost a month before her coronation, Narcissus Luttrell, historical writer and Member of Parliament in the late-seventeenth century for Bossiney (1679-1680) and Saltash (1690-1695), reported on Anne disbanding William's ecclesiastical commission.[54] William's commission was earlier discussed in this chapter as part of an assessment regarding the issues involved in Anne and William's relationship, but in this scenario it can be used to understand the dynamic between the Queen and her Archbishop of Canterbury. Luttrell believed that she was taking back direct participation in the appointment of bishops:

> Tis said her majesty will herself dispose of all ecclesiastical preferment belonging to the Crown as they become vacant, and not leave it to the Archbishop of Canterbury and 5 other bishops as the late king did.[55]

It is also significant to note that Anne disbanded the commission before she took on the more delicate role of declaring herself to be the kingdom's 'nursing mother' at her coronation. Becoming the 'nursing mother' may have had religious connotations, but was also an acutely political decision that effectively legitimised how she would lead when she had so little political or religious influence available to her.[56] In his memoir, Tenison accepted the nature of Church politics in a time of monarchical change, and declared that:

> Upon the Accession of a New Sovereign [Anne] to the Throne, it was but natural to see new Faces at Court, and several of the old Ones dismiss'd from it, so that it was not to be suppos'd, that the Archbishop who was so great a Favourite of King William, should be equally possess'd of the good Graces of his Successor, that had restor'd several of the Ministers that were outed in the late Reign, to their former places in Council.[57]

Tenison's acknowledgement that his influence on appointments and governance would decrease compared to his authority during William's reign, establishes that he knew how political preferences could influence clerical relationships. It was unlikely

---

[54] Henry Horwitz, 'Luttrell, Narcissus (1657–1732)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/17226, accessed 5 December 2016.
[55] Cited in: *ibid*.
[56] Chamberlayne, *Present State*, p. 108; Luttrell, *Historical Relation*, p. 157.
[57] Thomas Tenison, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Thomas Tenison, Late Archbishop of Canterbury*, London, J. Roberts, 1716, p. 101.

that Anne would seek the Archbishop's guidance, a circumstance further demonstrated as her coronation approached and she ordered that Sharp deliver the sermon.[58] Anne's selection of Sharp over Tenison (or anyone else) reiterates her political alliance and willingness to rule her 'family' as she saw fit; that is, to take her role as the Supreme Governor of the Church seriously and to be involved as much as possible.[59] The Queen's favour for Sharp points to a more general liking for the Tories and likelihood that she would appoint Tory-supporting bishops. As this chapter demonstrates, this decision prompted Sykes to make the unchallenged declaration that Sharp led 'alone in the royal confidence and counsel in all affairs relating to the Church'.[60]

'Touching' and the religious politics of succession

Previous sections of this chapter have assessed the ecclesiastical politics in the Lords, Convocation, and Anne's relationship with the Church leaders. However, she had another relationship with her subjects, and the more explicitly sacerdotal issue of 'touching' is one that she could use to enrich her political potency. At a time when Anne also had a difficult relationship with many of her bishops who sided more with the Whigs, touching was also an area where she could set herself apart from bishops who were not divinely selected to hold their role as she was.

Anne's decision to revive the practice of 'touching' (where she literally touched with her hand those with a form of tuberculosis known as scrofula) demonstrates her belief in the sacerdotal power she held. In England, touching began as early as 1058 with Edward the Confessor, and had been used by many subsequent monarchs (including outside of England) to demonstrate publicly the divine right of the monarch.[61] Charles II maintained the practice, though James II rarely partook in the custom as it had been a ritual of the Church of England at a time when he was attempting to increase toleration for Catholics.[62] William III refused to administer the

[58] National Archives, Gloucestershire Records, Lloyd-Baker-Sharp Manuscripts, K3, Tenison to Sharp, 28 March 1702.
[59] Matthew Jenkinson, *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II*, 1660-1685, Woodbridge, Boydell & Brewer, 2010, p. 70.
[60] Sykes, 'Anne and the Episcopate', p. 435.
[61] David Sturdy, 'The Royal Touch in England', in Heinz Duchhardt, Richard A. Jackson and David J. Sturdy (eds.), *European Monarchy: Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times*, Leipzig, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992, p. 190.
[62] *ibid*.

'touch' as he was a Dutch Calvinist and believed it was superstition. He also had no divine claim to the throne so he did not perform an act that might bring attention to this circumstance.[63] Anne wasted no time in restoring the practice and her reasoning was clear. Less than a year into her reign in early 1703, she wrote to Sarah Churchill:

> I intend (an it please God) when I com from Windsor to touch as many poor people as I can before hot wheather coms. I do that business now in ye Banqueting house which I like very well, that being a very cool room, & ye doing it there keep my own house sweet & free from crouds.[64]

Anne's belief that her acts of touching 'please[s] God', makes it clear that she was 'in all respects a true daughter of the Church of England', as historical writer Edward Chamberlayne noted in the years before her accession.[65] It has been speculated that Anne was also aware of the importance of showing herself as the divine holder of the throne when Jacobite sympathisers remained.[66] Given her minimal royal prerogative, asserting this sacerdotal right to the throne promoted her legitimacy and reinforced her mothering image as a woman who could soothe her subjects' illness with divine authority. Thus, she touched as many as she could.

At first, Anne received groups of approximately forty sufferers of scrofula, though according to a letter penned by John Sharp in 1702 she hoped:

> … as she has strength (for she has lately had the gout in both her hands) to increase her number, and from forty [she hopes] to touch two hundred or three hundred at a time.[67]

Precise daily numbers of how many Anne touched are not available but broader numbers do exist as each person touched received a small medal known as healing gold, and the distribution of these medals was recorded. In her best twelve-month period between May 1706 and May 1707, Anne distributed 1,793 medals.[68] She was thus most likely never successful in touching 'two hundred or three hundred at a time', but the medal dispersal indicates that she remained dedicated to the task.[69] She also

---

[63] *ibid.*
[64] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 29 April 1703.
[65] Chamberlayne, *State of England*, p. 108.
[66] Christopher Sinclair-Stevenson, *Inglorious Rebellion: The Jacobite Risings of 1708, 1716 And 1719*, London, Faber, 2010, pp. 41-68.
[67] John Sharp to William Lloyd, n.d., in Tindal Hart, *John Sharp*, p. 222.
[68] *ibid.*
[69] *ibid.*

continued to touch until the very end of her reign when her immobility and ill-health made it even more of a difficult and strenuous task. Three months before the Queen's death the courtier Mary Lovett wrote that:

> … the Queen disorders herself by preparing herself to touch […] no one about her cares she should doe it, for she fasts the day before and abstains severall days, which they think does her hurt.[70]

As can be reconstructed from Lovett's anxious comments, Anne created her own ritual of rest and fasting to be able to complete the religious task. Her continued practice in the ritual could also be interpreted as a political ploy to raise doubt over the Hanoverians' potential succession as they had no direct hereditary divine right to the throne as she had. William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, declared in a letter that:

> The Queen is truly zealous for the Church of England, though there may be some about her that are not so, yet it's hoped there are many great ministers in her interest that may in due time assist her in giving ease to those that suffer from conscience sake, and for the true interest of the Royal family and hereditary monarchy.[71]

Lloyd's words clearly demonstrate that in his view Anne was entirely dedicated, or 'truly zealous', for the Church.[72] Lloyd states, however, that the Queen's decision to re-introduce touching had been interpreted by some unnamed members of the court as showing favour towards the Jacobites and in this way her sacerdotal Protestant action became complicated by conflicting political and religious loyalties. Lloyd recorded that some believed every touch was an acknowledgment of the Stuarts' divine claim and, therefore, raised questions about the Hanoverian succession which had been in place since the 1701 Act of Succession.[73] Lloyd may have had a paranoid view that Anne's actions were favourable to the succession of the Catholic line of the Stuarts living in European exile, but the ambiguity in the reasons for Anne's revival of 'touching' allows for discussion concerning her belief that she possessed the gift to

---

[70] Mary Lovett to Lord Fermanagh, 15 May 1714, in Margaret Verney (ed.), *Letters of the Eighteenth Century Vol. I*, London, E. Benn, 1930, p. 356.
[71] Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *3rd Report*, p. 273, Bishop William Lloyd to Sir Charles Calthorp, 29 June 1702.
[72] *ibid*.
[73] HMC, *3rd Report*, p. 273, Bishop William Lloyd to Sir Charles Calthorp, 29 June 1702; 'Act of Settlement (1701), Chapter 2, Region 12 and 13, Will 3', Legislation.Gov.UK, http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2/introduction, accessed 23 July 2015.

heal people. Her letters to Sarah Churchill and dedication to her faith establishes that she believed she possessed a divine right to the throne and its sacerdotal potency.[74]

Anne nonetheless found herself in the position where the monarch who preceded her and likely the monarch who would follow, were not members of the Stuart hereditary line. By participating in the religious act of 'touching' she could religiously and politically set herself apart from William as a Whig-sympathetic king who was a Dutch Calvinist, and the Lutheran Hanoverians waiting in the wings by reminding large numbers of people that she was the monarch with the divine right to the throne. She was also aware from her accession that the Jacobites and James Francis posed a threat to her reign, a further reason for her to touch and reinforce her divine right. The Queen's continued efforts with non-jurors (thirteen years after James II was deposed) similarly made it clear that she was aware that some believed she was not the rightful heir even within the Stuart dynasty.[75] The issues with the Jacobites were summarised for the Queen by Patrick Hume, 1st Earl of Marchmont, who informed her in 1702 that:

> … if the Queen have a good title, the pretended prince has none; and if the pretended prince have a good title, the Queen and her progeny have none. There is no medium.[76]

Anne's awareness of the threat that the Jacobites posed to her rule is also clear from a letter she sent to Sarah Churchill within the first months of her reign:

> I must own I am not apt to beleeve all ye report one heares, soe can not give into ye opinion that there are many Jacobites in England, but I'me as well satisfied as you can be, that those that are soe, are as much my enemies as ye papists, & I am very sensible there people will allways have designes against me, for as long as ye young man in France lives (which by ye law of nature will be longer then me) no body can doubt but theire will be plot both against my crown & life, you may be sure I'le take as much care of both as I can.[77]

It is impossible to gauge what level of threat Anne perceived, but the danger her life and crown were in due to potential Jacobite attacks was a topic reiterated to her by her

[74] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 29 April 1703.
[75] Overton, *Non-Jurors*, pp. 65-73.
[76] Marchmont to Anne, 11 July 1702, G. H. Rose (ed.), *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, 1685-1750 Vol. III*, London, John Murray, 1831, p. 250.
[77] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 22 August 1702.

advisers.

In January 1703, Gilbert Burnet informed the Queen that her life 'would be in danger when', rather than if, 'the Jacobites attempted to bring in the Prince of Wales'.[78] As a result of Anne's firm alliance to the Church and the Protestant succession, there were threats to her life from within and outside of the kingdom. However, she gave little credence to any of them, telling Robert Harley:

> There accounts that are com of a designe against my person dos not give me any uneasiness, knowing God Almightys protection is above all things, & as he has hitherto bin infinitely gracious to me, I hope he will continue being soe.[79]

Anne may have taken comfort in God providing her with protection, but she was also determined to make the kingdom as peaceful a place as possible for those she ruled over. The Queen told Godolphin that one of her ambitions was that 'it shall be my endeavour to make my Country and my friends easy'.[80] The mantra Anne followed as she led England was probably reinforced by her popularity while she worked hard to maintain the most fervent and continuous public support enjoyed by any monarch since Elizabeth, of which her accessibility during touching was one part.[81] Her reintroduction of 'touching' clearly demonstrates her acute appreciation of galvanising support from her subjects. This point became an awareness of growing importance as Anne came to realise the extent to which she did not have the Whig-Parliament's or the Upper House of Convocation's Whig-sympathetic bishops' votes to carry out her desires and aspirations.

Summary

Examining Anne as she came to the throne demonstrates the issues she inherited and encountered which affected her ability to implement her royal prerogative and influence over the Church. This chapter establishes that she would lead her kingdom through a motherly approach to her duties. However, the House of Lords and the episcopate were under Whig control, which had a great impact on her role in the Lords,

[78] Quote cited in, Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 152.
[79] HMC, *Bath*, Vol. I, p. 223, Anne to Robert Harley, 21 November 1712.
[80] Cited in Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 150, Anne to Sidney Godolphin, 1 May 1705.
[81] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 150.

and her ability to guide the Church regardless of her position as the Supreme Governor. Nonetheless, the chapter also determined that she found ways to compensate for the control Tenison and the Whig-sympathetic majority had taken from her. Touching was one method the Queen used to politically set herself apart from her predecessor and possible successor by demonstrating her divine right to the throne. The act also signalled that even if she could not overrule Convocation, she could nonetheless assert her position as the highest religious figure in the kingdom.

CHAPTER SEVEN - Anne's Early Reign and the Church (1702-1706)

This chapter analyses how Queen Anne attempted to implement her objective of changing Parliament and the Church's demographics after she inherited a Whig-majority in Parliament, and Whig-supportive bishops in the episcopate. Examining how her religious and political decisions were sometimes carried out, pushed aside, or if she made decisions that were forced on her, reveals how she attempted to influence the Church with her own High Church and Tory-sympathetic principles. She made these attempts at a time when she had little power, a reduced royal prerogative, and was combatting a largely Low Church episcopate. Anne thus may have started her reign by setting an early precedent for only appointing Tory-loyal bishops to the episcopate, but the Whigs eventually learned how to manipulate her selections and translations of bishops.

The documentary evidence points to how the Whigs and Anne's advisers (John and Sarah Churchill and Sidney Godolphin) joined forces and learned to overcome her Tory and High Church decisions, but an additional factor arises in this analysis. As Anne lost her influence as the Whigs, Churchills and Godolphin came together to serve their own interests, she did not merely accept defeat. When she saw one of her aspirations for influencing the Tories and Church thwarted, she did not cower. Instead, she changed tactics in her unrelenting bid to meet her objectives. Sometimes her determination was successful, sometimes it was not. However, throughout the first years of Anne's reign, the evidence reveals that she remained vigilant to combatting those who attempted to manipulate her rule as she sought small victories and capitalised on the opportunities that presented themselves. This chapter assesses the points including Anne's role in the development and voting of the Occasional Conformity bills, and her early appointments of Tory-sympathetic bishops to the episcopate, to determine how from the beginning of her reign she had clear intentions that did not always come to fruition. This examination subsequently is a precursor to the next chapter's assessment of the difficulties she faced in the middle years of her reign as many of the Whigs came together to combat her goals for Parliament and the Church.

The sources that provide the closest assessment of Anne's (and those nearest to her) decision-making processes come from the personal correspondence between

Anne, the Churchills, and Godolphin. These letters are highly personal as the group had known each other for decades before Anne became queen. The correspondence nonetheless often discussed topics of critical political and clerical importance, was often formal in genre, and despite the personal nature was likely to be read by others. The sources establish how the Queen reacted to her loss of political and religious control in the first years of her reign, and permit the formation of a detailed and personal reconstruction of Anne's reactions to England's political and ecclesiastical changes. This process allows for a rare assessment of the Queen's response to her declining ability to guide the Church and Parliament.

The first Occasional Conformity bill

The part that Parliament and bishops played in restricting Anne's exercise of her royal prerogative becomes evident from her first Parliament in late 1702. During the first session Daniel Finch, 2nd Earl of Nottingham, drafted the first Occasional Conformity bill before William Bromley and Arthur Annesley, Members of Parliament for Oxford and Cambridge, respectively, sent the bill to the House of Commons on 4 November.[1] The bill was designed to prevent dissenters from holding public office.[2] The events surrounding the bill reveal how, within the first seven months of Anne's reign, the 'nursing mother' in rhetorical terms experienced the reality of the extent to which political developments could impact on her aspirations for the Church, a trend that continued for the entirety of her reign.

The practice of occasional conformity followed the Toleration Act of 1689. It permitted people to qualify for civil or military positions by attending one Church of England service each year. Occasional conformity thus affected the Church's capacity to influence the community from the pulpit as many did not attend regular services.[3] Anne provided her royal assent to the bill. It was the case that monarchs withholding

[1] Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), p. 163; Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: A History of England 1603-1714*, London, Longman, 1980, p. 422.
[2] Brett Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2014, p. 166.
[3] 'William and Mary, 1688'. See: *An Act for Exempting their Majestyes Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certaine Lawes*, Chapter XVIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 15', *Statutes of the Realm: Vol. VI, 1685-94*, John Raithby (ed.), Great Britain Record Commission, 1819, pp. 74-76, accessed September 10, 2015, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol6/pp74-76.

royal assent was rare, though Anne exercised this right in 1707 when she failed to allow the militia to enter Scotland.[4] Anne nonetheless had concerns for the terms of the proposed bill as Prince George, who was a Lutheran, attended private Lutheran services at a chapel at St James's Palace while he also appeared in public at Church of England services. Anne's concerns are evident from Godolphin's letters. On 10 December 1702, he wrote to Robert Harley, who was also Speaker of the House, regarding the Queen being aware of the awkwardness of having a Lutheran husband when she was a High Tory Protestant. However, Godolphin asked the question, 'does anybody think […] this Queen won't take care to preserve the Church of England?'[5] Godolphin's point suggests the widespread knowledge within parliamentary and ecclesiastical circles that Anne's dedication to the Church was unquestioned regardless of her husband's faith.

The bill passed quickly through the Tory-dominated House of Commons.[6] Even Daniel Finch's inclusion of financial penalties for those who did not attend regular Church of England services did not affect the Tory vote. A letter from Godolphin to Harley on 10 December 1702, states that the Tory majority in the Commons saw the advantages of the bill. The majority either saw the benefits of increasing conformity to the Church, or else they supported increasing the Treasury's finances via the penalties against those who did not adhere to the bill.[7] With the bill having support in the House of Commons, it was sent to the House of Lords for the final vote. It was in the Lords that the Occasional Conformity bill became undone by political manoeuvers over which the Queen had little control. She may have been a daughter of the Church and mother of the kingdom, but neither equated to parliamentary influence.

Godolphin was also concerned about the repercussions of the bill as he feared dividing Parliament on a religious issue was not a worthwhile reason to split the parties further when delicate political matters were present.[8] The Duumvirs' attention was focused on the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), and they believed that unity in Parliament was essential to making funds available and having actions

[4] *ibid.*
[5] Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *Portland*, Vol. IV, pp. 50-51, Godolphin to Harley, 10 December 1702.
[6] Holmes, *Religion and Society*, p. 215.
[7] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. IV, pp. 50-51, Godolphin to Harley, 10 December 1702.
[8] *ibid.*

approved for England's military involvement in the dispute.[9] Godolphin's concern in having a religious issue divide Parliament as he was trying to secure political votes for military manoeuvres is evident as he wrote to Robert Harley in the days before the vote. Godolphin questioned, 'do they forget that not only the fate of England but of all Europe depends upon the appearance of our concord in the dispatch of our supplies?'[10]

As the vote for the bill approached there is little evidence that the Duumvirs did anything to promote its success, but both men supported the bill when it came time to vote.[11] Any concerns that Anne had regarding George's Lutheranism were also overcome. Prince George, as Duke of Cumberland, was a member of the Lords and voted in favour of a bill that would require him to attend Church of England services or else face financial penalties.[12] One of the only records of George's reaction comes from Thomas Wharton, 1st Marquess of Wharton, a strong Whig and an opponent of the bill which may have influenced his recording of events. Nonetheless, Wharton declared that after the vote, George said to him that 'my heart is with you', suggesting that the Prince did not favour the bill but voted for it due to political reasons.[13] Even though the Whigs held a numerical majority in the House of Lords, the personal voting preferences of its members could not be guaranteed and subsequently measures were taken to ensure the bill's defeat.[14] The Whig leaders used the political tactic of attaching unrelated amendments such as land tax increases to the bill. The 'tacks' to the Occasional Conformity bill saw a stalemate form and any chance of the bill passing eliminated.[15]

The Occasional Conformity bill's defeat is the first of many events throughout Anne's reign where she was forced to try to negotiate influence, but where she saw

---

[9] *ibid.*
[10] *ibid.*
[11] 'The first parliament of Queen Anne: First session - Act preventing occasional conformity - begins 20/10/1702,' *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Vol. III, 1695-1706*, London, Chandler, 1742, pp. 212-217, accessed September 24, 2015, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol3/pp212-217.
[12] Cited in: Winston Churchill, *Marlborough: His Life and Times Vol. I*, New York, Scribners, 1948, p. 672.
[13] *ibid.*
[14] G. M. Ditchfield, David Hayton, and Clyve Jones (eds.), *British Parliamentary Lists, 1660-1880: A Register*, London, A & C Black, 1995, p. 37.
[15] 'The first parliament of Queen Anne: First session - Act preventing occasional conformity - begins 20/10/1702', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Vol. III, 1695-1706*, London, Chandler, 1742, pp. 212-217, accessed September 24, 2015, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol3/pp212-217.

her aspirations met with little parliamentary support. The Duumvirs' decision not to actively promote the bill also set a precedent that led to confrontation as Anne's reign continued. The bill's defeat also signalled the beginning of Whiggish resistance to the High Church and Tory-supporting Queen. Thus, within the first twelve-months of Anne's reign, she saw her religious policies and choices thwarted by parliamentary politics and political involvement in ecclesiastical matters.

The first Tory bishops

Anne encountered a different set of circumstances when it came to appointing and translating bishops. She could exercise her authority as Supreme Governor of the Church and role as the true daughter of the Church by making selections with no political or ecclesiastical body able to control her appointments. Analysing her early clerical appointments demonstrates the power she had concerning Church selections and their political ramifications. This examination also identifies why some Whigs realised that they needed to find a method of using politics to erode her ability to guide the Church's direction. The Whigs' realisation that this manoeuvre was possible occurred because of the intertwined nature between religion and politics during the period. The Whiggish response to Anne's reign demonstrates how Whig members were trying to disempower the Queen because they realised that religious power had the possibility of turning into political power via the episcopal bench in Parliament, and influence voting in Convocation that could have political ramifications.

Thomas Tenison and other prominent Whig-supporting members of the episcopate including Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, William Talbot, Bishop of Oxford, and William Lloyd, Bishop or Worcester, had each been appointed during William's reign, when Whig-sympathetic bishops replaced non-jurors with bishops. Thus, William had a significant impact on shaping the episcopate Anne inherited (see Table 2). Anne's actions during the opening years of her rule demonstrates her objective to create a Tory-sympathetic majority in the episcopate as she appointed Tory-supportive bishops as sees became available due to death and translation. The first see to become available in her reign was Carlisle after Thomas Smith died on 12 April 1702. Smith's death occurred during the six-week period between William's death and Anne's coronation on 23 April. Anne's actions immediately established how

she hoped to see her intentions achieved.[16] Smith was replaced by William Nicolson whose appointment is significant on two levels. First, his selection demonstrates how Anne's religious and political views shaped her ecclesiastical appointments as she selected a High Church, Tory-supporting bishop who would now sit in the Upper House of Convocation and the episcopal bench in the Lords. Second, the selection of Nicolson also displays the new realities that prevailed in the politics of religion by revealing Tenison's waning influence as Sharp's level of authority in guiding the monarch's ecclesiastical selections expanded.

Nicolson was ordained in December 1679 and received a prebend before becoming the vicar of Torpenhow, south-west of Carlisle in 1681.[17] Nicolson also kept strong Tory company with Philip Musgrave, clerk of the Privy Council, and Musgrave's father, politician Sir Christopher Musgrave. Nicolson had repeatedly promoted Christopher Musgrave as the Tory candidate for the constituency of Carlisle in the parliamentary elections during the late-seventeenth century.[18] Few records detail the precise events concerning Nicolson's appointment. The lack of evidence suggests that either little debate occurred surrounding the selection, or that records of the debates are lost. What is known is that Christopher Musgrave and John Sharp recommended him to the Queen in their correspondence, and she subsequently promoted Nicolson from his vicarage to the bishopric of Carlisle.[19] That Musgrave and Sharp suggested Nicolson is to be expected as he had campaigned for Musgrave and proved his Tory allegiance, while the see of Carlisle fell under Sharp's influence as Archbishop of York. With Musgrave's and Sharp's endorsement, Nicolson received the see of Carlisle on 31 October 1702 without any significant recorded conversation occurring between the Queen and Tenison. As an early Tory-supportive appointment, Nicolson's selection demonstrates that Anne was eager to see Tory-sympathetic bishops selected, and was satisfied to accept Sharp's recommendations.

---

[16] David W. V. Weston, 'Smith, Thomas (1614–1702)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/25910, accessed 14 October 2015.
[17] D. W. Hayton, 'Nicolson, William (1655–1727)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/20186, accessed 2 September 2015.
[18] *ibid.*
[19] *ibid.*

Table 2 – The bishops of Anne's reign

DIOCESE	BISHOP	YEARS
Canterbury	Thomas Tenison	1695-1715
Bangor	John Evans	1702-1716
Bath & Wells	Richard Kidder	1691-1703
	George Hooper	1704-1727
Bristol	John Hall	1691-1710
	John Robinson	1710-1714
	George Smallridge	1714-1719
Carlisle	Thomas Smith	1684-1702
	William Nicolson	1702-1718
Chester	Nicholas Stratford	1689-1707
	William Dawes	1708-1714
Chichester	John Williams	1696-1709
	Thomas Manningham	1709-1722
Durham	Nathaniel Crew	1674-1721
Ely	Simon Patrick	1691-1707
	John Moore	1707-1714
	William Fleetwood	1714-1723
Exeter	Jonathan Trelawney	1689-1707
	Offspring Blackall	1708-1716
Gloucester	Edward Fowler	1691-1714
Hereford	Humphrey Humphreys	1701-1712
	Philip Bisse	1713-1721
Lichfield & Coventry	John Hough	1699-1717
Lincoln	James Gardiner	1695-1705
	William Wake	1705-1716
Llandaff	William Beaw	1679-1706
	John Tyler	1706-1724
London	Henry Compton	1676-1713
	John Robinson	1714-1723
Norwich	John Moore	1691-1707
	Charles Trimnell	1708-1721
Oxford	William Talbot	1699-1715
Peterborough	Richard Cumberland	1691-1718
Rochester	Thomas Sprat	1684-1713
	Francis Atterbury	1713-1723
Salisbury	Gilbert Burnet	1689-1715
Sodor & Man	Thomas Wilson	1698-1755
St Asaph	Edward Jones	1692-1703
	George Hooper	1703-1704
	William Beveridge	1704-1708
	William Fleetwood	1708-1714
St Davids	George Bull	1705-1710
	Philip Bisse	1710-1713
	Adam Ottley	1713-1723
Winchester	Peter Mews	1684-1706
	Jonathan Trelawney	1707-1721
Worcester	William Lloyd	1699-1717
York	John Sharp	1691-1714

Further episcopal developments reveal the complex nature of Anne's religious duties.

The deaths of Edward Jones, Bishop of St Asaph, and Richard Kidder, Bishop of Bath and Wells, in May and August respectively of 1703, are instances where Anne's early exercise of her right to appoint and translate Tory-supporting bishops is further demonstrated. Her actions following Jones's and Kidder's deaths reveal both Tenison's lack of influence and the Whig political leaders' uncertainty about how to respond to the Queen's choices. She elected George Hooper to fill Edward Jones's bishopric at St Asaph. Hooper had been Dean of Canterbury since 1691, and he had had earlier dealings with the Queen; she had even requested him to be her son Prince William's tutor in 1698.[20] In 1701, Hooper was also elected prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation. The predominantly High Church Lower House nonetheless experienced difficulties with Tenison's Low Church and Whig-supportive Upper House, as any motion passed by the Lower House also had to pass through the Upper House.[21] William's death and Anne's accession worked in Hooper's favour.[22] He first accepted the Welsh see of St Asaph on 31 October 1703 after Jones's death, but only six months later Richard Kidder's death resulted in Hooper then being translated to Bath and Wells.[23] This left St Asaph open for Anne to appoint a new bishop. St Asaph was not a privileged or wealthy see as it was in a rural area of northern Wales, but its bishop still sat in the Upper House of Convocation, on the episcopal bench in the Lords, and could vote on political and clerical matters. Hooper's replacement at St Asaph was William Beveridge, whose prominence in the Church began decades earlier. Beveridge (along with Anthony Horneck, preacher at the Savoy Chapel, and William Smythies, curate of St Giles Cripplegate) had throughout the 1680s started a series of voluntary religious societies. The purpose of Beveridge's work is well summarised in the historical writing of Gilbert Burnet:

> In King James's reign, the fear of popery was so strong […] that many, in and about London, began to meet often together, both for devotion and for their further instruction: things of that kind had been formerly practised only among the puritans and the dissenters: but these were of the church, and came to their ministers, to be assisted with forms of prayer and other directions: they were chiefly conducted by Dr Beveridge.[24]

---

[20] Gilbert Burnet, *History of His own Time*, London, Thomas Ward, 1724, p. 386.
[21] George Hooper, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation*, London, T Bennet, 1701.
[22] Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1857, p. 157.
[23] *ibid*.
[24] Burnet, *His own Time*, p. 18.

Beveridge swore allegiance to William and Mary, unlike the non-jurors who remained loyal to the oaths sworn to James. Beveridge had been offered Bath and Wells in 1691, but despite his commitment to William, he elected not to accept the appointment as the non-juror Thomas Ken technically held the see.[25] It took Beveridge three weeks to make the decision before he concluded that he 'would not eat Dr. Ken's bread'.[26] A pamphlet printed after Beveridge's rejection of Bath and Wells indicates that the non-jurors (including the doyen of the non-jurors, William Sancroft, former archbishop of Canterbury) praised Beveridge for his actions.[27] Beveridge was nonetheless also seen as a traitor by those who had sworn allegiance to William and Mary. An anonymous pamphlet, *A Vindication of Their Majesties' Authority to Fill the Sees of the Deprived Bishops*, declared that:

> There are no greater and more pressing obligations [than] to choose an Ecclesiastical preferment void by death, but our present circumstances are such as ought to overrule all Niceties. The mischiefs of such a refusal being so intolerable as nothing can excuse, much less justify it, but the absolute unlawfulness of succeeding in such preferments while the deprived bishop lives [and] who have submitted to the present government.[28]

The pamphlet argues that William and Mary as the Supreme Governors of the Church of England had the authority to replace non-juring bishops who refused to take the Oath of Allegiance to them. Beveridge remained dedicated to the Church, but not to the Whiggish political sympathies which dominated the Church because William filled it with Whig-supportive bishops to sees technically held by non-jurors.[29]

Beveridge also co-founded the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) in 1698 which has been called 'the most striking post-revolution fruition of the movement for voluntary associations within the Church of England'.[30] The S.P.C.K. established charity schools in England and Wales, and strengthened the

---

[25] Cited in: David Richard Thomas, *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph: General, Cathedral, and Parochial*, London, James Parker, 1874, p. 129.
[26] *ibid*.
[27] Anonymous, *A Vindication of Their Majesties' Authority to Fill the Sees of the Deprived Bishops*, London, Ric Chiswell, 1691
[28] *ibid*, p. 4.
[29] *ibid*.
[30] Leonard W. Cowie, 'Beveridge, William (bap. 1637, d. 1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/2321, accessed 10 September 2015.

Church via education and missionary work in reaction to perceived threats to the Church's influence in society.[31] Beveridge's actions inadvertently brought him to Anne's attention. Details of any relationship between the pair are sparse, but on 16 July 1704 she appointed him Bishop of St Asaph, a position he held while retaining his prebend at St Paul's.[32]

The cases of George Hooper and William Beveridge illustrate how Anne's early ecclesiastical appointments followed the pattern of her favouring and achieving Tory-supportive and High Church representation in the episcopate and Upper House of Convocation. Her selections reflect expected choices, considering her upbringing and education under Henry Compton and Edward Lake, and her own actions decades earlier relating to the removal of her father from the throne during the Revolution. Understanding that the Queen's early ecclesiastical decisions were made with little regard for their political consequences in a majority-Whig parliament is significant as this occurred in part due to the Whig parliamentarians not yet having deciphered how to exert influence over her ecclesiastical decisions. This situation was rectified by the time Anne made later appointments and translations.

The second and third Occasional Conformity bills

In Anne's opening speech to Parliament on 9 November 1703, she stated that she hoped to see 'perfect peace and unison' between her subjects.[33] She spoke about peace, but on 25 November, William Bromley, the Member for the University of Oxford who introduced the first Occasional Conformity bill, introduced a second Occasional Conformity bill which prompted political eruptions.[34] The introduction of the bill led Anne to deal privately with the Tory party faction's public decision to enter the bill without consulting her. From a political standpoint, she technically played no significant role in how the bills formed or in the repercussion of the voting process, but she could theoretically withhold her royal assent to prevent any bill from passing. The political events surrounding the bill are significant in demonstrating how politics

[31] *ibid*.
[32] *ibid*.
[33] Cited in: Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 176.
[34] Churchill, *Marlborough*, p. 702.

impacted on Anne's ability to guide the Church and her difficulties with Parliament.[35] From this point forward, political scenarios began overruling her royal prerogative as Queen and Supreme Governor, and her subjects' view of her as the true daughter of the Church and the kingdom's 'nursing mother'.

Following Bromley's introduction of the second bill in 1703, Anne's feelings are made clear in a letter she wrote to Sarah Churchill on 10 December 1703. The Queen believed the bill was announced as a 'pretence for quarelling', but Bromley's actions have also been interpreted as being designed to force the Queen to side with the High Church at a time when her political advisers, the Duumvirs, were increasingly aligning themselves with the Whigs.[36] As the bill neared its parliamentary vote, a letter from the Queen suggests that Churchill had been complaining to Anne about the bill being prejudiced against Whigs.[37] Anne felt it necessary to defend the bill that encouraged Church attendance, despite Whiggish political objection, and declared 'I see nothing like persecution in the Bill'.[38] Anne's letter to Churchill was also defensive in tone and indicates that she had no desire to discuss the bill with her Whig confidante:

> I must own to you that I never cared to mention any thing on this Subject to you because I knew you would not be of my mind […] you may think this is a notion putt into my head, but upon my word it is my own thought.[39]

Anne's declaration that Churchill 'may think this is a notion putt into my head' is a significant acknowledgment that she was aware of the perception by some that she was being politically pressured in only the second year of her reign. Anne nonetheless chose not to contest Churchill's negative views. After chastising her for suggesting that the bill was akin to persecuting Whigs, Anne goes on to beg 'She [Sarah Churchill] would never let difference of opinion hinder us from liveing together as we used to do'.[40] Despite Anne's belief that High Tories with a 'pretence for quarelling',

---

[35] Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837,* Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2002; Caroline Levin and Robert Bucholz (eds.), *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, London, University of Nebraska Press, 2009.
[36] Marlborough MSS, Section II, Anne to Sarah, 10 December 1703; G. V. Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707', *The English Historical Review* Vol. 82, No. 325, 1967, p. 730; Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times*, London, S.P.C.K., 1948, p. 179.
[37] Churchill, *Conduct*, pp. 10-11.
[38] Marlborough MSS, Section II, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 10 December 1703.
[39] *ibid.*
[40] *ibid.*

introduced the bill, and Sarah Churchill's opposition to Occasional Conformity, the Queen's defence suggests she favoured the bill and the potential security it would bring the Church by ensuring public office holders were at least publicly conforming Anglicans.[41]

Anne also faced a third matter that needed her consideration as her husband's Lutheranism once again became an issue. Prince George had voted in favour of the first bill, but before the second vote he elected not to support the bill. Anne's response to this decision is evident as she declared to Sarah Churchill on 10 December 'I think him very much in ye right'.[42] Anne's support of her husband's choice suggests that she was not blindly devoted to the Tories and the High Church, but the situation was nonetheless a complicated mix of personal and public pressures on the Queen.

Anne's support of George also demonstrates that she had a clear idea of what she hoped to do, but that her aspirations could get lost in the political complexities of her manoeuvres and thus her ambitions could be frustrated. If the bill passed, George would still have to contend with the issue of attending Anglican services or face financial penalties as he held public office as the Lord High Admiral of the Navy.[43] George's refusal to vote for the bill and Anne's acceptance of his religious decision, at least in her letters to her confidante, can be viewed from multiple perspectives. First is that the Queen's husband voting in favour of laws enforcing religious conformity that contradicted his position appeared as a desperate act to many involved, or so thought Anne. However, George was not compelled to vote or adhere to religious conformity. His marriage contract allowed him to continue practising his Lutheranism and to vote freely in the Lords. It should be noted that when the marriage contract was formed in the early 1680s, few likely predicted that two decades later his wife-to-be would be a sole-ruling Queen.[44] Additionally, earlier consorts such as Charles I's wife Henrietta Maria, and Charles II's wife Catherine of Braganza, were not denied

[41] *ibid*.
[42] *ibid*.
[43] Speck, 'George, prince of Denmark and duke of Cumberland', *ODNB*.
[44] Charles Beem, 'Why Prince George of Denmark did not become a King of England', in *The Man Behind the Queen*, edited by Charles Beem and Miles Taylor, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, pp. 81-91.

Catholic clergy and masses despite being consorts of the rulers of Protestant England.[45] These arrangements were in their marriage contracts, but their religious practices were conducted away from the public's view, and as women they did not hold a seat in the House of Lords as George did.[46] Anne and the Tories who supported the bill may have lost George's backing, but the day before the vote on 13 December, the Queen again declared to Sarah Churchill that George would not vote in favour of the bill.[47]

The second Occasional Conformity bill failed in the House of Lords. According to Gilbert Burnet (though it must be reiterated that he was a Whig-supportive bishop), there was also Tory fallout from what Prince George's failure to vote for the bill symbolised. Burnet recorded that some Tories' negativity concentrated on the Queen's decision not to use every possible option to gain further votes for the bill.[48] This negativity was bruited about as 'High Tories', whom Burnet did not personally identify, viewed the bill as a chance to regain some (albeit minor) political control over the Whigs who had grown strong during William's reign.[49] Thus, when Anne failed to explore every avenue possible to secure votes, the Tories 'were generally inflamed with this matter, could hardly forgive the Queen and the Prince [and] the coldness that they expressed on this occasion'.[50] A letter from John Churchill to his wife before the parliamentary vote nonetheless suggests that Anne and those close to her were aware that further divisions were forming within the party:

> I can't by noe means allow that all the Tory party is […] against the Queen. I think it is in her power to make use of allmost *all but some of the hands*, to the true interest of England.[51]

As it became evident that as Anne could not be the Queen every member of the Tory

---

[45] Caroline M. Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria (1609–1669)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/12947, accessed 30 December 2015; S. M. Wynne, 'Catherine (1638–1705)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/4894, accessed 8 December 2016.
[46] Michelle White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2006, p. 21; Wynne, 'Catherine (1638–1705)', *ODNB*.
[47] British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers (Blenheim), E 19, Anne to Sarah, 13 December 1703.
[48] Burnet, *His Own Time*, p. 109.
[49] *ibid*.
[50] *ibid*.
[51] Blenheim, E 5, John Churchill to Sarah Churchill, 10 December 1703.

party desired, factions began to divide further. A small group of Tories who were disturbed by Anne's decision not to compel Prince George to vote for the second Occasional Conformity bill also began producing propaganda that equated her with William and his Whiggish orientation.[52] That members of the Tory party would compare Anne to a king who endorsed a Whig-majority in Parliament and the episcopate demonstrates how just as religious decisions could cause issues between the Queen and the Whigs, so too could they disrupt the relationship between her and the Tories. Thus, Anne was not free from criticism, nor did she receive unequivocal support, even from the party to which she had been loyal for decades before her reign began.

The Whigs' emerging capacity to control Anne's religious aspirations and the repercussions of her losing favour with some of the High Tories is established by the events surrounding the third Occasional Conformity bill in late 1704. As Parliament resumed in November, the third bill was immediately sabotaged by Tories in the House of Commons after the bill was 'tacked' to land tax, the same method the Whigs used in the Lords to thwart the first bill passing in 1702.[53] That Tories in the Commons attempted to sabotage the bill when in 1702 and 1703 its previous iterations had swiftly passed through the Tory-dominated Commons, indicates how quickly political allegiance and priorities even within the same party could change. As it was disgruntled Tories who were tacking amendments to the third bill, Anne had to combat the manoeuvres of the political party she favoured for much of her life by finding a way to have the tack removed. In the midst of dealing with the tacking, John Sharp travelled to London to meet with the Queen in November 1704. Knowing that the third Occasional Conformity bill was in doubt, he suggested she enlist Godolphin's help to gain the support of the 'leading Tories'.[54] Sharp theorised that if Godolphin promised the Tories to support and promote the third bill publicly, then the tacks might be removed. Sharp recorded in his diary that he suggested this plan to the Queen 'but I [Sharp] found she liked not this proposal'.[55] Anne instead asked Sharp to use his

[52] Churchill, *Marlborough,* p. 704.
[53] 'The first parliament of Queen Anne: First session - Act preventing occasional conformity - begins 20/10/1702', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Vol. III, 1695-1706*, London, Chandler, 1742, pp. 212-217, accessed September 24, 2015, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol3/pp212-217.
[54] Cited in: Sharp, *John Sharp*, p. 306.
[55] *ibid*.

influence as a senior clergyman positioned in York to ensure that as many northern politicians as possible voted against the tacks, to which Sharp agreed.[56]

Anne's interpretation was that the Tories would try to stop the bill's passing and is evident as she concluded in a letter to Sarah Churchill on 17 November 1704 that:

> I must own I have ye same opinion of Whig & tory, that ever I had, I know both there principles very well, & when I know my self to be in ye right, nothing can make me alter mine, it is very sertin that there are good & ill people of both sorts. I can see ye faults of ye one as well as ye other, & am not deluded by any bodys calling themselves of the Church, for God knows there are too many that talks of religion that have no true Sense of it.[57]

Despite Anne's declaration that 'there are good & ill people' in the Tory and Whig parties, the Tories who placed the tacks on the third bill were defeated in the House of Commons. On 28 November, the land tax tacks were removed and the bill passed by a vote of 251 to 134.[58] The Queen was nonetheless still out of favour with the Whig-majority in the House of Lords, and with minimal debate the third Occasional Conformity bill was defeated on 15 December by 71 votes to 50. That Prince George and the Duumvirs' voting choice had played such a large role in earlier votes suggests that their decision to not vote in favour of the third bill is indicative of its eventual failure.[59] The absence of discussion regarding the third bill also indicates that each side of the vote knew their position before deliberations began. Anne's actions also suggest that she knew Sharp was a more likely candidate to promote the bill than Godolphin. Even after the tacks were removed in the Commons, however, the Duumvirs' and George's decision not to vote for the bill suggests that the Queen held no hope for its passing in the Lords as she already knew how the majority would vote.[60]

The third bill's failure is particularly noteworthy when interpreting the factors that impacted on Anne's ability to influence the Church. During the voting for all three attempts at passing the bill, its failure each time came at the hands of the Whig-

---

[56] *ibid*.
[57] Blenheim, E 19, Anne to Godolphin, 24 November 1704.
[58] Patricia Ansell, 'Harley's Parliamentary Management', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Vol. 34, 1961, pp. 92-97.
[59] British Museum Additional Manuscripts (Add MSS), 17,677 ZZ, f. 538, L'Heritage to States, 26 December 1704; Vernon to Shrewsbury, 1 and 8 December 1704, George Payne (ed.), *Vernon Correspondence: Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III from 1696 to 1708 Vol. III*, London, Colburn, 1841, pp. 277-279.
[60] *ibid*.

majority in the House of Lords. Yet, the third bill is notable for a change in its passage through the House of Commons. Only two years into her reign, the political party the Queen sided with had divided to such an extent that a bill she favoured was almost prevented from passing through the Tory-majority of the Commons due to the actions of some within her preferred party.

Anne faced opposition in the Lords to her hopes for the Occasional Conformity bill, but it must be noted that despite the difficulties she sometimes faced in the Commons and the Lords, her opponents were not flatly determined to deny her wishes. At the same time as the Queen attempted to have the second and third Occasional Conformity bills passed unsuccessfully, Parliament did pass Queen Anne's Bounty Act of 1703, which took effect in 1704 as Queen Anne's Bounty.[61] The bounty was used to supplement the incomes of poorer clergy of the Church in the rural, smaller, and less financially fruitful areas. The practice of supplementing clerical incomes began with Henry VIII and continued into the twentieth century.[62] However, that the bounty was heavily reshaped in Parliament during the beginning of Anne's reign demonstrates that the opponents of the Conformity bills were not all entirely against the Queen or the Church. Along with the Fifty New Churches Act of 1711, the Bounty is one of the signature moments of Anne's reign and one of the explicit signs of her genuine concern for the Church. It demonstrates that at least some of Parliament's politicians were assessing each of the Queen's aspirations on a case by case basis.

The Queen appoints a Whig-supportive bishop

Little attention has been given to the Whig-majority becoming a prominent factor in matters concerning the Church during Anne's reign. Assessing the motivations and repercussions of her choice to appoint a bishop to gain favour with the Whigs is a tactic that demonstrates her evolving political activity and establishes that she was aware she had to alter her behaviour to remain influential. The early years of Queen Anne's reign saw her appointing Tory-supporting bishops to sees in England and Wales to reduce the Whig episcopate that had formed during William's rule. These appointments included William Nicolson, Thomas Hooper and William Beveridge with the

[61] Parliament of England, *Queen Anne's Bounty Act of 1703*, 2 & 3, Anne, C 20.
[62] Le Fanu and William Richard, *Queen Anne's bounty, a short account of its history and work*, London, Macmillan, 1921, p. 13.

selections being made with little consideration of the Whig politicians or Whig-sympathetic bishops as had occurred during Tenison's reign over William's ecclesiastical commission.[63]

The beginning of 1705 represented a change. An examination of how the Whigs used politics to begin re-establishing their ecclesiastical dominance, combined with study of how the Tories began sabotaging Anne's rule, further demonstrates the complexities around which she was forced to manoeuvre. James Gardiner, Bishop of Lincoln, died on 1 March 1705 and the availability of a large and wealthy see ignited a conflict that included Whigs, Tories, Anne, and her ecclesiastical advisers. Tenison hoped to secure Lincoln (where he had been bishop from 1691 to 1694) for William Wake, Dean of Exeter. Tenison's desired selection would also see another Whig-supporting bishop enter the episcopate and halt the emerging pattern of Anne appointing Tory-sympathetic bishops.[64] Tenison was so keen to see Wake appointed that he wrote to him to ask 'with plainness and without loss of time, whether he would accept'.[65] As Tenison attempted to secure Lincoln for Wake, Godolphin's letters indicate that Wake was also the candidate that he and the Junto hoped to see selected.[66] As Tenison and Godolphin were eager to see Wake granted Lincoln, letters exchanged between Francis Atterbury, a prebend of Exeter Cathedral, and Godolphin suggest that John Sharp favoured Sir William Dawes, 3rd Baronet, for the appointment.[67] Dawes was a Tory peer, had been Canon of Worcester since 1698, and was a clerical confidant of both William III and Anne. Sharp's correspondence also suggests he hoped Dawes would eventually succeed him as Archbishop of York and thus Sharp wanted to secure Dawes ecclesiastical experience.[68]

The history of Anne's Tory-supportive translations indicates that she would have sided with Sharp's Tory-based choice of Dawes. The Queen, however, followed Tenison, Godolphin and the Junto's lead and appointed Wake to Lincoln on 16 July

---

[63] Luttrell, *Historical Relation*, p. 157; William Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, New York, Routledge, 2012, p. 71.
[64] Lambeth Palace Library (LPL) MSS 942, f. 146.
[65] *ibid*.
[66] Add. MSS. 28,055, f. 94, Harley to Godolphin, 17 July I704; Bodleian Add. MSS. A. I9, f. 29-30, Godolphin to Burnet, 7 Nov. 1705.
[67] County Record Office, Gloucester, Lloyd-Baker-Sharp MSS, 4. V. 2, Atterbury to Sharp, 1 May 1705.
[68] *ibid*.

1705 and issued the *Congé d'Elire* to elect him.[69] There is no clear evidence why Anne sided with the Whig leaders and Tenison rather than Sharp and the Tory-supporting bishops. That she elected Wake to Lincoln as 'a reward for their [the Whigs'] services in Parliament', regarding entirely political matters that included supporting John Churchill's military movements in France, is a valid conclusion.[70] Even without intentionally doing so, Anne had nonetheless given credence to the notion that political circumstances could affect ecclesiastical choices – the consequences of which greatly shaped the following years of her reign and is assessed in coming chapters. Unlike the Occasional Conformity bills where Parliament was necessary to pass laws regarding religion, Anne's appointment of the new bishop was within her royal prerogative as there was no formal political or clerical influence that could guide her choice.

Her choice demonstrates how a seemingly minor ecclesiastical appointment established how politics could manipulate the Church and vice versa.[71] The Queen had inadvertently demonstrated to the Junto that decisions that were entirely of her own choice could be guided by using political persuasion. This factor emerged as a pattern in many of her future ecclesiastical (and political) decisions.

Summary

By 1705, only three years into Anne's reign, the bargaining and compromises necessary for her to play any role with a Parliament and episcopate dominated by Whigs had started to come at the cost of the Queen's own principles. Yet she made this sacrifice based on the insight that as monarch she had to remain within the Whig leaders' decision-making process.[72] Anne came to the throne as a woman whose High Church and Tory loyalties had been fostered since birth and demonstrated throughout her adult years for decades before she came to the throne. She acceded the throne looking to secure the Church from its decreasing influence over government and society by securing the episcopate with bishops who were likely going to be sympathetic to her desires and vote accordingly in Convocation and Parliament. She

[69] John Le Neve, *The Lives and Characters of All the Protestant Bishops of the Church of England Since the Reformations Vol. I*, London, W. Bowyer, 1720, p. 236.
[70] Cited in: Bennett, 'Robert Harley', p. 730; Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison*, p. 179.
[71] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 200.
[72] Roger Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns*, London, Bell, 1697, pp. 480-481.

hoped to increase its prosperity after nearly two decades of challenges to its security during James's reign of Catholicism, and William's years of allowing Whig-majorities to form in Parliament and the Church that were generally opposed to her High Church and Tory favour. She had early success in appointing the Tory-supportive William Nicolson, Thomas Hooper and William Beveridge to bishoprics. Yet her actions during the Occasional Conformity bills and her support of the Whig candidate William Wake for the see of Lincoln alienated her from her High Tory parliamentary and High Church clerical supporters.

The result was that a queen who was against the Whigs in Parliament and the Church, found herself having to side with the party she did not favour as she lost the support of the Tories who once trusted her.

CHAPTER EIGHT - The Junto Force her Hand (1706-1707)

Collectively, the Junto were the most influential politicians of Anne's reign. Cumulatively, their impact was overwhelming as they acted in concert to limit the Queen's influence over political decision-making. However, this chapter assesses their impact on the Church and how they, not the Queen, came to control the appointments to bishoprics that were officially her prerogative. The chapter first assesses how the Junto forced the appointment of Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland, to Anne's cabinet in 1706. Although this was not an ecclesiastical appointment, the manoeuvring and chicanery it reveals is an important prelude to understanding the way bishoprics (which were also great offices of state) were handled. Spencer's appointment marks a turning point in Anne's rule and reveals what little control she had over her reign as her power structure began to collapse while the Junto's authority rose. With Anne's political power thwarted, the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707 is then assessed in terms of what it reveals about the Queen's priorities and expectations to determine how the Junto used their political power to take control of her of ecclesiastical decisions.

The chapter establishes that the Junto, John and Sarah Churchill, and Sidney Godolphin all set out to force the Queen into accepting Spencer, and when she did it was a moment of weakness that prefigured her losing control of ecclesiastical appointments to the Junto. The sources for this evaluation are the letters that circulated between the aforementioned groups. The correspondence determines that the Junto, the Duumvirs, and Sarah Churchill had different motivations for wanting Spencer selected and seeing the Junto's influence rise, but they nonetheless shared the same objective of ignoring the Queen's wishes. What happened with this explicitly political appointment allows for fuller understanding of the politics of religion in Anne's reign.

Charles Spencer's appointment

When the second session of Parliament began on 3 December 1706, Anne's numerous concessions to the Whigs throughout the previous months gave the party and the Junto significantly increased power. Consideration of this appointment reveals much about the reality of politics. The political concessions that Anne made directly preceded the decline in her ecclesiastical control due to the intertwined nature of religion and politics, and the desire of many around the Queen to manipulate her actions. Primarily,

the Junto decided that Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland, should replace Sir Charles Hedges (a Tory and admiralty court judge) as Anne's Secretary of State for the South of England.[1] Examining the methods employed by not only the Junto, but also the Whigs more generally and the Duumvirs to compel Anne to dismiss Hedges and appoint Spencer raises issues of significance that go beyond Spencer's appointment. The process which led to his selection demonstrates how several issues concerning Anne's reign had formed (or were forming) in 1706. Assessing Spencer's forced selection situates Anne in the reality of politics four years into her reign. The tension between Whigs and Tories can also be assessed in finer detail as the arguments for Spencer's appointment highlight numerous political ideologies that were at play in her cabinet and amongst her advisers. The examination additionally allows for further assessment of how political power was exercised at court and in Parliament in a work that focuses heavily on how religious power was delineated.

There is no clear evidence why Charles Spencer was selected as a candidate to replace Hedges, though Spencer's personal situation may provide some explanation. He was the son of Junto member Robert Spencer and in 1700 he married Anne Churchill, Sarah and John Churchill's daughter, and Anne's goddaughter.[2] Queen Anne nonetheless had reasons to dislike Spencer. He was a Whig who had spent most of the previous four years publicly expressing his hope of the government being free from influence by the Church and monarch, an opposite approach to the High Church Tory Queen's aspirations.[3] At a time when Anne was also facing difficulties with the 'Church in Danger' cry from the High Tories who suggested she was not doing enough to protect the Church, it is clear why she expressed no desire to promote someone who openly questioned her authority over her cabinet.[4] At the beginning of the events that led to Spencer's appointment, her reasons to discourage his promotion were shared by the Duumvirs, albeit for different reasons.[5]

Godolphin's letter to Churchill on 19 April 1706 makes it clear that the two were

---

[1] British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers (Blenheim), AI-36: Godolphin to John Churchill, 19 April 1706.
[2] Henry L. Snyder, 'Spencer, Charles, third earl of Sunderland (1675–1722)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26117, accessed 22 October 2015.
[3] Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), p. 219.
[4] *ibid*.
[5] Blenheim, AI-36: Godolphin to John Churchill, 19 April 1706.

concerned by the promotion of an individual with uncompromising Whig-ideals at a time when their focus was on guaranteeing England's involvement in the War of the Spanish Succession. In order to see their intentions come to fruition, they were careful not to upset the delicate balance of politics in Parliament - a balance that would not be helped by the promotion of an uncompromising Whig.[6] The Duumvirs essentially needed the cabinet members with whom compromises or bargains could be made rather than members with uncompromising ideas and visions. They were also aware of how the Queen would react, and campaigning for a candidate of whom she would not approve was not in their best interests.[7] They were additionally unenthusiastic about promoting Spencer as it was the Junto's desire. As unofficial assistants to the Junto, it was Godolphin and Churchill's task (regardless of their personal preference) to see the Whig leaders' wishes carried out, and Spencer's appointment would only increase the Junto's political control.[8]

Sarah Churchill wasted no time in canvassing the Queen to appoint her Whig son-in-law to a position in high office, although her attempts to see Spencer promoted began subtly. Her initial method was not to endorse Spencer, but to belittle Charles Hedges. Churchill's motives are apparent from a letter she wrote to the Queen on 6 April 1706, in which she declared of Hedges's character that he:

> … has noe capacity, noe quality, no interest, nor never could have been in that post but that every body know my Lord Rochester cares for nothing so much as a man that hee thinks will depend upon him.[9]

Churchill believed Hedges contributed little to the post of Secretary of State for the South of England. She thus took an indirect approach with the Queen, but Godolphin's letters suggest that Sarah Churchill was putting significantly more pressure on him to use his influence with Anne to see Spencer's appointment approved. The letters between Godolphin and the Churchills regarding Spencer's selection help to decipher how the wishes and influence of the Queen were purposefully ignored by her confidante and advisers.

On 19 April 1706, Godolphin sent a letter to John Churchill declaring that he had visited Sarah Churchill 'chiefly to let her see the unreasonableness of her friends

---

[6] *ibid.*
[7] *ibid.*
[8] *ibid.*
[9] Blenheim, G 17, Sarah Churchill to Anne, 6 April 1706.

in some particulars', as he outlined the difficulties involved in seeing Spencer promoted.[10] Three days later, Godolphin sent another letter to John Churchill, this time describing the Queen's steadfast objections to the Whigs:

> I have had some discourses with Mrs Morley [Anne] about the *papers* you have redd to her before you went away, and some other thoughts of that nature [regarding the Whigs]. But all that matter goes so much uphill with her, that she will hate one for endeavouring to perswade her to half what is really necessary for her own good. I doubt this tempter must have ill consequences of many kinds.[11]

While Godolphin's letter outlines the 'uphill' task that he envisaged confronted him, Churchill, and the Whigs in convincing Anne to appoint Spencer, the Queen's adviser's words also illuminate a secondary situation. When Godolphin told John Churchill that Anne 'will hate one for endeavouring to perswade her to half what is really necessary for her own good', he was referring to the issues threatening Anne's power.[12] Without a Tory majority in the House of Lords, Anne faced the unpleasant reality of operating with a Parliament and Church dominated by Whigs and Whig-sympathies. Godolphin's words regarding Spencer again illuminate that she had little parliamentary power without compromising her principles because she had to keep the Whigs and the Junto on side. Her actions ensure an analysis can develop that examines Anne as she found ways and means to exercise power in reality, rather than in the theoretical ways she hoped to see the Church's role in society and government increase via bishops and parliamentarians who shared her vision.

Between April and July 1706, requests made to the Queen by Godolphin, and Sarah and John Churchill regarding Spencer's appointment temporarily receded in the surviving correspondence, but this four-month period saw Whig influence over her cabinet and in Parliament continue to grow. The first indication of the Whigs' increasing strength concerned Thomas Wharton, 1st Marquess of Wharton, whom Anne disliked and had taken pleasure in removing from office in 1702.[13] The Junto campaigned on Wharton's behalf to have him reinstated, and such was Anne's lack of

---

[10] Blenheim, AI-36: Godolphin to John Churchill, 19 April 1706.
[11] *ibid*.
[12] *ibid*.
[13] According to Kenyon's summary of the relationship, Anne 'disliked him [Wharton] intensely, and took great pleasure in personally taking his staff of office from him', cited in: J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuarts*, London, Fontana, 1966, p. 188.

influence compared to the Junto's that she agreed to return him to his position as Chief Justice of the Royal Forests and Parks South of the Trent. The position was not prestigious, but Godolphin believed it was a role that would enable Wharton to influence voters in the constituency towards the Whigs in the general elections.[14] Wharton's promotion thus not only saw someone Anne disliked gain a position she had actively denied them, it also meant they could now promote the political ideas that were not in line with the High Church and Tory Queen's aspirations. Nonetheless, the next Whig appointments came at the cost of two Tories whose futures can be determined by how the Queen responded to a letter from Sarah Churchill. Anne wrote on 5 July:

> What you said conserning Mr Graham & Mr Seymour, seemed so reasonable to me that […] I can now tell you dear Mrs Freeman that ye first of these Gentlemen has had his Sentence, & ye other will have it very soon.[15]

Sarah Churchill's specific concerns regarding Graham and Seymour, grooms of Prince George's bedchamber (positions which ensured they had close, constant and potential influence over the Prince) are not known. However, considering the Queen's reluctance to remove Tories from office, Anne's response suggests that the two grooms had to be punished for some impropriety. Graham was subsequently replaced by Churchill's nephew and a favourite of Thomas Wharton, Colonel Charles Godfrey, Jr.[16] Colonel Samuel Masham replaced Seymour in the Prince's bedchamber, an appointment that later altered the Queen's personal alliances, favourites, and advisers significantly.[17]

Despite the Queen's concessions to the Whigs and the Churchills with the dismissal of several Tory ministers and the appointment of several Whigs, these actions were not enough to curb their aspirations for Spencer. The Junto exercised their power on 20 August when Godolphin informed the Queen that he would be forced to resign if Spencer was not appointed to the position of Secretary of State for the South. Godolphin's threat to resign is a well-documented event of the period, but it can also

[14] British Museum Additional Manuscripts (Add MSS), 17,677 BBB f. 398v, L'Hermitage to States of Holland, 27 August 1706; Blenheim, AI-14: Godolphin to John Churchill, n.d.
[15] Blenheim, E 19, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 5 July 1706.
[16] Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, London, Hambledon, 1967, p. 324; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 221.
[17] *ibid*.

be examined to provide context to Anne's deteriorating relationship with her advisers, a circumstance that led to her becoming increasingly powerless against the Junto. Precisely what Godolphin told Anne is not known, but the details of his ultimatum to the Queen were chronicled by Robert Harley. He recorded that Anne declared:

> Nothing will satisfie them [the Junto]. If so much pressed now to take him [Spencer] in, when most thought him unfit, wil it be possible to part with him when he appears to be so? All power is given to them. Those that press it must be delivered from the engagements or terrors they are under. If you stop it now, it wil make you better served and observed by al sides, it is gon so far it wil be too late hereafter – Everybody wil worship the Idol party that is set up. Ballance the good and the evil of taking him or keeping him out.[18]

Godolphin's threat to resign was enough to make the Queen accept that Whig tactics might force her to let Spencer into office. Aware that Spencer's appointment could become inevitable, Anne first attempted to compromise with the Junto. On 23 August, she offered to appoint Spencer to cabinet and provide him with a pension on the proviso that he was not appointed to office 'til some post is vacant'.[19] Godolphin dismissed the Queen's proposition and informed her that the Junto would accept only Spencer being appointed to Charles Hedges's position of Secretary of State for the South.[20] At the same time, Sarah Churchill's letters demonstrate that her involvement in her son-in-law's appointment became more aggressive than her earlier denouncing of Hedges. Her correspondence with the Queen on 27 August began to closely resemble threats:

> Tis certain that your government can't be carryd on with a part of the Torrys, & the Whigs disobliged, who when that happens will joyn with any people to torment you & that are true servants. […] Your security & the nations is my chief wish, & I beg of God Allmighty as earnestly as I shall do for his pardon at my last hour, that Mr and Mrs Morley [Prince George and Anne] may see their errors as to this notion before it is too late, but considering how little impression any thing makes that comes from your faithful Freeman [Sarah Churchill], I have troubled you too much & I beg your pardon for it.[21]

Churchill's words clearly illuminate Anne's position in 1706. The Queen had little

[18] Add MSS 70,331, Anne to Godolphin, written by Harley, 20 August.
[19] Add MSS 56,105, Anne to Godolphin, 23 August 1706.
[20] Tresham Lever, *Godolphin: His Life and Times*, London, John Murray, 1952, p. 159.
[21] Blenheim, G 17, Sarah Churchill to Anne, 27 August 1706.

hope of passing anything she would have wanted through Parliament, having lost the support of the High Tories. For Anne to have any control over Church and State in the early-eighteenth century where she held little royal prerogative, she needed Whig support. The evidence disappears following Churchill's threat which indicates that Anne did not reply to Churchill, and instead the Queen held out from appointing Spencer. Anne's feelings regarding the situation are expressed in a letter to Robert Harley several days later on 30 August. Referring to her loss of High Tory support, she wrote 'I am not inclined nor never will be to employ any of those violent persons that have behaved them selves soe ill towards me'.[22] Anne then described how she wished she could rule:

> All I desire is my liberty in encourageing & employing all those that Concur faithfully in my Service whether they are call'd Whigs or Torys, not to be tyed to one, nor to ye other, for it I should be soe unfortunate as to fall into ye hand of either.[23]

Anne's words outline her hopes, but it is the following sentence which summarises that the Queen knew she was defeated by party politics and the power of the Whig-majority. She wrote:

> … I shall look upon my self soe I have the name of Queen, to be in realety but theire slave, which as it will be my personal ruin, soe it will be ye destroying of all Government, for instead of putting an end to faction, it will lay a lasting foundation for it.[24]

Anne had conceded that she was 'in realety but theire [the Whigs'] slave', and that it would lead to the 'destroying of all Government', as her letter aptly summarises her bitter awareness of her own political position in late 1706.[25] Granted there must be allowance for some rhetorical exaggeration from a disappointed Queen, but the comments are also candid. With the battle lines drawn, exchanges between the Queen, Godolphin, Sarah Churchill and Harley continued throughout September and on until

[22] Add MSS, 41,340, f. 104, Anne to Robert Harley, 30 August 1706.
[23] *ibid*.
[24] *ibid*.
[25] *ibid*.

November.[26] During this period, the alliances stayed the same with Anne and Harley on one side, and the Churchills, the Junto and Godolphin on the other. Both parties knew the issue of Spencer had to be dealt with by the time Parliament resumed so his appointment did not become an issue of parliamentary discussion. Harley conceded that Spencer's selection had been stalled as long as possible on 20 November when he conceded his protests against the Whig candidate were worthless in the Junto's view, and that maintaining objections was beginning to cost him influence within Parliament.[27] Harley retracted his public rejections of Spencer which led Anne to replace Hedges with Spencer after months of seeing her wishes and demands ignored by the Whig-majority.[28]

Spencer's appointment ended a long political debate that was fought to overrule the Queen's personal wishes, but these events also reveal Anne's political power during 1706 as minimal and corroding. His selection in the end demonstrates how the Whigs, Junto, and Duumvirs manipulated Anne's personal and political authority; it delineates how political power was exercised in private and in cabinet; and it reveals how concerns regarding the possibility of these deliberations entering the parliamentary sphere were enough to force a resolution. These were skills the Whiggish group soon built upon to dismantle the Queen's ecclesiastical authority, an area where she had held much more control.

The repercussions of Anne's defeat by the Junto

The changes that occurred to and under Anne's regality between 1704 and 1706 did not go unnoticed by the Queen's Tory adherents. In the weeks leading up to Parliament's opening in December 1706, she spent ten days at Newmarket, during which time it was noted by Sir Thomas Cave, 3rd Baronet and Tory politician, that:

[26] Many letters and manuscripts continue the discussions concerning Spencer's appointment, and Anne's refusal to accept it, but these works continue discussions regarding themes already outlined. See: Blenheim, E 3, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 7 September 1706; Blenheim, A1-36, Godolphin to John Churchill, 10 September 1706; Blenheim, E 20, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 14 September 1706; Blenheim, E 20, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 18 September 1706; Blenheim, G 18, Sarah Churchill to Anne, 26 September 1706; Blenheim, E 19, Anne to Sarah, 27 October 1706; Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah, 2 November 1706.
[27] Blenheim, A1-14, Godolphin to Harley, 20 November 1706.
[28] *ibid*.

> … there was a small appearance at Newmarket, of which 'tis said the Queen took notice that the Gentry did not meet Her Majesty, which makes me think few but Whigs were there.[29]

Cave's observation offers one of the only records of Anne's time in Newmarket and though his words cannot be corroborated, they do stand as one testament to her political isolation in late 1706. The Queen's decision to shift away from the High Tories, not to support the Tory-endorsed second Occasional Conformity bill fully, and to permit the replacement of Tory for Whig ministers and a bishop when she selected Wake over Dawes for the see of Lincoln, had repercussions for her in real terms. Cave deduced that Anne's actions had resulted in her having lost her appeal to the Tory party due to her Whig concessions. At the same time, Anne failed to gain Whig backing because she was not a Whig supporter, but a Tory-sympathetic queen who had made allowances to the Whigs.[30]

Spencer's appointment also meant the Whig foothold in the House of Lords had grown larger when Parliament resumed on 3 December 1706. Just as Anne had been compelled to promote Spencer to her cabinet, she also approved the appointment of several Whigs to the peerage. Godolphin and Thomas Wharton were given earldoms, William Cowper, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, became a baron, and James Montague, Member of Parliament for Tregony and Beeralston, became the solicitor general.[31] In conjunction with the elevation of Whigs, Anne was also manoeuvred by the Whigs into dismissing her ally John Sheffield, 1st Duke of Buckingham, in much the same way as she was compelled to appoint Spencer. Sheffield's removal prompted an observer of these events to issue the pamphlet, *The Memorial of the Church of England*, which suggested Sheffield was a friend of the Church who had been wronged by Anne. The pamphlet gave no consideration to the power the Junto had acquired over the Queen.[32]

Anne was likely more willing to dismiss some Tories from cabinet than others.

---

[29] Sir Thomas Cave to Lord Fermanagh, 19 October 1706: Margaret Verney (ed.), *Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century from the Manuscripts of Claydon House*, London, E. Benn, 1930, p. 265.
[30] *ibid.*
[31] Abel Boyer, *History of Queen Anne*, London, J. Roberts, 1722, p. 274; William Coxe, *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough*. London: Longman, 1820, pp. 132-133.
[32] Margaret D. Sankey, 'Sheffield, John, first duke of Buckingham and Normanby (1647–1721)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/25297, accessed 22 September 2016.

For example, William Villiers, 2nd Earl of Jersey, had questioned the Duumvirs' commitment to safeguarding the Church as Anne hoped.[33] Villiers was in hindsight correct to question their faith, but he was doing so publicly and at a time when Anne needed Godolphin and Churchill to be aligned closely with her, at least in the public sphere to increase her political credibility and influence. Daniel Finch, 2nd Earl of Nottingham and writer of the Occasional Conformity bills, was also dismissed with pleasure by the Queen as she was 'infuriated' that he had campaigned to have Electress Sophia of Hanover brought to England.[34] Finch had campaigned on the grounds that it was a necessary move to eliminate the risk of a Catholic Stuart succeeding Anne.[35] These changes are well-known aspects of early-eighteenth century English political history, but in this context they reiterate that the Queen was not blindly devoted to the Tories, nor were they unquestionably dedicated to her. For Anne, these changes also left Robert Harley as her only Tory adviser in an ever-growing Whig environment.

The breakdown of the Queen's relationship with the Duumvirs as they sided with the Junto and the rise of Spencer, also came at the cost of Anne's relationship with Sarah Churchill. The divide between Anne and Sarah Churchill is a well-documented aspect of Anne's life, discussed in Churchill's memoir and the various modern biographies of the pair. However, the repercussions of the breakdown were such that Anne became increasingly isolated from those she once relied on for political and social companionship and guidance. Churchill had been part of Anne's life since the early 1680s, and a close confidante since at least 1683 after James II approved her as a member of Anne's household.[36]

Churchill lost her special status as the Queen's confidante and was replaced by Abigail Hill. Hill was Robert Harley's cousin and she gained a position in Anne's bedchamber in 1697, and played a role of increasing importance in her life over the

---

[33] Stuart Handley, 'Villiers, Edward, first earl of Jersey (1655?–1711)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/28289, accessed 9 September 2016.

[34] Henry Horwitz, 'Finch, Daniel, second earl of Nottingham and seventh earl of Winchilsea (1647–1730)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/9427, accessed 22 September 2016; Keith Feiling, *History of the Tory Party 1640-1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1924, p. 395.

[35] Gregg, *Queen Anne*, pp. 201-211.

[36] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, between 18 May and 28 July 1683.

next decade.[37] In 1703, Sarah Churchill wrote of receiving a letter from Anne in which she referred to 'her dear Mrs Hill twenty times over'.[38] By 1705, the Queen referred to Hill as 'soe good a Creature', and she had become the deputy in the Queen's bedchamber.[39] Churchill's estrangement from Anne began with her being absent from Court as Churchill had children and a family of her own, and ended in her threats regarding the Whigs' power. Meanwhile Abigail Hill flourished in Anne's favour.[40] Following Spencer's forced appointment, the Queen turned to Hill as her new favourite for comfort and support. Such was Anne's change in preference that when Hill married Samuel Masham (the man who replaced Seymour in Prince George's bedchamber after Sarah Churchill's complaints), Churchill was not informed of the marriage for fear she would interfere or try to stop it.[41] The 2,000 guineas from the Privy Purse the Queen gave Hill as a wedding present further demonstrates Anne's favour for the newly-wed Mrs Masham.[42] Sarah Churchill's response at discovering the marriage and gift are evident in her memoir where she recorded that:

> … I discovered that my cousin was become an absolute favourite […] & I likewise then discovered beyond all dispute Mr Harley's correspondence and interest at Court by means of this woman.[43]

Churchill's words in a memoir published almost forty years after the fact are hardly evidence of what was precisely taking place in the Queen's life decades earlier. Anne's actions concerning Hill's marriage nonetheless suggest that as Sarah Churchill, her husband, and Godolphin fell out of favour, they were replaced by Harley and Masham. The direct consequence in the Queen's change of favour is that the Churchills and Godolphin felt significantly less obligated to assist Anne in pursuing her intentions.

The Duumvirs remained two of the Queen's primary advisers, but as the Junto's power grew, Churchill and Godolphin realised that further promoting Whig

---

[37] Frances Harris, 'Masham , Abigail, Lady Masham (1670?–1734)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18261, accessed 10 December 2016.
[38] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 20 August 1703.
[39] Add MSS 31,145 ff. 72-73, Lady Wentworth to Raby, 28 August 1705.
[40] R. C. Bostock, 'Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford', *Notes and Queries* Vol. 10, No. 5, 1906, p. 391.
[41] British Library, Egerton Manuscripts, 2,676 ff 6-8, Privy Purse Accounts.
[42] *ibid*.
[43] Churchill, *Conduct*, p. 184.

objectives would increase their own political influence. From Anne's perspective, the developments concerning Spencer's appointment and the Queen's slow break from the Churchills and Godolphin is part of a series of events that fall into the trajectory of Anne's loss of political power in Parliament. This subsequently limited her ability to influence the Church and increase the episcopate's Tory supporters.

The Bishoprics Crisis

The forced appointment of Charles Spencer to Queen Anne's cabinet demonstrated how her advisers could defy her wishes, and the resultant loss of her influence over her cabinet as the Whigs had largely learned to operate without her. The occurrences that are now known as the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707 can be seen as a continuation of the series of events including Spencer's appointment. The events demonstrate how political compromise led to Anne's temporary loss of control over Church appointments only five years after she dismissed William's ecclesiastical commission with the intention of appointing bishops who would be sympathetic to her causes in Convocation and the Lords.[44] Examining the Crisis from the Queen's perspective establishes the role she played in an ecclesiastical battle being fought for political gain. G. V. Bennett's frequently cited landmark work focuses on the political aspects of the Crisis but without considering Anne as a focal point.[45] Other works have investigated the religious repercussions of the Bishoprics Crisis, including the clerical process of selecting bishops for translation.[46] Yet the question of how parliamentary politics encroached on the Queen's ability to exercise her royal prerogative and to appoint and translate bishops remains underexplored.

As this thesis focuses on the factors that diminished Anne's ability to guide the Church, her rule between 1702 and late 1706 represents the starting point to the circumstances that dominated the Bishoprics Crisis. The events that unfolded would

[44] 9 December 1706, cited in: Sharp, *John Sharp*, p. 300-301; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1857, p. 157.
[45] G. V. Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707', *English Historical Review* Vol. 82, No. 325, 1967, pp. 726-746; Charles Arnold-Baker, *The Companion to British History*, Routledge, New York, 2015, p. 348; Hamish Fraser and Callum Brown, *Britain Since 1707*, Routledge, New York, 2014, p. 298; Winn, *Queen Anne*, p. 723.
[46] Tindal Hart, *John Sharp*, pp. 240-246; Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times*, London, S.P.C.K., 1948, pp. 180-188.

not have played out as they did but for the breakdown in relationships between the Queen and the Churchills, Godolphin and the Junto. Anne's resistance to appointing Spencer to her cabinet, and her turn in favour to Abigail Masham at the cost of Sarah Churchill's influence, ensured that the Crisis occurred with clearly defined 'sides'. Political division amongst the Queen's advisers thus meant that the Crisis was an ecclesiastical battle that was fought on a political front. This section accordingly demonstrates how a queen with strong Tory and High Church views had what little prerogative she had left eroded by the Junto's power.

The Crisis stemmed from political interest in appointments to financially valuable and politically influential sees after bishops died in quick succession. It began on 9 November 1706 when Peter Mews, Bishop of Winchester, died after being administered the wrong medicine.[47] The choice of the new bishop of Winchester was of immediate political importance as Winchester was one of England's largest and wealthiest sees.[48] Gilbert Burnet's and Thomas Tenison's recorded versions of what occurred after Mews's death are the relevant sources to assess the implications to Anne of the see being vacant, and how these issues led to a crisis. As prominent clergymen, Tenison and Burnet (as Bishop of Salisbury), were high in the Church hierarchy and left detailed and involved perspectives of the events that took place between the Queen and her advisers. Both men's records are quite similar, though their versions of events must be viewed in the light of their Whig-sympathetic beliefs.

The Junto, however, encountered an immediate problem. Godolphin (as part of his role with the Queen) had already promised the see to Jonathan Trelawny, Bishop of Exeter and a prominent Tory supporter, for his assistance in campaigning for Sir Edward Seymour, 4th Baronet (the Member of Parliament for Exeter since 1695), during the 1705 elections.[49] Tenison recorded that the Junto was furious with Godolphin's actions and about the Queen's subsequent promise to select Trelawny for the bishopric at Winchester. Tenison was ordered by the Junto to meet with Anne and question Trelawny's appointment in the hope of securing Mews's position for a Whig-

[47] Andrew M. Coleby, 'Mews, Peter (1619–1706)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18633, accessed 13 October 2015.
[48] John C. English, 'The Duration of the Primitive Church: An Issue for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Anglicans', *Anglican and Episcopal History* Vol. 73, No. 1, 2004, p. 67.
[49] Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *Bath*, Vol. I, pp. 173-174, Godolphin to Harley, 14 June 1707.

sympathetic candidate.[50] Tenison's report to the Junto on 23 January 1707 states that 'my Discourse [with the Queen] was short, it was being said to me on my entrance on it, that the thing was already determined, though the person was not declared'.[51] His description of the Queen's words suggests she had no intention of bowing to the Whigs in the case of Mews's replacement. Her royal prerogative and position as the Supreme Governor enabled her to make the selection, but she could not stop the political and personal repercussions of her decisions.

When Nicholas Stratford, Bishop of Chester, then died on 12 February 1707, the issues caused by Mews's death, including Anne's promise to Trelawny and the Junto's subsequent anger, became part of a much larger and more complicated situation.[52] Two weeks later William Jane also died, leaving vacant his prominent ecclesiastical position of regius professor (a professorship with royal patronage) of Divinity at Oxford.[53] With Trelawny promised, but not appointed, to Winchester, and Stratford's and Jane's deaths, three desirable ecclesiastical positions were available in early 1707 and the Junto promoted candidates whom the Queen would most likely dislike.

The process of attempting to have Whig-supportive bishops appointed begins with a letter from Tenison to the Junto on 27 February 1707. The letter outlines that the Archbishop consulted with the Duumvirs, and consequently the three supported Samuel Freeman, Dean of Peterborough, for Winchester, Charles Trimnell, Rector of St James in Westminster, for Chester, and Dr John Potter, a moderate Whig, for the regius professorship.[54] The Whig-supportive archbishop and the Duumvirs were thus increasingly more closely aligned with the leaders of the Whig party than they were with the monarch. Robert Harley was given the names of the desired Whig appointees and he provided them to the Queen but she remained silent on the matter. Norman Sykes suggests that Harley interpreted the silence as Anne being determined to

---

[50] *ibid*.
[51] Surrey, 371/14/D/12, Tenison to Somers, 23 January 1707.
[52] Henry D. Rack, 'Stratford, Nicholas (*bap.* 1633, *d.* 1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26646, accessed 14 October 2015.
[53] R. A. P. J. Beddard, 'Jane, William (*bap.* 1645, *d.* 1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14650, accessed 14 October 2015.
[54] Surrey, 371/14/D/12, Tenison to Somers, 27 February 1707.

exercise her royal prerogative over the appointments.[55]

Anne's letters and those of her advisers can be used to piece together the developments, her responses, and the process of considering the candidates for the bishoprics and professorship. Harley's, Godolphin's, and John Churchill's correspondence have been carefully examined by historians, but usually for constructing the political chronology of the Crisis. The same letters also yield insights as to how Anne reacted to the ecclesiastical repercussions of the political argument. The letters between Harley and John Churchill reveal that the Queen was considering several Tory-supportive options for the regius professorship. In a letter to the Queen, John Sharp, who was Anne's primary adviser in most issues relating to the Church, suggested Dr Offspring Blackall, a clergyman who later became Bishop of Exeter. Sharp recommended William Dawes, the Tory candidate for the see of Lincoln in 1705 before Wake was appointed.[56] Anne was familiar with both candidates because Sharp had used his influence as almoner (which allowed him to select those who preached before the Queen) to ensure that she knew the two Tory-sympathetic contenders.[57] Harley also suggested his favourite, George Smallridge, deputy to William Jane (the deceased regius professor). Anne subsequently promised Smallridge the position as he was Harley's choice and Smallridge was also familiar with the position.[58]

John Churchill also had a vested interest in the appointee to the regius professorship. Churchill's family home Blenheim was in Oxfordshire, and he believed that a Tory regius professor's political perspectives in Oxford were detrimental to his political aspirations. Churchill's motivations were therefore not solely against the Queen or in favour of the Whig-supported candidate; instead he hoped to benefit his own circumstances. Smallridge's name appears in Churchill's letters nearly eight months before the professorship became available.[59] Subsequently, eight months before Jane's death, Churchill was cautious about Smallridge (who was twenty-years younger than Jane) being promoted from deputy regius professor to the full position

[55] The letters between Robert Harley and John Churchill, discussing the Queen's possible selections are discussed in: Norman Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 50, No. 199, 1935, p. 444.
[56] *Ibid*, p. 435, 444.
[57] *Ibid*, p. 444.
[58] *ibid*.
[59] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. IV, p. 320, Churchill to Harley, 29 July 1706.

on Jane's retirement or death.[60] Churchill's views are evident in a letter he sent to Godolphin in July 1706, eight months before William Jane died:

> I have been inform'd that the Dean of Carile [Dr Francis Atterbury] and Dr Smallridge make compliment to Her Majestry, but at the same time are as violent as if they were gover'd by Lord Rochester [John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester, the High Church Tory who was dismissed in the purge of High Tories].[61]

Despite Churchill's misgivings regarding Smallridge's potential promotion, the Junto and the Whigs were distressed to see three ecclesiastical vacancies apparently already filled with Tory-supporting churchmen. The Junto tasked the Duumvirs with changing Anne's mind as, in the case of Godolphin, Junto member Lord Chancellor William Cowper declared that 'the world cannot believe he could not hinder her' in her selections.[62] However, the Duumvirs' political task would have personal and religious repercussions for Anne. The letters between the advisers allow for an analysis of their approach and provide insights concerning their changing attitude towards the Queen's ecclesiastical authority. The Duumvirs knew from the beginning that they were tasked with changing Anne's mind about a decision she had no desire to discuss or alter. Godolphin reported to Churchill on 11 April 1707 that:

> The queen has never said the least word to me of Oxford, or the professorship, but in all other things, she leans that way, as much as she did in that while you were here.[63]

The pair not only had to contend with the Queen's intention to appoint her own bishops and professor, but also Harley's support for and role in her decisions. On 8 June, Godolphin complained to Churchill that 'those spirtuall affairs which seem to grow rather worse and worse, [Harley] has not much altered his mind in those matters though he won't own anything like that'.[64]

---

[60] Beddard, 'Jane, William', *ODNB*; Richard Sharp, 'Smallridge, George (1662–1719)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/25737, accessed 30 September 2016.
[61] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. IV, p. 320, Churchill to Harley, 29 July 1706.
[62] Cited in: Henry Snyder, 'The Formulation of Foreign and Domestic Policy in the Reign of Queen Anne: Memoranda by Lord Chancellor Cowper of Conversations with Lord Treasurer Godolphin', *Historical Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1968, p. 157.
[63] Blenheim, A 2-23, Godolphin to John Churchill, 11 April 1707.
[64] Blenheim, A 2-23, Godolphin to John Churchill, 8 June 1707.

As 1707 progressed, Anne found herself in a quandary as she began to show disfavour towards Smallridge's appointment. Anne had shown she was by no means an uncritical Tory, such as when she did not encourage Prince George to vote for the second and third Occasional Conformity bills.[65] That she began to question her own favour of Smallridge thus further demonstrates her ability to be aware of and consider the complexities and subtleties that were involved in many of her decisions. Her changing perspective is outlined in her own words via a letter to John Sharp on 12 February when she stated that 'she had been told that Smallridge was One of those who flew in ye face of the Government by representing the Church to be in Danger'.[66] Nonetheless, her need to compromise her beliefs to remain part of the Whig decision-making process meant she could not conform to the High Church and Tory desires of the group.

Thus, Anne's letter to Harley highlights that Smallridge should have been Anne's ideal candidate as a High Churchman. However, Anne was no longer strictly a High Church and Tory queen. Her acceptance that political and religious compromise was necessary for her to continue being an effective leader with any influence over Parliament meant that Smallridge was not her ideal candidate in 1707. She did not publicly rescind her promise to Smallridge, though Sarah Churchill determined that Anne had started to favour Dr John Potter, the moderate Whig candidate who would be more complementary to Anne's political and religious compromises than a High Church Tory.[67] Churchill also may not now have been as close to the Queen as she once was, but she still had a good understanding of Anne's tactics. Churchill concluded that Anne's discussions with two people regarding the same position 'was probably enough, many months passing, & many delays & difficulties being pretended' before her ministry would have to make its choice.[68] Churchill concluded that with delays and interruptions, the Queen would later be free to select either candidate even if she had earlier promised the position to Smallridge.

In addition to the choices that Anne was making regarding the professorship, during April she sent Offspring Blackall a letter offering him the choice of Exeter or Chester. Blackall chose Exeter which the Queen promised him before offering William

[65] Cited in: Churchill, *Marlborough*, p. 672.
[66] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. IV, p. 388, Anne to Harley, 12 February 1707.
[67] Blenheim, G 19, Sarah Churchill's *Character of Princes*, p. 65.
[68] *ibid*.

Dawes the see of Chester.[69] The Junto and the Duumvirs had in the past manipulated Anne to accept their decisions, such as William Wake's appointment to Lincoln, and Spencer's appointment as Secretary of State. Yet the Junto and Duumvirs' limited success concerning the ecclesiastical appointments of 1707 offers rare insights into Anne's negotiations, even if she had promised the positions but not finalised them.

The turmoil of vacancies and promises then escalated further on 31 May 1707 after Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely, died suddenly.[70] A letter from Godolphin to Churchill on 8 June declared that Anne wasted no time in filling the vacancy and translated John Moor, Bishop of Norwich.[71] That no major discussion occurred concerning the translation of Moor to Ely suggests that the Crisis was a political issue fought with clerical appointments as the selections in question could increase the Junto's influence in the political sphere. The Junto needed several sees available to gain further influence over the Church and Upper House of Convocation. That no confrontation arose regarding Ely suggests that they were not concerned with the composition of the episcopate, and that the Junto's objective was to gain further political control of the Lords, a fight possible without consideration of Moor's appointment. As Anne filled the see of Ely, Moor's previous bishopric Norwich was now vacant and Godolphin was the first to realise that three empty sees, rather than two (combined with a professorship), would only complicate matters when many positions had been promised but not finalised. Godolphin's perspective is made clear in a series of letters he exchanged with John Churchill from 8 June 1707. Scholars have used and quoted the letters between Godolphin and Churchill but the letters also demonstrate that Anne's advisers were aware of how politics could shape religious decisions. Godolphin wrote:

> There are three bishopricks vacant [Chester, Exeter, and Norwich] and I find I has soe little hopes of them being well filled that I seem resolved to use all my endeavours to keep them vacant till I can have Mrs Freeman's [Sarah Churchill's] assistance in these spirituall affairs.[72]

---

[69] National Archives, Gloucestershire Records, Lloyd-Baker-Sharp Manuscripts, H 18, 3, Nathaniel Crewe to John Sharp, 31 May 1707: Crewe reported what had occurred during April 1707.
[70] Jon Parkin, 'Patrick, Simon (1626–1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/21568, accessed 16 October 2015.
[71] Blenheim, A 2-23, Godolphin to John Churchill, 8 June 1707.
[72] *ibid*.

Six months after Spencer's appointment, Godolphin was also keen to see bishops appointed to counter Spencer's Whig involvement in Church selections and policy. Determining Godolphin's intent is possible due to a letter he wrote to Harley on 14 June 1707. Godolphin asked Harley to use his persuasion with the Queen to appoint Trelawny to Winchester so debate did not continue regarding sees that had been publicly promised. Godolphin noted '[I] know so much of my Lord Sunderland's [Spencer's] mind in that matter […] I find something will happen which may be shocking and uneasy to the Queen', though he did not specify what he believed Anne might find 'shocking and uneasy'.[73]

At the same time, John Churchill realised that Anne was determined to resist all Whig-supported appointments for as long as possible. His perspective of the Queen's actions can be reconstructed from his suggestion to Godolphin on 24 June that he should approach Anne with Harley 'to lett the Queen see with all the freedome and plainness imaginable her trew interest' by having Harley as her Tory favourite recommend she appoint Trelawny to close the matter.[74] Godolphin's response came in a letter where he declared that Churchill's strategy would make no difference to Anne's likelihood of settling the Trelawny affair:

> … Harley does so hate and fear [the Junto] that he omits no occasion of filling the queen's head with their projects and designs; and if [I] should take him with me upon any occasion of that kind, he would either say nothing or argue against what the others say as he did upon some subjects, some months since when [you] were present.[75]

Godolphin also reported in the same letter that Anne's stance on the appointment of Blackall and Dawes was that her royal promise had been given and thus the matter was closed. Godolphin declared that Anne:

> … has indulged her own inclinations in the choice of some persons to succeed the bishops and which give the greatest offence to the Whigs that can bee. [Anne] has gone so farr in this matter (even against my warnings) than really to bee no more able than willing to retract this wrong step.[76]

Godolphin's view was that Anne's situation was clear. She refused (despite Godolphin

[73] HMC, *Bath*, Vol. I, pp. 173-174, Godolphin to Harley, 14 June 1707.
[74] Blenheim, A 2-23, Godolphin to John Churchill, 24 June 1707.
[75] *ibid.*
[76] *ibid.*

and Churchill's advice) to appoint Whig-supported bishops. The Duumvirs' hopes of Harley being a contributing factor in seeing the Queen make what they considered the correct ecclesiastical decisions for parliamentary reasons also seemed unlikely as Harley, according to Godolphin's words to Churchill on 24 June, 'feared and hated' the Junto.[77] Godolphin subsequently identified the political forces driving Anne's ecclesiastical decisions, but he also recognised Harley as more likely to argue against the Junto rather than persuading Anne to side with them. Harley's position accordingly did nothing to aid in the Whig determination to see Whig-supporting bishops appointed.

Remembering that the Junto declared 'the world cannot believe [Godolphin] could not' influence the Queen's decisions, by early July Churchill had realised that he and Godolphin were losing control of Anne.[78] Churchill viewed his advisory position to the Queen as being at a crossroads if Harley's determination against the Whigs could not be subdued, and Godolphin's inability to persuade Anne towards the Junto's wishes could not be rectified. That Churchill saw the potential decline in his influence over the Queen, and subsequently attempted to rectify the situation can be seen from a letter he sent to her on 7 July. He questioned Harley's sincerity and doubted the Tory support Anne could expect when he wrote:

> It must end in betraying your quite, whoever goes about to persuaide you that you can be served at this time by the Torrys, considering the malice of their chiefs, and the behaviour of the greatest part of the cleargy, besides the Nation is of opinion that if they had the management of your affaires, they would not carry this war on with vigor, on which depends your happiness and the safety of our religion. I would beg as a favour, if anybody near your person is of opinion that the Torrys may be trusted, and at this time made use of, that you would be pleased to order them to put their project in writing, and know if they will charge themselves with the execution, then you will see their sincerity by excusing themselves.[79]

Churchill's letter is an attempt to separate Anne from Harley, as Churchill was aware that his and Godolphin's influence could be lost to Harley's Tory guidance. The Duumvirs were simultaneously conscious that their political advance lay with the Whigs and a significant factor in their Whiggish success or failure would be

[77] *ibid.*
[78] Snyder, 'Reign of Anne', p. 157.
[79] Blenheim, B 2-23, John Churchill to Anne, 7 July 1707.

determined by their ability to influence the Queen. Churchill wrote to Anne to tell her that his and Godolphin's situation within the Whig party was clear, but they did not receive a response from the Queen.[80] There is no mention in Harley's correspondence of Churchill's 7 July letter, though the surest sign that Anne ignored Churchill's words comes from Godolphin's correspondence with Churchill on 8 July when he stated that Anne 'did not say the least word of her having had a letter from you'.[81] Godolphin also acknowledges that the Queen continued to demonstrate her royal prerogative 'of the Crown' and to act 'without consultation with [her] ministers', as she remained steadfastly devoted to appointing Blackall and Dawes to the sees in question.[82] Thus, Anne had no interest in relinquishing any power to the Junto regarding an issue over which they held no authority.

The diminishing influence of the Duumvirs over the bishoprics and regius professorship led Sarah Churchill to seek the Queen's attention in mid-July, but Churchill's outreach to Anne did not begin a dialogue. Churchill's unhappiness about being supplanted in the Queen's favour with Abigail Masham is also evident, though this conclusion must be interpreted from Anne's response to Churchill as Anne appears to have burnt Churchill's letters concerning this topic.[83] Anne's response to Churchill's letters nonetheless suggests that Churchill had been testing the Queen's loyalty to her, which can be seen by Anne's response of:

> … I am exstreamly Conserned to find [your] unkind & unjust thoughts continue still of my being changed, & that you can think me capable of being catched with flattery, indeed I am nether, for I have ye same sincere tender passion for you as ever.[84]

Anne's words indicate that she was eager to have Churchill believe that others were not influencing her, and that she was as loyal to Churchill as she had ever been. Later in the same letter, the Queen also confessed that:

---

[80] *ibid.*
[81] Cited in: Bennett, 'Bishoprics Crisis', p. 739; Sykes, 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', p. 445.
[82] *ibid.*
[83] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 17 June 1707; Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill 18 June 1707; Blenheim, G 17, Sarah Churchill to Anne 13 July 1707; Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill 16 July 1707; Sarah Churchill, *Authentick Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Her Grace, Sarah, Late Dutchess of Marlborough*, London, Hooke, 1744, p. 184.
[84] Blenheim, E 18, Anne to Sarah Churchill, 18 June 1707.

> I must own I have of late bin a little afraid to speak on any Subjects that we differd upon, becaus you have bin pleased to think I have shut my eyes, that I am infatuated, that I am fond of some people […] & when I happen not to agree in ye very good opinion you have some, & ye very ill of others, then you think that proceeds from ye wrong informations & notions that some sort of people give me. & all I can say to justify myself is not to be believed, these are ye reasons that have made me seem reserved tho I am not so in my hart.[85]

Despite Anne's explanation of why she may have appeared reserved with Sarah Churchill ('tho I am not so in my hart'), from Churchill's point of view, the critical passage in the letter was that the Queen had not sought Churchill's opinion 'on any Subjects that we differd upon'.[86] Like Sarah Churchill's husband and Godolphin before her, Sarah had lost the power she once held over the Queen. When Churchill realised she had lost her influence over Anne, she changed tactics to be more forceful and direct with the Queen knowing that she had the political support of the Junto behind her. This change in tactics further demonstrated the loss of Anne's support structure, and can be seen in a letter she wrote to Anne on 18 July 1707. Churchill attacked Robert Harley on several fronts: his ability to hold a leading position in cabinet; his motives when advising the Queen; and Anne's willingness to follow his lead.[87] Churchill's criticism of Harley quickly turned into an attack on George Smallridge (the Tory candidate for the regius professorship), as Churchill declared 'hee [Smallridge] has been as violent as any in everything of late' in the promotion of his beliefs and attack of those who criticised them.[88] She thus attacked Smallridge rather than directly promoting her candidate, John Potter, just as she had belittled Sir Charles Hedges's capabilities as Secretary of State for the South when she hoped to see Charles Spencer appointed to the position.

The Queen did not respond to Sarah Churchill's criticisms of her selection or Harley's influence. A letter from Godolphin to John Churchill several weeks later nonetheless suggests Anne's choice remained of primary interest to the Duumvirs, Sarah Churchill and the Junto. However, Godolphin's letter states that nothing changed in Anne's intentions or devotion to Harley or his cousin, Abigail Masham, the pair who had replaced the Duumvirs and Sarah Churchill as the Queen's adviser

---

[85] *ibid.*
[86] *ibid.*
[87] Blenheim, G 17, Sarah Churchill to Anne, 18 July 1707.
[88] *ibid.*

and confidante. Godolphin declared that:

> I reckon one great occasion to the [Queen's] obstinacy, and of the uneasyness she gives herself and others, especially about the clergy, proceeds from an inclination of talking more free than usually to Abigail. And this is layd hold of, and improved by Harley upon all such matters, if not upon others, to insinuate his notions [which] are as wrong as possible.[89]

The Duumvirs' solution to their lack of control was that they would become 'quiet, and let [Harley and Masham] do as they please', potentially because they were aware of the Junto's plans.[90]

In a much-discussed historical event, at the end of August the Junto met at Spencer's home, Althorp, where he and the Whig leaders plotted how Harley would be removed from office.[91] The meeting demonstrates how politics were used to overrule the Queen's political and religious aspirations. Godolphin was aware that if Anne compromised with the Junto, their determination to remove Harley might be averted. His realisation and subsequent suggestion for how to defuse the issues is apparent from a letter Godolphin sent to her on 11 September in which he proposed that she could appoint a Whig-supported bishop to the see of Exeter rather than her Tory-sympathetic candidate, Offspring Blackall.[92] Anne flatly rejected the suggestion in a letter the following day and declared that 'I could not answer it neither to God Almighty nor my Self, my conscience & honour being so far ingaged to that matter'.[93]

The Queen and her advisers' stalemate continued through September. A change was nonetheless forced in October as Parliament was soon resuming which ensured that issues that had been discussed in letters or in private could soon be publicly disputed in Parliament. Anne's actions suggest she ultimately knew she would never come out victorious concerning the bishops' appointments, and finally she was essentially forced by the circumstances to make the Whigs an offer of peace. In exchange for giving Blackall and Dawes their promised bishoprics, 'for the future she was resolved to give them [the Whigs] full content [control]' over ecclesiastical appointments.[94] The Queen had pragmatically accepted that ecclesiastical selections,

---

[89] Blenheim, A 2-23, Godolphin to John Churchill, 16 August 1707.
[90] Blenheim, A 1-37, Marlborough to Godolphin, 18 August 1707.
[91] Add MSS, 4294, f. 46: Burnet to Tenison, 27 August 1707.
[92] Blenheim, B 11, Godolphin to Anne, 11 September 1707.
[93] Add MSS, 52,540, Anne to Godolphin, 12 September 1707.
[94] Gilbert Burnet, *History of His own Time*, London, Thomas Ward, 1724, p. 340.

an area where her royal prerogative still reigned, had been taken from her by the Whigs' political prowess.

Thus, almost a year after Peter Mews had died the previous November, the Junto, Duumvirs, and Sarah Churchill had spent months determining how to manipulate the Queen only to have Blackall and Dawes be given their bishoprics. Nonetheless, the Queen's decision to cede ecclesiastical control of appointments and translations to the Whigs demonstrates that she conceded that her wishes (in an area where she technically held complete power) had been overruled by the combined power of the Junto and the Whig-filled Parliament.[95]

John Potter was also given the regius professorship at Oxford in early 1708 after being supported by the Churchills 'since the previous March'.[96] His appointment indicates that the Duumvirs' and Sarah Churchill's power was secondary to the Junto.[97] The Bishoprics Crisis, Anne's role in it, and the wider implications on her alliances tested her religious and political skills.[98] Most notably for Anne, it became evident that if she was going to regain any influence over the Church or Parliament, this would have to be done without the Duumvirs, Sarah Churchill and most of the members of her own cabinet.

Clerical appointments during and following the Crisis

Even as the Whig-majority in parliament continued to challenge the Queen's royal prerogative regarding ecclesiastical choices, documentary evidence shows she remained dedicated to the Church and Tory party where possible, and used imagination and strategy to circumvent the political interference of the Duumvirs and Junto. The Bishoprics Crisis can be characterised as a political contest between the Queen, the Duumvirs and the Junto with empty bishoprics being the flashpoint of the political dispute. As politicians, advisers and the Queen fought over Chester and Exeter, and the regius professorship at Oxford, other appointments and translations occurred. These lesser selections are little discussed in the modern scholarship, however, they provide insights into the Crisis and demonstrate the extent of which the Junto

[95] Roger Coke, *A Detection of the Court and State of England during the Four Last Reigns*, London, Bell, 1697, pp. 480-481.
[96] Bennett, 'Bishoprics Crisis', p. 746.
[97] *ibid*.
[98] *ibid*.

appreciated that religious positions were worth fighting for because religious power translated into political power and control.[99]

When John Moore, Bishop of Norwich, was translated to the wealthier see of Ely as part of the repercussions of the Bishoprics Crisis on 31 July 1707, it left Norwich available.[100] Tenison saw an opportunity to bolster the number of Whig supporters in the episcopate and recommended Anne appoint Charles Trimnell. Tenison had previously suggested Trimnell to Anne for the see of Exeter after it became available following Jonathan Trelawny's promotion to Winchester in 1706, and later for the see of Chester after Nicolas Stratford's death on 12 February 1707.[101] Exeter went to Offspring Blackall and Chester to William Dawes as these were the translations that Anne had made before she was 'for the future […] resolved to give them [the Whigs] full content' over clerical appointments.[102] As the Queen had achieved seeing Blackall and Dawes translated, she took John Churchill's advice in January 1708 and, to avoid alienating the 'church whig' group, she approved Tenison's third suggestion of Trimnell and appointed him to Norwich.[103]

Two months later on 5 March 1708, William Beveridge died. He had been the Tory whom Anne selected for St Asaph on 16 July 1704 as part of her initial appointments of Tory-supportive bishops.[104] The Queen's agreement to allow Whig control over appointments and translations of bishops ensured Beveridge's replacement would not be a Tory choice. The selected candidate was William Fleetwood, the rector of Wexham since 1706, who had Whig sympathies and had risen

---

[99] See G. V. Bennett, Geoffrey Holmes and Robert Bucholz on the Crisis from a largely political standpoint. See: Bennett, 'Bishoprics Crisis', pp. 726-746; Geoffrey Holmes, *Politics, Religion, and Society in England 1679-1742*, London, Hambledon, 1986, pp. 120-125; Holmes, *British Politics*; Robert Bucholz, *The Augustan Court*, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, 1993.

[100] Peter Meadows, 'Moore, John (1646–1714)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/19126, accessed 26 October 2015.

[101] W. M. Jacob, 'Trimnell, Charles (*bap.* 1663, *d.* 1723)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/27742, accessed 26 October 2015.

[102] Burnet, *His Own Time*, p. 340.

[103] Jacob, 'Trimnell, Charles', *ODNB*.

[104] Leonard W. Cowie, 'Beveridge, William (bap. 1637, d. 1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/2321, accessed 10 September 2015.

to prominence under William and Tenison.[105] However, he had also gained favour with Anne as she believed his sermons showed a dedication to the Church as a sacred institution rather than more Erastian Whig considerations.[106] Her satisfaction with him is evident as she routinely referred to him as 'my bishop'.[107] Her fondness for him as a clergyman may be what made him acceptable to the Queen, but Fleetwood could offer her little help politically.[108] The selection of bishops was far from straightforward and the next round of appointments show the Queen could occasionally have her way despite a Whig ascendency. When John Williams, Bishop of Chichester, died on 24 April 1709, Anne secured a Tory and High Church supporter despite the Whigs' technical control over ecclesiastical appointments. Williams had been appointed to Chichester in 1696 during the peak of William III's and Tenison's actions in filling the episcopate with Whig-sympathetic bishops.[109] Williams was replaced by Thomas Manningham who had served as chaplain to William and Mary, but he had also gained favour with Anne during her reign via public declarations of support for her right to print sermons which he declared were 'her gift to the publick'.[110] Anne subsequently knew Manningham and his dedication to the Church, and appointed him to Chichester.[111] It should be noted that the appointment has left behind little in the way of records of discussion between Anne and her clerical advisers, or of Whig protests.

Some appointments made during and after the Crisis are less discussed by scholars but still play a significant role in the context of assessing the factors that guided Anne's determination to still prioritise the Church during her reign. Firstly, her appointment of Trimnell demonstrates that even after the Whigs gained quantified influence over ecclesiastical appointments, Anne remained aware that choosing the

---

[105] Stuart Handley, 'Fleetwood, William (1656–1723)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/9691, accessed 27 October 2015.
[106] Jennifer Farooq, 'Preaching for the Queen: Queen Anne and English Sermon Culture, 1702-1714', *Journal of Eighteenth Century Studies* Vol. 37, No. 2, 2014, p. 166.
[107] Cited in: Charles Doble, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne: Vol. II*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1885, p. 104.
[108] *ibid*.
[109] J. S. Chamberlain, 'Williams, John (1633x6–1709)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/29516, accessed 26 October 2015.
[110] Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 97-98.
[111] Chamberlain, 'Williams, John', *ODNB*.

right Whig-sympathetic bishops were necessary if she wished to retain a voice in parliamentary decisions. Similarly, Fleetwood may have been selected for Anne by the Whigs, but he was a bishop whom she appeared to believe was acceptable and may side with some of her religious objectives. Manningham's appointment nonetheless makes clear Anne's focus on translating Tory-supportive bishops, and paved the way for some success in ecclesiastical selections when the Junto was distracted with more pressing political strife as foreign wars continued and loomed. Anne thus accepted the Whig compromise, but the Queen furthered her own objectives whenever the opportunity presented itself.

Summary

During 1706, the Junto exerted the very real power they held over the Queen and they subsequently exercised their dominance alongside the Duumvirs and Sarah Churchill. The Queen saw her long-term favourites betray her in favour of prestige, in the case of John and Sarah Churchill, and preference for parliamentary security, in the case of Godolphin. What had become apparent by the end of 1706, is that politics and personal relationships were having the greatest impact on Anne's inability to influence the Church as she had hoped. The Bishoprics Crisis also greatly decreased the Queen's ability to exercise power in the specific area of selecting bishops. Her capacity to choose bishops was one of the few remaining controls her royal prerogative gave her, but the Junto with the Duumvirs' assistance had determined how to use politics to guide Anne's ecclesiastical choices. The Junto wanted ecclesiastical control for political reasons, and subsequently the Queen found some balance and success in having appointments made with which she generally agreed.

Anne had nonetheless experienced a significant breakdown in any ability to influence Parliament or the Church by the end of Spencer's appointment and the Bishoprics Crisis. However, as the Junto's power continued to increase, some members of her cabinet and Parliament were growing cautious of them gaining overwhelming political control.

CHAPTER NINE - The Queen Regains Influence (1708-1714)

This chapter examines the implications for Anne's regality of events from the end of the Bishoprics Crisis to her death in 1714. The broad contention of this thesis is that the clarity of Anne's religious and political perspectives conflicted with the political and religious demands of her councillors, bishops and parliamentarians, and she was not able to see many of her objectives achieved. She never saw her original attempts at the Occasional Conformity bills pass through Parliament though the bill was passed in 1711 after more than half a decade of her having few avenues to pursue regarding the bill. She never established a Tory-sympathetic majority who shared her objectives in the Upper House of Convocation, or made the politicians in the House of Lords become more agreeable to her High Church and Tory views on how the Church should interact with government and society. This chapter further exemplifies this point, but in assessing the second half of Anne's reign, it also analyses her emerging strategies as she negotiated the politics of religion of her own reign. She never cowered, and when faced with defeat she did not back down, but refined her approach to attempt to combat the manipulation of her authority by the Whigs, some of the Tories, and many from within her inner circle. In these actions the child of Compton's education becomes apparent.

By the conclusion of what is now called the Bishoprics Crisis, Anne had temporarily lost control of what little influence she held over her beloved Church of England. This chapter's analysis of this loss of control begins with the Duumvirs forcing Robert Harley out of the cabinet. An assessment of Prince George's death in 1708 then focuses on the repercussions to Anne's leadership of her finding herself further isolated from her cabinet and advisers, and having one less trusted confidante after George's death. An examination of Henry Sacheverell's trial examining this event from Anne's perspective then considers its implications for her rule, and illuminates how the Junto gained too much power in the view of many of England's elite before support partly returned to the Queen. After a show of voter displeasure with the Whigs and confidence in the Tory party after the general elections in 1710, Anne re-established control of the Church as much as possible. However, the chapter finally determines that though Anne regained control of ecclesiastical appointments, she ultimately did not live long enough to replace the major Whig-sympathetic bishops

such as Thomas Tenison, William Wake, or Gilbert Burnet, with Tory-supportive clergymen to gain a controlling influence over the bishops of the Church.

Substantial amounts of detail of the events that shaped the last years of Anne's reign are on record. It was a paper-heavy, epistolary, and enclosed world where she, the Junto, the Duumvirs, Robert Harley, Sarah Churchill, Thomas Tenison, John Sharp, and Gilbert Burnet wrote personal letters to each other that discussed political and clerical issues of great significance. Additionally, many of these people recorded their version of events in their diaries, memoirs, or personal historical reflections. Being the later period of Anne's reign, the letters and diaries of figures who became prominent in the second half of her rule also become relevant, including those from Dr David Hamilton, Abigail Masham, and Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury. Analysis of these sources helps to frame the later events of Anne's reign not only from her perspective, but also from the views of the various players who affected her ability to guide Parliament and the Church.

Robert Harley's removal and Prince George's death

The Bishoprics Crisis in part resulted in a series of events that ended in Robert Harley's removal from office, and it is a significant outcome for assessing the events of Anne's rule as she continued her reign without her primary Tory adviser. Godolphin and John Churchill entered talks with Harley about possible changes to cabinet as the Bishoprics Crisis ended. The Duumvirs realised that the Junto was gaining unsurmountable power following their appointment of Spencer, success in the Crisis, and dismissal of the Queen's wishes.

Surviving evidence suggests that letters between the trio began on 5 December 1707 and suggest Harley had formed a 'moderate scheme […] to rescue the ministry and defeat the Junto'.[1] That the exchange took place is a testament to the Duumvirs becoming aware that the Junto had gained too much control. Harley's plan relied heavily on trust as his proposal involved reconstituting the Queen's cabinet with his own followers.[2] The Duumvirs agreed to the plan because they did not favour High

[1] The letters between Godolphin, John Churchill, and Harley date from 5 December 1707 and are discussed in: G. V. Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707', *The English Historical Review* Vol. 82, No. 325, 1967, p. 743.
[2] *ibid*.

Tories but nor did they support unchecked Junto control as had occurred through much of 1706 and 1707.[3]

From Anne's perspective, she had lost faith in the Duumvirs as they sided with the Whigs, but if they used their influence to promote a moderate government then their presence was worthwhile despite their past failings.[4] Harley's proposal also became feasible because of a general parliamentary revolt against the Junto's hope to continue the War of the Spanish Succession. Some Whigs pushed for further involvement in the conflict, but the financial cost of war had turned many politicians against England's participation.[5] The shift in public opinion can be seen in a letter penned by Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, to Charles de la Faye. Talbot had minimal contact with Anne in 1707 as he only returned from self-imposed exile in Europe in 1705, but, as a statesman since Charles II's reign, Talbot had political experience which later led him to become one of the Queen's dependable favourites. Talbot recorded that:

> … pease is much wanted & desired in the Country for tho we have plenty of all things, money is so scarce, that nobodys rents are payd which makes the land tax felt heavily. I speak not for my self […] but I speak the general voice.[6]

The desire for peace (and, to not keep funding a war) made Harley's scheme possible, but Anne saw the prospect of other opportunities. A letter she wrote to John Sharp on 16 December demonstrates that only eleven days after Harley and the Duumvirs first entered talks, she saw the chance that presented itself when she instructed Sharp to:

> … give no countenance to the Whig Lords, but that all the Tories, if they would, should come in; and all the Whigs likewise, that would show themselves to be in her interests, should have favour.[7]

Anne's letter clearly establishes that she was encouraged by the unexpected opportunity to cut the Junto's power. She was eager to ensure that the archbishop

---

[3] *ibid.*
[4] *ibid.*
[5] National Archives, State Papers Domestic (SP) 34/8 f. 160, Charles Talbot to Charles de la Faye, 5 October 1707.
[6] *ibid.*
[7] John Sharp's diary, 16 December 1707, see: Thomas Sharp, *The Life of John Sharp: Archbishop of York Vol. I*, London, Rivington, 1825, p. 323.

informed those he had influence with that her power was returning, and that the time had come for them to show her favour if they hoped to receive it in return.[8] Despite Anne's certainty that Harley's moderate scheme would return some level of power to her via a cabinet substantially filled with Tories, his plan was not executed with precision. After Harley had criticised the Duumvirs' efforts in the War of the Spanish Succession, Godolphin and John Churchill believed Harley's ultimate goal was to see them removed along with the Junto so he would have the greatest influence over the Queen.[9] Godolphin's suspicions are apparent from a letter he wrote to Harley on 30 January 1708:

> I am very sorry for what has happened to lose the good opinion I had so much inclination to have of you, but I cannot help seeing and hearing, nor believing my senses. I am very far from having deserved it [criticism] from you. God forgive you![10]

None of John Churchill's archived letters discuss his anger at Harley's criticism or suspicion that Harley's goal was to have him and Godolphin removed from cabinet, but his actions make the Duumvirs' feelings clear. On the evening of 8 February 1708, the Duumvirs and Sarah Churchill met with Anne and threatened to resign from her service if Harley was not removed.[11] Sir John Cropley, Member of Parliament for Shaftesbury, provides the record of the meeting which is usually cited by historians. Cropley's record suggests that '[Godolphin] told ye Queen he came to resign ye Staff, that serving her longer with one so perfidious as Mr Harley was impossible'.[12] Anne then replied that 'in respect of his long service, she would give him til tomorrow to Consider when he should doe'.[13] Cropley next recorded that:

> … then enter'd ye [John Churchill], prepar'd with his utmost address. He told her he had ever served her with obedience and fidelity […] that he must lament he came in Competition with so vile a creature as Harley.[14]

---

[8] *ibid.*
[9] Geoffrey Holmes and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708 Reconsidered', *English Historical Review* Vol. 80, No. 317, 1965, pp. 677-678.
[10] Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *Bath*, Vol. I, p. 190, Godolphin to Harley, 30 January 1708.
[11] PRO 30/24/21, f. 12, Sir John Cropley to Shaftesbury, 9 February 1708.
[12] *ibid.*
[13] *ibid.*
[14] *ibid.*

Churchill declared that if Harley's service 'should continue as long as [Churchill's] breath', then he would be forced to make it his duty to 'be speedy in resigning his Commands, that [Anne] might put his sword into some other hand immediately'.[15] The Queen responded, 'then, My Lord, you will resign me your sword'.[16]

Cropley portrays Anne triumphantly accepting Churchill's resignation, but if so, the Queen's and Harley's euphoria was short-lived. The Duumvirs had led England and then Great Britain through military difficulties and onto successes, and their dismissal caused concern for the Whig-majority in the House of Lords, but also the Tory-dominated House of Commons. The Duumvirs subsequently immediately gained public support from Algernon Seymour, 7th Duke of Somerset, Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1st Duke of Newcastle, and William Cavendish, 2nd Duke of Devonshire.[17] Harley gained no public declarations of support and, by the end of 9 February (the day after Anne had accepted Churchill's resignation), the Queen summoned the Duumvirs and told them she would remove Harley. Harley's few supporters, Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke, Simon Harcourt, 1st Viscount Harcourt, and Thomas Mansel, 1st Baron Mansel, were also removed from cabinet.[18] The removal of several Tories from office additionally meant their positions were filled with Whigs. Henry Boyle replaced Harley as Secretary of State, and Robert Walpole (later Britain's first prime minister) became Secretary of War in place of Henry St John.[19] The significance of Harley's official removal (unofficially, he remained close, influential, and in regular contact with Anne) and the other changes to Anne's cabinet can be seen in light of their repercussions to her leadership, as the Queen's hope of seeing moderate-Toryism rise in government had resulted in further Whig domination.

She was, however, simultaneously met with a greater personal crisis. In late September 1708, Prince George fell ill. His health was a topic of discussion between Godolphin and John Churchill, with Godolphin's closeness to the Queen's innermost circle meaning he likely possessed accurate information which had been preserved and is now archived. He informed Churchill in a letter dated 4 October that 'the Prince has

[15] *ibid.*
[16] *ibid.*
[17] PRO 30/24/21, f. 11, Sir John Cropley to Shaftesbury, 9 February 1708.
[18] Angus McInnes, *Robert Harley: Puritan Politician*, London, Littlehampton, 1970, p. 121.
[19] British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers (Blenheim), A 2-38, Godolphin to John Churchill, 21 July 1708.

been very ill of a violent cold, and the Queen much alarmed at it'.[20] Godolphin went on to explain that George 'is much better', but then his illness began a downwards slide.[21] On 23 October, George became sick once again. Godolphin (again possessing detailed information) informed Sarah Churchill that:

> The Prince seems to bee in no good way at all (in my opinion) as to his health, and I think the Queen herself seems now much more apprehensive of his condition, than I have formerly remembered upon the same occasion.[22]

There was no improvement to Prince George's condition as Anne constantly waited by his side. Her reaction to her husband's ill-health is described in a letter from Richard Steele to his wife. Steele may now be better known as a journalist, but in 1708 he had for three years been a member of Prince George's household.[23] Steele's position meant that when he wrote that Anne waited on George 'with such care and concern', he probably witnessed the display himself, and he was also likely present on the afternoon of 28 October when George died.[24] James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos (also Member of Parliament for Hereford and paymaster of the Queen's forces), provides one of the few accounts of the impact of George's death. Though it must be noted that he did not hold as close a position as Godolphin, Harley or Steele, Brydges nonetheless provides a detailed account that is often cited by historians. He wrote that the day after the Prince's death:

> His [George's] death had flung the Queen into an unspeakable grief. She never left him til he was dead, but continued kissing him the very moment his breath went out of his body.[25]

George's death was devastating to Anne, but there were additional political consequences from the loss of her husband of twenty-five years. She had become

---

[20] *ibid*.
[21] *ibid*.
[22] Blenheim, E 20, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 25 October 1708.
[23] Calhoun Winton, 'Steele, Sir Richard (*bap.* 1672, *d.* 1729)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26347, accessed 1 October 2016.
[24] Richard Steele to Mrs Steele, 28 October 1708, see, Rae Blanchard (ed.), *Correspondence of Richard Steele*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1941, pp. 242-243.
[25] James Brydges to Cadogan, 29 October 1708, see, Godfrey Davies, 'The Seamy Side of Marlborough's War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No 1, 1951, pp. 40-41.

further personally and politically isolated from her cabinet and her leading advisers, and had one less trusted confidant at a time when she had so few. This fact was illuminated by Abigail Masham whose intimate friendship ensured she possessed insights into Anne's life and behaviour, and was witness to the Queen's isolation during the first weeks after George's death. She reported to Robert Harley on 6 November that:

> My poor aunt [her code for Anne] is in a very deplorable condition, for now her ready money [courage] is all gone […] she has shut and bolted the door upon herself.[26]

The most succinct summary of Anne's condition perhaps comes from Edward Gregg who wrote in his biography of the Queen:

> She had lost eighteen children; her dearest friend and confidante had become estranged from her; her own health was precarious and she was to a great extent living the life of an invalid. Now her husband, her partner in a marriage which scandal had never touched and in which harmony had reigned, was taken from her. Inevitably, this final tragedy temporarily broke her spirit […] but it did not break her will to be recognised as one of the Rulers of the World.[27]

Her actions over the previous years indicate that she also hoped to remain pivotal in influencing the Church's place in English society and government.

The trial of Henry Sacheverell

The Queen's juggling of bishops and removal of Harley and other Tories from her cabinet was how the first decade of the eighteenth century finished for Anne. However, public events that did not directly involve her such as the trial of the High Church clergyman Dr Henry Sacheverell in 1710, also reveal more about her determination to secure and maintain the Church despite her having minimal influence on the matter. Modern research on Sacheverell's trial is extensive, but these events also had an impact on Anne's leadership, an aspect of the controversy which is more rarely

[26] *ibid*.
[27] Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne*, New York, Routledge, 1980 (2014 reprint), p. 280.

studied.[28] Reviewing the circumstances leading up to, and the developments after the trial, establishes that this clerical, political and legal event had significant repercussions for the Queen's political and ecclesiastical authority.

London's Lord Mayor for 1709-1710, Sir Samuel Garrard, 4th Baronet, was a Tory politician.[29] As mayor, it was his responsibility to appoint the preacher for the annual 5 November sermon at St Paul's Cathedral to commemorate the joint anniversary of the failed 1605 Gunpowder Plot and William III's landing at Torbay in 1688.[30] Garrard selected Henry Sacheverell.[31] The Queen had no influence in Garrard's decision, and she had no personal connection with Sacheverell. However, the High Church emphasis of his sermons had been apparent throughout her reign and some were printed, including *The Character of a Low-Church-Man* in 1702, and *The Rights of the Church of England Asserted and Proved* in 1705, before he gained the chaplaincy at St Saviour's in Southwark.[32]

Sacheverell's 5 November 1710 sermon, *The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State*, was an attack on the Whig-majority government and the Whigs themselves.[33] He compared the failed Gunpowder Plot not to William's landing, but to the execution of Charles I, declaring that the Plot and the King's execution were two days of:

---

[28] Holmes, *Doctor Sacheverell*; Jones, 'Debates in the House of Lords', pp. 759-771; Mark Knights, *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell*, London, Wiley, 2012; Brian Cowan, *The State Trial of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*, London, Wiley, 2012.

[29] David C. Elliot, 'Garrard, Sir Samuel, fourth baronet (1651–1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10403, accessed 12 December 2016.

[30] British Library, Landsdowne Manuscripts, 1024, f. 199, Garrard's statement to the House of Commons, 14 December 1710.

[31] *ibid*.

[32] *The Character of a Low-Church-Man* attacked William Lloyd for being a Whig-sympathetic bishop and warned clergy to follow the monarch's beliefs. See: Henry Sacheverell, *The Character of a Low-church-man: Drawn in an Answer to The True Character of a Church-man*, London, Booksellers of Great Britain, 1702. *The Rights of the Church of England Asserted and Proved* reiterated the power he believed the Church and its Supreme Governor should hold over Parliament. See: Daniel Defoe and Walter Wilson (eds.), *Memoirs of the Life and Time of Daniel De Foe Vol. II*, London, Hurst, 1830, p. 247. The hopes of Thomas Tenison and the Whig-sympathetic bishops were not enough to defeat Henry Sacheverell's chaplaincy campaign and he was chosen for the position by 28 votes to 19 on 24 May 1709. See, William Bisset, *The Modern Fanatick: With a Large and True Account of the Life of Dr Sacheverell*, London, Baldwin, 1710, pp. 17-18.

[33] Henry Sacheverell, *The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State*, London, Publisher not listed, 1710.

> … rage and bloodthirstiness of both the popish and fanatick enemies of our Church and Government. […] These TWO DAYS indeed are but one united proof and visible testimonial of the same dangerous and rebellious principles these confederates in iniquity maintain.[34]

Sacheverell commented on those who denied obedience to God and the Supreme Governor of the Church when he declared:

> … the steady belief in the subject's obligation to absolute and unconditional Obedience to the Supreme Power in all things lawful, and the utter illegality of Resistance upon any pretence whatsoever.[35]

Sacheverell's attack was aimed at anyone not absolutely and unconditionally obedient to Anne. Sacheverell's decision to assert the primacy of Anne's rule by denouncing William's kingship also represents a rare instance of this approach. In the past, the Queen's opponents had used comparisons between her and William to condemn *her* abilities. As discussed earlier, when Anne acceded to the throne, diarist John Evelyn and Dutch diplomat Anthonie Heinsius recorded criticisms of Anne based on her perceived feminine weakness compared to William, the 'warrior king' who could keep England safe from the Jacobites.[36] Though not all criticism was as straight-forward as men's concerns about womanly weakness, initially she was distrusted by the Tories as well. During the aftermath of the failed vote for the second Occasional Conformity bill in 1703, John Churchill recorded that disgruntled High Tories had used propaganda to declare that Anne was just as much a Whig-sympathetic monarch as William III.[37] Sacheverell broke that trend by arguing that William and his Whig and Low Church followers had nearly brought destruction to the Church and the kingdom. Sacheverell claimed that they advocated disobedience to the Church and Supreme Governors (like Anne) who attempted to make the security of the English Church their priority. What is evident about Sacheverell's sermon is that even though he had no clear personal links with Anne, his words promoted her values and royal prerogative. At the same time, the sermon also denounced those who inhibited her influence over the Church, and used their votes in Parliament or the Upper House of Convocation for Whig or

---

[34] *ibid*, p. 3.
[35] *ibid*, p. 12.
[36] John Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn Vol. IV*, E. S. de Beer (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1955, p. 173.
[37] Churchill, *Marlborough*, p. 704.

Low Church purposes.

As Sacheverell left St Paul's a crowd cheered, and after the 500 copies of the initial print run of his sermon sold out by 25 November, the second and third print runs numbered 30,000 and 40,000 copies, respectively.[38] The attention Sacheverell received ensured that by the end of November many Whigs hoped to punish him. In the House of Lords, the Whig majority could use their votes to see his goods confiscated, a fine charged, or have him imprisoned for his outburst.[39] However, lawyers examined the sermon and decided that Sacheverell had chosen his words so carefully that the address could not clearly be labelled seditious.[40] The alternate method of punishing Sacheverell was charging him at the Bar of the House of Commons for displaying contempt for the Commons resolutions, with a majority vote being enough to convict him.[41] With charges more likely to be laid at the Commons' Bar, on 13 December 1709, the Commons impeached Sacheverell of high crimes and ordered him to attend the Bar of the House.[42]

Much of this narrative is familiar, but can be sharpened and focused by considering Anne's reactions to what, after all, was a sermon that should have harmonised with her view of Church and State. Anne's first recorded response to Sacheverell's sermon occurred after she was informed of his impeachment and is not at all an expression of approval for what on the surface should have been a text in sympathy with her own views. According to Gilbert Burnet's memoirs, she told him that Sacheverell's 'was a bad sermon and that he deserved well to be punished for it'.[43] It is difficult to predict Anne's motivations or to know if she really spoke these words given that Burnet was a Whig-supportive bishop, but one interpretation can be made based on her general sentiments. One might suggest that Anne found it distasteful that the sermon attacked too many people with ferocity, and that Sacheverell could not attack members of both political parties and many from the clergy without some

[38] Harvard Digital Manuscripts, Houghton Manuscripts, Cholmondeley, f. 67, Clements's examination, http://hcl.harvard.edu/libraries/houghton/collections/early_manuscripts/about.cfm, accessed 18 November 2015.
[39] Alexander Cunningham, *A History of Great Britain Vol. II*, London, Strahan, 1787, p. 276.
[40] *ibid*.
[41] Henry Sacheverell, *The Tryal of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*, London, Rhames & Dickson, 1711, p. 146.
[42] Trumbull, MSS, LIII, 14 December 1710.
[43] Gilbert Burnet, *History of His own Time*, London, Thomas Ward, 1724, p. 446.

punishment that he 'deserved well'.[44]

The trial began two months later on 27 February 1710 and lasted three weeks. There are few indications of Anne's opinion on the matter. The Queen's perspective can be seen via a letter sent during the trial by Abigail Masham to her cousin, Robert Harley. Masham had one of the strongest personal associations with the Queen and wrote:

> I was with my aunt [Anne] last night on purpose to speak to her about Dr S and asked her if she did not let people know her mind in the matter. She said, 'No, she did not meddle one way or other, and that it was her friends' advice not to meddle'.[45]

Anne's decision to remain silent during the trial is noteworthy. Officially the monarch had no power to intervene in the trial. However, for much of her reign she had tried to gain influence, and yet the evidence suggests she made no attempt to interfere on behalf of a man who praised her, or to side with those he attacked in hope of gaining some favourability. One of the only other records that enables insights into Anne's views during the trial comes from one of her doctors, Dr David Hamilton. Hamilton had developed a close and growing relationship with her (judging by the increasing number of personal interactions he chronicled in his diary and correspondence), and recorded that the Queen declared:

> … that there ought to be a punishment but a mild one, least the mob appearing on his side should occasion great commotions and that his Impeachment had been better left alone.[46]

Anne may have been concerned about Sacheverell's trial causing civil unrest, but her belief regarding the outcome of the trial was prescient and societal order remained intact. Sacheverell was convicted by 69 votes to 52, but while his punishment could have been life imprisonment, his penalty of being suspended from preaching for three years was 'a mild one', as Anne had suggested.[47] She was also right in that, from a Whig perspective, Sacheverell's 'impeachment had been better left alone'.[48] Sections

---

[44] *ibid*.
[45] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. IV, p. 532, Abigail Masham to Robert Harley, February 1710.
[46] David Hamilton, *The Diary of Sir David Hamilton, 1709-1714*, Philip Roberts (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 6.
[47] *ibid*.
[48] *ibid*.

of the population (and Parliament) had grown cautious of the power that the Junto and Whigs had accumulated and how they attempted to use it.[49] Moderation about Sacheverell was one manifestation of these tensions and concerns.

That the Whig-majority in Parliament were losing ground to the Queen did not go unnoticed and there are opinions on record about a more triumphant and authoritative queen rising. High Tory Henry Somerset, 2nd Duke of Beaufort, declared to Anne 'Your Majesty, is now Queen indeed'.[50] This suggests that some appreciated that she now potentially had the ability to direct the kingdom if she chose. As historically familiar as the events surrounding Sacheverell's sermon and trial are, it is Anne's restrained reaction, her intuition about the public's reaction, and the subsequent comment by Somerset that hint at her growing political stakes that merit observation. As the Queen saw the beginning of a turn against the Whigs, she also saw her opportunity to gain influence in Parliament and the Church.

Transfer of power

Despite a perceived increase in the Queen's political power, she made no sudden or sweeping changes even as the Junto began losing some of its influence as 1710 began.[51] Parliament was prorogued until 5 April 1710, and when it returned Anne began making changes to her cabinet. Her reasons are outlined in the Queen's letters. On 13 April, she reported to Godolphin informing him that she intended to replace the Whig Henry Grey, 12th Earl of Kent, with the Tory Charles Talbot, 1st Duke of Shrewsbury. It was Talbot's letters in 1707 that had signalled the beginning of a shift away from the Junto as many politicians hoped to distance England from the Spanish Wars.[52] Anne wrote:

> I have not yet declared my intentions of giveing the Staff & ye key to the Duke of Shrewsbury because I would be ye first that should acquaint you with it.[53]

---

[49] *ibid.*
[50] Cited in: William Coxe, *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough*. London: Longman, 1820, p. 278.
[51] Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, London, Hambledon, 1967, p. 193; Holmes, *Politics and Religion*, pp. 185-190; Bucholz, *Augustan Court*, p. 170; Clyve Jones (ed.), *Politics in the Age of Anne: 40 Years On*, London, Wiley, 2009, p. 97, 102, 107.
[52] SP 34/8 f. 160, Charles Talbot to Charles de la Faye, 5 October 1707.
[53] Blenheim, B 11, Anne to Godolphin, 13 April 1710.

The Queen may have notified Godolphin about this change but she had no interest in his response as the following day she began the process of replacing Grey with Talbot. Talbot was a formidable Tory ally for the Queen and had a significant influence on her, a point Godolphin realised according to a letter he sent to Sarah Churchill where he declared that 'I incline to think that [Talbot] may soon come to have as much influence with the Queen as I used to have heretofore'.[54] There is no indication why Godolphin was surprised that Anne would favour the opinion of a Tory candidate of her own choosing at the expense of his influence. Considering his slow turn to the Whigs and threat to resign his position if he did not get his own way concerning Charles Spencer's appointment during 1706 and Harley's removal in 1708, respectively, repercussions to their relationship were inevitable.[55]

Anne's next target was Charles Spencer. Her dislike of Spencer had always been clear.[56] Her later feelings towards Spencer can be sourced from William Legge's (2nd Baron of Dartmouth) notes within Burnet's *History of His Own Time*, where Legge wrote that in 1710:

> … the Queen said, Lord Sunderland [Charles Spencer] always treated her with great rudeness and neglect, & chose to reflect in a very injurious manner upon all princes before her, as a proper entertainment for her.[57]

With Anne's feelings regarding Spencer clear and the results of the election signifying a shift against the Junto, she was keen to explore if the turn against the Junto could be exploited and Spencer removed. The precise details of her actions are lost but can be gauged from a letter by Godolphin to Sarah Churchill on 1 June 1710, wherein he informed Churchill that the Queen intended to remove Spencer from office as soon as possible.[58] Anne's increasing political power is further demonstrated in her determination to act as no one had the option to combat her choice directly after several years of her political and ecclesiastical selections being manipulated by others. Rather, Godolphin suggested to the Queen that Spencer's dismissal would leave John Churchill in a vulnerable position as her Lord Treasurer.[59] Regardless of whether there

[54] Blenheim, E 20, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 29 April 1710.
[55] British Museum Additional Manuscripts (Add MSS), 70,331, Anne to Godolphin, written by Harley, 20 August.
[56] Blenheim, B 11, Anne to John Churchill, 9 July 1706.
[57] Burnet, *His Own Time*, Dartmouth's Notes, p. 9.
[58] Blenheim, E 5, Godolphin to Sarah Churchill, 1 June 1710.
[59] Blenheim, B 2-8, Godolphin to John Churchill 2 June 1710.

was any validity to Godolphin's concern, his unease is evident from a letter he wrote to John Churchill on 2 June where he declared that:

> The Queen said Marlborough [John Churchill] was too reasonable to let a thing of this kind doe so much prejudice to himself, and to the whole world […] and that nobody knew better than Marlborough and myself, the repeated provocations that Sunderland had given.[60]

Talk of Spencer's dismissal also prompted Sarah Churchill to try to divert the anticipated course of action, although she too had lost her power over the Queen. Churchill and Anne rarely exchanged letters by June 1710, the divide between the two having steadily grown worse since Spencer was first forced into Anne's cabinet. Churchill's hope of sparing her son-in-law's position is clear from a letter she sent to Anne on 7 June which attempted some emotional manipulation of the widow and stated that she believed that, if Prince George were still alive, 'I am sure the Prince would have prevented your going into a scheme with a collection of the worst people in the kingdom'.[61] Despite this attempt, Churchill's letter made no difference to a queen who had regained some control over her own reign. Godolphin informed John Churchill on 12 June that Anne summoned Junto member John Somers, 1st Baron Somers, and confirmed she would be dismissing Spencer:

> … and [assured] him at the same time that she was entirely for moderation and she did not intend to make any other alterations, but this was a resolution she had taken for a long time, and that nothing could divert her from it.[62]

The Duumvirs then employed a tactic that had worked in the past when events had not gone as they had planned. A letter from Godolphin to the Queen, dated 14 June, warned that if she dismissed Spencer, John Churchill might resign from his military position. Anne's response is clear from her retort that:

> I have no thoughts of takeing the Duke of Marlborough from the heade of ye army, nor I dare say no body els has, if he & you should doe soe wrong a thing at any time, espesialy at this Critical Juncture, as to desert my Service, What Confusion might happen would lye at your doors & you alone would be answerable & no body els.[63]

---

[60] *ibid*.
[61] Blenheim, G 17, Sarah Churchill to Anne, 7 June 1710.
[62] Blenheim, B 2-9, John Churchill to Godolphin, 9 June 1710.
[63] Blenheim, B 11, Anne to Godolphin, 14 June 1710.

Her final thoughts on the issue were clear and the following day on 15 June she officially dismissed Spencer.[64]

The Queen had got what she desired: revenge for having Spencer forced on her. In eliminating Spencer, she also removed someone with whom she could not work; not because of his politics (she routinely worked with other Whigs) but because of his attitude, his 'rudeness and neglect', and 'very injurious manner' towards her.[65] Spencer's removal also marks another shift in the Queen's powers. She had been forced to appoint him because she had no way of combatting the Junto's wishes, just as she was compelled to give the Junto a degree of power over ecclesiastical appointments. However, Anne never gave up. She never hid her disdain for Spencer, and though it took four years, she bided her time until she could force her wishes to be implemented.

The events concerning Spencer's dismissal also make another point clear; Godolphin remained dedicated to the Churchills to a higher degree than he did to the Queen. Anne's increase in power and confidence in Robert Harley (who remained her close adviser despite his earlier removal), furthered eroded her deteriorating relationship with Godolphin. Her feelings are only recorded by Dr Hamilton (in what is again a testament to the close relationship he had with her during the period), who wrote that Anne declared:

> That the Duchess made my Lord Marlborough and my Lord Godolphin do any thing, and that when my Lord Godolphin was ever so finally resolv'd when with her Majesty, yet when he went to her [Sarah Churchill], she impress'd him to the Contrary.[66]

The culmination of Anne's increase in power, the influence from Harley, and Godolphin's refusal to favour her over the Churchills led to her dismissing him on 7 August 1710. Anne's removal and her reasoning are evident from a letter she sent to Godolphin.

> The uneasiness which you have showed for some time has given me very much trouble, though I have borne it; and had your behaviour continued

[64] Henry L. Snyder, 'Spencer, Charles, third earl of Sunderland (1675–1722)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26117, accessed 22 October 2015.
[65] Burnet, *His Own Time*, Dartmouth's Notes, p. 9.
[66] Roberts, *Hamilton Diary*, p. 9.

> the same it was for a few years after my coming to the crown, I could have no dispute with myself what to do. But the many unkind returns I have received since, especially what you said to me personally […] makes it impossible for me to continue you any longer in my service, but I will give you a pension of four thousand a year, and I desire that, instead of bringing the staff to me, you will break it, which I believe will be easier to us both.[67]

In another letter, undated, Anne reinforced that Godolphin should break the white staff rather than return it personally; an indicator of how strong her feelings were now against him.[68]

The dismissal of Spencer and Godolphin demonstrates the Queen's confidence in her ability to navigate the politics of her rule. This impression is reinforced by James Brydges, Tory Member for Hereford and a commentator on Prince George's death, when he concluded in a letter on 21 August that his fellow parliamentarians believed that Spencer's and Godolphin's dismissal by 'the Queen has show'd such a resolution in it, that nobody doubts her going thro with it [calling the next elections]'.[69] Brydges's prediction was correct and two weeks later, on 14 September, Robert Harley informed Thomas Pelham-Holles, 1st Duke of Newcastle, that he and the Queen were ready to go ahead with general elections as 'it being resolved in her own breast'.[70]

The result of the elections gave Anne the biggest majority in the House of Commons that she experienced during her reign.[71] The transfer of power that occurred following Sacheverell's trial and the ensuing political changes place the Queen's influence as central to understanding her unrelenting determination, and how she was able to regain the ecclesiastical prerogatives she had been forced to relinquish during the highpoint of the Junto's power. The transfer of power to the Queen also resulted in one of her longest lasting contributions to England as during 1710, the New Churches in London and Westminster Act being passed by Parliament.[72] The act was funded by a tax on coal coming into London, a tax started in 1670 to help fund the ongoing rebuilding of St Paul's Cathedral after the Great Fire of London. The Act was

---

[67] Spencer MSS, Section I, *Letters from Anne to Sidney Godolphin and John Churchill*, Anne to Godolphin, 7 August 1710.
[68] Roberts, *Hamilton Diary*, p. 66.
[69] Brydges to Morice, 21 August 1710, Clara Buck and Godfrey Davies, *Letters on Godolphin's Dismissal in 1710*, Los Angeles, Huntington Library, 1940, p. 234.
[70] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. II, p. 219, Harley to Pelham-Holles, 14 September 1710.
[71] Speck, *Tory and Whig*, p. 123.
[72] Parliament of England, *New Churches in London and Westminster Act of 1710*, 9, Anne, C 17.

to build fifty new churches in the rapidly growing areas of London and while the target was not met, almost 20 churches were constructed, which have become known as the Queen Anne Churches.[73]

The Queen was keen to demonstrate her power as it returned. Her primary focus after seeing some political power return to her was to dismiss the cabinet members that she had grown to dislike or had been forced on her. The Fifty Churches Act nonetheless shows how Parliament's approval of increasing the number of churches was one way the Queen could continue to ensure that her subjects had access to an Anglican parish church.[74] Similar to her dedication to 'touching', Anne held a different relationship with her public from that with her political ministers and clergy, and increasing the number of churches was one way she mobilised her position as the Supreme Governor.

Occasional Conformity success and episcopal transitions

As Anne built up political momentum throughout 1710 via the dismissal of Spencer and Godolphin, and the Tory victory in the general elections, she experienced one of the rare occurrences during her reign where she orchestrated parliamentary politics to enable, rather than prohibit, her hope to take more direct control over the Church.[75] Examining how political shifts enabled her to regain full control of clerical appointments after she had ceded much of her power to the Junto following the Bishoprics Crisis, demonstrates her continued desire to see the episcopate grow in Tory-supportive numbers.[76]

The Occasional Conformity bill of 1711 being passed is difficult to relate directly to the Queen's growing political power and the demise of the Junto, but historians have suggested that the Tories in the Commons, and the Tories and some Whigs in the Lords came together to undermine the ruling Whig leaders' power.[77] Regardless of whether the two are related, the Occasional Conformity Act, or Act for

---

[73] *ibid*.
[74] *ibid*.
[75] Holmes, *British Politics*, pp. 387-389; Holmes, *Politics and Religion*, p. 109; Jones, *40 Years On*, p. 24; Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 230-240; Stuart Prall, *Church and State in Tudor and Stuart England*, London, H. Davidson, 1993, p. 169.
[76] Burnet, *His Own Time*, p. 340.
[77] Andrew Browning, *English Historical Documents, 1660-1714*, Abingdon, Psychology Press, 1996, pp. 398–399.

preserving the Protestant Religion, was passed on 20 December 1711.[78] As the original bills had broadly intended, the 1711 bill ensured that anyone holding national or local office in England or Wales was required to attend Church of England services or face a £40 fine and be permanently barred from government employment.[79]

While debate regarding occasional conformity took place (and after its passing), Anne also experienced success in regaining control over her ecclesiastical choices. The events that followed the death of John Hall, Bishop of Bristol, on 4 February 1710, and the appointment of his replacement John Robinson, signalled a dramatic shift in Anne's political situation. John Hall had been an 'esteemed' man, but he was also a product of William's promotion of Whig-sympathetic bishops into the episcopate.[80] Robinson had served as an ambassador to Stockholm between 1678 and 1687, and an ambassador to Sweden from 1694 until 1709.[81] Having risen to prominence under Charles II and thus prior to James's Catholic or William's Whig influence, Robinson held a trusted place with the Queen. He also acted as her intermediary with Charles VII of Sweden and other members of the Swedish royal family.[82] The ecclesiastical politics of Robinson's diplomatic work earned him an honorary doctorate of divinity from Oxford on 7 August 1710, after which he was consecrated as Bishop of Bristol on 19 November.[83] Throughout much of 1707 to 1710, the Junto had control over ecclesiastical selections. The decline in the Junto's popularity and Tory success in the Commons following the elections in 1710 meant that a Whig majority still existed in the Lords. However, it also meant that Anne's parliamentary support base was growing, and no one challenged the Queen's Tory-supportive selection.

The way this transfer of power impacted on Anne's ecclesiastical leadership is further demonstrated in her continuing appointment of Tory-supportive bishops who might share her objectives without Whig interference. George Bull, Bishop of St

---

[78] Act of the Parliament of Great Britain (statute number 10 Anne c. 6).
[79] Act of the Parliament of Great Britain (statute number 10 Anne c. 6).
[80] John Stoughton, *History of Religion in England from the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century Vol. V*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1881, p. 223; John Dunton, *The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London*, London, J. Nichols, Son, & Bentley, 1705, p. 445.
[81] John B. Hattendorf, 'Robinson, John (1650–1723)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/23849, accessed 6 November 2015.
[82] *ibid.*
[83] *ibid.*

David's, died on 17 February 1711. Bull had been appointed to the small Welsh see in March 1705 while Anne was appointing Tory-sympathetic bishops before William Wake was translated to Lincoln, and the Duumvirs and the Junto realised how to use politics to manipulate her ecclesiastical decisions.[84] Bull was replaced by Philip Bisse, and few points make Anne's position clearer in 1711 than the fact that Bisse was Harley's 'urbane and socially-minded cousin', and later became one of her ecclesiastical advisers.[85] Bisse upheld the moderate Tory politics that Anne favoured in 1711, and as he politically fitted the 'Harleian mould' he benefitted from her patronage.[86] The Queen trusted him to such an extent that he was translated to the larger see of Hereford in 1713 after the death of the Whig-supportive bishop, Humphrey Humphreys.[87] That Anne could now appoint a Tory-sympathetic bishop who was even the cousin of her anti-Whig adviser, illustrates the ecclesiastical power the Queen had regained.

The Queen's power, but lack of time

By the beginning of 1711, Anne had experienced a rare moment of success in the House of Commons and could return to appointing Tory bishops in the Church. Winning elections, seeing Tory bishops rise in the Church, and dismissing Spencer and Godolphin demonstrates almost unprecedented power in her reign that had previously been thwarted by the Duumvirs, the Junto, the Whig-majority in the Lords, and the Low Church majority in the episcopate. After more than nine years of sovereignty that had often been dictated by the power of the Whigs or members of the Junto, the rise in Tory influence could have been the beginning of the Queen being able to direct the affairs of the Church as she desired. However, Anne did not live long enough to implement a Tory change in Convocation or Parliament.

With Tory control over the House of Commons and a cabinet comprising Tory supporters, 1711 onwards appeared to be a good opportunity for the Queen to secure

---

[84] G. V. Bennett, 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707', *The English Historical Review* Vol. 82, No. 325, 1967, p. 730; Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times*, London, S.P.C.K., 1948, p. 179.

[85] Cited in: G. V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975, p. 140.

[86] Norman Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737 Vol. I*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1957, p. 130.

[87] E. G. Wright, 'Humphrey Humphreys, bishop of Bangor and Hereford', *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, Vol. 2, 1950, pp. 72–86.

the Church a Tory-supportive episcopate. One issue nevertheless prevented her from making any changes between 1711 and when she died in 1714 - she still lacked ecclesiastical influence due to the Whig-majority in the House of Lords, and the Whig-supporters who filled the episcopate. Examining how politics rather than religion took precedence in the Queen's focus can be done through an assessment of the factors guiding the political, and few ecclesiastical, issues with which she dealt between 1711 and her death. Despite gaining parliamentary support in the Commons, this made little difference to her ability to influence the Whigs in the Lords or the long-term Whig-sympathetic bishops of the episcopate, even if there was a mild turn again them (such as that which enabled the Conformity bill of 1711 to pass). Surveying the political and religious history from Anne's perspective demonstrates that parliamentary issues prevented a Protestant and once highly Tory-supportive queen from taking an active and constant role in the security of the Church.

Anne had steadily increased the number of Tory bishops in the episcopate throughout her reign, but these numbers (combined with the Whig concessions she chose or was forced to make) were not enough to eliminate the Whig-filled episcopate that William had created. In Anne's later reign, Philip Bisse was moved to Hereford and Adam Ottley, a Tory prebendary of Hereford since 1686, was appointed Bishop of St David's on 23 February 1713.[88] On 20 May 1713, Thomas Sprat, Bishop of Rochester since 1684, died which allowed Francis Atterbury, the Dean of Carlisle and one of Anne's advisers, to fill the position. Atterbury saw his appointment as 'an opportunity to break free from the shackles of an unsupportive government', now that a Tory majority was forming.[89] Anne's appointments and translations increased the Tory presence, but they were not enough to achieve a Tory-sympathetic majority in the Upper House of Convocation. A Tory-supportive majority did not guarantee most of the bishops would side with the Queen's wishes, but it provided a better starting point and likelihood of reaching common goals than she had with the Whig-sympathetic bishops. Nonetheless, influential sees remained in control of the Whig bishops, including Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, William Talbot, Bishop of Oxford, and William Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester. Regardless of their differing relationships with the Queen, they remained

[88] G. E. Evans, 'Adam Ottley, bishop of St. David's, 1713–23', *Carmarthenshire Antiquary*, Vol. 28, 1938, pp. 117-130.
[89] British Library, *Portland Manuscripts*, folio 5.660.

firmly dedicated to Low Church and Whiggish ideals rather than the High Church Queen's aspirations.

The Queen's quickly deteriorating health also played a role in her changing priorities. The decline of her wellbeing begins to be tracked in August 1711 in the correspondence of Jonathan Swift, a churchman and a long-term supporter and courtier. He recorded after attending a meeting with Anne that:

> The Queen sent for us into her bedchamber, where we made our bows, and stood about twenty of us round the room, while she looked at us […] and once a minute said about three words to some that were nearest her.[90]

Anne also expanded her circle of political advisers. In 1710, the loss of any allegiance from the Duumvirs resulted in Robert Harley being one of her few advisers, but by the following year she became increasingly close to Charles Talbot, 1st Duke of Shrewsbury. Anne's attachment to Talbot can be gauged by her words as she wrote in a letter to Harley in 1711 that 'I speake to him [Talbot] of every thing & advice with him on all occasions & will continue doeing so'.[91] The result of Talbot's influence was also apparent to many close to her in an official sense. Junto member William Cowper, 1st Earl of Cowper, was reportedly told by her doctor, Dr Hamilton (who recorded the conversation) that 'when some Lords told the Queen that they would vote for the Interest of the Nation, she bid them vote as [Talbot] did'.[92]

The Queen's focus was also aimed at ensuring peace for her kingdom, an aim that became clearer as other much discussed events of the early-eighteenth century unfolded. Throughout her reign, John Churchill led the military in numerous major battles as part of the War of the Spanish Succession. His victories in 1711, such as his capture of Bouchain in northern France, made it clear to Anne and Parliament that Churchill would be leading a 'full-scale' invasion of France during 1712 if not stopped.[93] Anne's hope for peace is evident from a letter she sent Harley on 24 September 1711, in which she declared that 'I have this business of ye Peace soe much at hart, that I can not help giving you this trouble to ask if it may not be proper to order'; that is, a halt to political movements that could draw England nearer to

[90] Jonathan Swift, *Journal to Stella Vol. I*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1948, p. 328.
[91] HMC, *Bath*, Vol. I, Queen to Robert Harley, 15 November 1711.
[92] Cited in: Roberts, *Hamilton Diary*, p. 29.
[93] SP, 28/243, f. 18: Thomas Wentworth to Henry St John, 1 January 1712.

conflict.[94] Additional to the struggle with France, in April 1711 Emperor Joseph I's death gave his younger brother, Archduke Charles, a strong influence over the Holy Roman Empire and Hungary. Part of the War of the Spanish Succession's settlement was to give Charles the Spanish throne, but in the Whigs' view that was no longer in Britain's interests to remain involved.[95] Harley's proposed Peace of Utrecht was submitted to Parliament but the Whigs were inclined towards war for Britain's protection rather than peace.[96] The Tories were in control of the elected House of Commons, but the peers in the House of Lords and the bishops on the episcopal bench remained divided. To secure peace via the agreement to the Utrecht Treaty, Anne created twelve new peers and in May 1713, the Treaty was ratified and Britain's military involvement in the War of the Spanish Succession ended.[97]

The Queen's reactions to the events concerning the Holy Roman Empire and Hungary are evident in a letter she sent to Harley. She believed that the Treaty of Utrecht had her 'business of peace soe much at hart', but it was as the Treaty was approved that her health significantly deteriorated.[98] One of her doctors, Dr Shadwell, recorded on Christmas Eve of 1713, that the Queen had 'a violent inflammatory fever' that led to her going in and out of consciousness for hours.[99] Anne temporarily recovered but was ill again with fever and unconsciousness between 10 and 13 March before improving over the next two weeks.[100] She recovered by July 1714, and took the opportunity to dismiss Robert Harley, her adviser of more than twelve years. Harley's dismissal is a well-known moment in Stuart history, but it requires mentioning as a further example of the transition of advisers and support which Anne experienced throughout her reign. Anne and Harley's relationship experienced a slow decline after the Duumvirs were removed and he became the Queen's primary adviser. Her frustration with him stemmed from complicated negotiations during the Treaty of Utrecht which led Erasmus Lewis, Member of Parliament for Lostwithiel, to inform Jonathan Swift in a letter on 27 July that Anne had declared to her cabinet:

---

[94] HMC, *Bath*, Vol. I, Queen to Robert Harley, 24 September 1711.
[95] HMC, *Portland*, Vol. V, pp. 108-125, George Savile, 1st Marquess of Halifax to Robert Harley, 9, 25 November and 3, 6 December 1711; HMC, *Portland*, Vol. V, p. 126, John Toland to Robert Harley, 7 December 1711.
[96] *ibid*.
[97] Swift's journal entries of 3, 7 April 1713: Swift, *Journal to Stella*, pp. 653-537.
[98] HMC, *Bath*, Vol. I, Queen to Robert Harley, 24 September 1711.
[99] Cited in: David Green, *Queen Anne*, London, History Book Club, 1970, pp. 294-295.
[100] British Library, Stowe Manuscripts (Stowe), 226, ff. 279-290, Schutz to Robethon, 23 March 1714; ff. 297-298, Schutz to Bothmer 27 March 1714.

> … that he neglected all business, that he was seldom to be understood, that when he did explain himself, she could not depend upon the truth of what he said, that he never came to her at the time she appoint; that he often came drunk, and last, to crown all, he behaved himself towards her with ill manner, indecency and disrespect.[101]

According to Lewis's letter to Swift, the result of her feelings was that she dismissed Harley from the position of Lord Treasurer in the same meeting.[102] Anne had thus begun her reign with confidants including John and Sarah Churchill, Sidney Godolphin, and Robert Harley. Yet when she died of a stroke on 31 July, she was without any of her original favourites. The Queen's death is best summarised by John Arbuthnot, one of the doctors who stood next to her as she died, who famously wrote to Swift 'I believe sleep was never more welcome to a weary traveller than death was to her'.[103]

For 37 years before Anne became queen, she had been raised as and was a dedicated daughter of the Church. However, for the twelve years she reigned, politics, Whig-majorities in Parliament, Whig-sympathetic bishops in the episcopate, and personal disputes meant her desires to lead as England's 'nursing mother' who increased the security of the Church rarely came to fruition. Despite the obstacles that confronted her, she never cowered. Instead, Anne refined her approach to politics and combatted the manipulation and hijacking of her royal prerogative that went on by Whigs, Tories, and often from within her inner circle whenever the chance presented itself. The ecclesiastical politics of her reign bring these actions into clear relief.

Summary

Anne died twelve years and three months after her coronation in April 1702. At her coronation, the Kingdom came to be ruled by a queen with clear Tory and High Church allegiances and ambitions. This chapter has surveyed developments from her loss of authority to the Whigs following the Bishoprics Crisis, to her regaining some political influence after the voters in the general election grew cautious of the Junto and Whigs'

[101] Erasmus Lewis to Swift, 27 July 1714: Jonathan Swift, *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift Vol. II*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1963, p. 86.
[102] *ibid.*
[103] Arbuthnot to Swift, 12 August 1714: Swift, *Correspondence*, p. 121.

power. The result of Anne's final years being dominated by politics and having few opportunities to shape the composition of the episcopal bench, is that she was unable to overcome parliamentary politics' domination over her political and ecclesiastical reign. Even as the Whigs began to decrease in prominence, their majority in the Lords and episcopate limited the Queen's ability to influence the Church to which she had been wholly devoted. Thus, a queen whose ecclesiastical principles were once so strong that she chose the Church over her Catholic father's rule, was left with an almost powerless voice in the Church's governance.

It is easy to focus solely on Anne's inability to fulfil her aspirations tangibly for guiding the Church by filling the Upper House of Convocation with Tory-sympathetic bishops who might share her vision for the Church's growth and alliance with Tory politics. She also failed to pass the bills that would have upheld the connection between public attendance of Anglican church services and holding office until the latter part of her reign. Members of the House of Lords also never followed her High Church and Tory approach to politics that would have aided (rather than inhibited) in her ecclesiastical appointments rather than political factions frequently trying to prevent her selections. However, attention must also be paid to how she reacted to a reign of defeats and manipulation by those closest to her, and as she dealt with a majority political party that was rarely interested in acting on her wishes. Anne had lost all faith in Godolphin and John Churchill by the conclusion of the Bishoprics Crisis in 1707. Thus, when they threatened to quit her cabinet in February 1708 over Harley's moderate plan, she happily accepted their resignations. Nonetheless, her almost immediate reinstatement of the pair demonstrates the motivations of a leader more concerned over political stability than her own appearance. Even after she temporarily lost the power to appoint bishops to the Junto following the Bishoprics Crisis, she still managed to appoint numerous Tory-sympathetic candidates, and Whig candidates who would be loyal to her. Finally, she spent the last years of her reign knowing that the Duumvirs were using her for their own gain rather than being loyal to her. They remained in place during this time as Churchill continued achieving military victories, and Godolphin remained a skilful political adviser despite divided loyalties. When the military battles and the need for Godolphin's political expertise came to an end, Queen Anne immediately dismissed them as she continued to strive towards her goals of Tory prominence in her cabinet, and Tory-sympathies in the Church.

CHAPTER TEN - Conclusion

This work has explored the impact of Anne Stuart's upbringing and education on her years as Princess of Denmark, and after she became Queen Regnant of England. Anne came to the throne with clear High Church and Tory principles, and clear expectations of what could be the Church's role in government and society. Despite Anne's devotion to the Church throughout her life, the dominating factors in how she could exercise her royal prerogative as Queen were the Whig-majority in the House of Lords and the high number of Whig-supportive bishops in the episcopate, which prevented her from guiding ecclesiastical decisions as she would have preferred.

Three hundred years of historical examination have shaped current scholarly understandings of Queen Anne's position in English politics and religion. Yet less has been written about what she believed her own role was to play in politics and religion, and how they affected her actions as Supreme Governor of the Church of England. The thesis explored these less-assessed areas of history to position Anne as a central figure in England's politics and the politics of religion. The thesis examined the reasons for Anne's commitment to the Church that began from early childhood until she acceded the throne at 37 years of age. The work has also determined that in contrast to the strength and clarity of her beliefs, a trajectory exists of her inability to guide the selection of enough bishops who would vote in Convocation and the episcopate according to her wishes. Yet she never recoiled from those who tried to manipulate her or dismiss her aspirations. Instead, she changed tactics, fought for smaller victories, and was calculating in how she contended with her oppressors.

These circumstances were first established by assessing how Anne's formative years shaped her beliefs. The suspicions of Catholicism that surrounded Charles and James at the time of Anne's birth resulted in her being placed into the care of the Protestant Villiers family, whereas James hoped she would be raised Catholic. Her religious views and education were shaped by Henry Compton and Edward Lake; an anti-Catholic bishop and chaplain, respectively, who were ironically not chosen for Anne's benefit, but to alleviate concern that the monarchy was growing tolerant of Catholicism. Her education, especially the doctrinal instruction she received, was then formative in the sense that it shaped her political views, perspectives on religion, patronage, exercise of policy, and the choices of men she hoped to appoint and

translate as bishops. These factors are often discussed in the biographies of Anne's life, however the selection of her governess, tutor and chaplain had unpredictable ramifications to England as no one anticipated at the time that she would go on to become Queen regnant and Supreme Governor of the Church of England.

The relative freedom of thought and action that Anne enjoyed in her earlier years due to her unremarkable place in the line of succession also had striking consequences for the future, and establishes further factors that guided her adult views, confidants and advisers. Anne's royal male predecessors were invariably (due to their sex) provided with educations that prepared them for commanding roles in government and the military whether they were born as heirs apparent or inherited the crown via unforeseen circumstances. Her early modern female counterparts, Mary I and Elizabeth I, were also more prepared for leadership due to personal expectations of those around them and the Tudors' stringent educational expectations. Anne received the typical lessons of a late-seventeenth century elite woman of society who was well versed in the pursuits of the period including music, dance, drawing and singing. These were lessons were for those expected to marry noblemen or foreign princes and kings, they were not intended for a future queen regnant.

Anne's religious viewpoints as an adult reveal her uncompromising faith in the Church. It also establishes that decades before she became queen, her views on what the Church's position in government and society should be were well-established. However, her clarity of vision meant that a fault line appeared between ideal and reality. Anne's loyalty to the Church of England never wavered throughout James's attempts to convert her to Catholicism, even when imminent violence lay in England's future as William of Orange's invasion appeared inevitable. Anne's role in the lead up to the invasion is often overlooked in the biographies of her life that discuss these events amongst her marriage, eighteen conceptions, and the development of her relationship with Sarah Churchill and John Churchill. Anne's refusal to aid in brokering peace between James and William would potentially end in war. As such, her convictions were formidable as she chose the Church over her father's crown and possibly his life if he lost the war. In contrast to this thesis's findings, study concerning the Revolution rarely mentions Anne, and scholars tend not to regard Anne as a part of the political and religious disputes that led to the conflict. This thesis illuminated the vital role Anne played in ensuring the invasion occurred as it did, but also how critical her involvement was in shaping her own future parameters as a queen known

to be a true daughter of the Church. The thesis demonstrated that the religious perspectives that Compton and Lake taught to Anne as a child continued to be the principles she followed as an adult.

Study of Anne's accession highlights the issues she inherited and encountered that affected her ability to influence Parliament, or favour with most of the bishops in the Upper House of Convocation. From the day of William's death, Anne's sex was also a concern for some courtiers who questioned her ability to lead as monarch and Supreme Governor. For several years before England gained a queen regnant, however, this eventuation had been predicted, which moderated the controversy over a sole-ruling queen in Parliament and the Church. Thus, the prospect of a female sovereign following William was established even before Anne came to the throne. While controversy existed regarding her abilities, many others viewed this circumstance more neutrally. Anne's sex did, however, mean that at the beginning of her reign she was not as familiar with the processes of government or episcopal polity as she might have been if she were born male or higher in the line of succession. Her upbringing, and not only what she was taught but what she was not taught, meant she relied heavily on her ministers, Sidney Godolphin, John Churchill and Robert Harley, and selected bishops, chiefly John Sharp and Henry Compton.

The repercussions of this point have often been overlooked in earlier scholarship concerning her leadership. The bargaining and compromises necessary for Anne to play any role in a parliament and episcopate dominated by Whigs came at the cost of her being loyal to her High Church and Tory beliefs. However, she viewed these compromises as necessary sacrifices for a dedicated ruler. The Queen acceded to the throne with a decreased level of royal prerogative compared to many of her predecessors, and yet she hoped to be a monarch who secured the Church from perceived threats with Tory support after it had experienced nearly two decades of affronts following James's Catholicism and William's years of allowing Whig-majorities to form within Parliament and the Church. Anne had early success in appointing Tory-sympathetic bishops such as William Nicolson, Thomas Hooper, and William Beveridge. The thesis established that her actions during the debates over the Occasional Conformity bills and her support for William Wake, the Whig-sympathetic candidate for the see of Lincoln, alienated her from her High Tory parliamentary and High Church clerical supporters. The result of her compromises was that a queen who believed in her divine right, reintroduced 'touching', and who was against the Whigs

in Parliament and the Church, found herself having to side with them as she lost much of her Tory support. The leading Whigs simultaneously realised the power they held over the Queen and frequently exercised their rule to force Whig candidates into cabinet at the cost of Tory representation. The thesis showed that during the first four years of Anne's reign she experienced the full power of the Whig-majority, and the connectedness that existed between religious and political decisions during the period. The Queen also saw her long-term favourites, the Churchills and Godolphin, betray her to the Whigs for their own political security. The investigation ascertains that politics and personal relationships were having the greatest impact on Anne's aspirations as they inhibited her ability to influence the voting patterns and Parliament and Convocation as she desired.

The work then analysed Anne's profound loss of influence over politics and the Church as the Whigs gained legislative control following the Bishoprics Crisis. The Crisis was a political dispute fought over an ecclesiastical issue that cost Anne her right to appoint her own bishops, previously one of the few areas in which she had held incontestable control. The Junto's focus on politics gained them such power that they inadvertently orchestrated their own downfall during the elections of late 1710 after the wider Whig party and England's voters became cautious of their influence. The collapse in Whig-power led Anne to continue making Tory-supportive appointments to the episcopate when possible. These appointments, combined with those she had made since her accession, were nonetheless too little and too late to provide her with any ability to shape the Church's leadership, security, future or voting in Convocation or the episcopal bench. Anne had little control in the Church other than appointing and translating bishops as they died, and she simply did not live long enough to see a Tory-sympathetic majority form.

The dramatic events leading up to Anne's death meant there was little time for her to reflect on her life, particularly as she attempted to maintain control until the very end, which means historians are left to debate different aspects of the Queen's reign. One such debate asks whether the compromises Anne made for political reasons were ultimately fatal to her vision for the Church of England as its Supreme Governor. Aspects of this complex question have been assessed throughout the thesis, but only following Anne's death can the full impact and repercussions of her political compromises and dedication to the Church be assessed.

What is difficult to deny is that a High Church and Tory-supportive princess who

inherited a Whig-majority in the Lords and a Whig-sympathetic majority in the Upper House of Convocation was always going to face immense challenges in seeing any vision for the Church be met. This was not only a consequence of Whiggish parliamentary and Church influence, but also due to the fact that ecclesiastical appointments came with political repercussions and vice versa. Thus, for the first three years of Anne's reign, she did appoint Tory-sympathetic bishops to the episcopate when sees became available through death or translation. This all changed on 16 July 1705 when she appointed the Whig-sympathetic bishop William Wake to Lincoln as a reward to the Whigs for supporting Churchill's military request.

From Wake's appointment until Anne's death, it could be argued that the Queen's political compromises were fatal to her aspirations for the Church of England. After the Whigs had learned how to influence her ecclesiastical decisions, this was a method that was simply repeated, and remained the case until the latter-half of her reign when she started regaining some political control following the general elections of 1710. However, one must consider the alternative. If Wake was appointed partially in return for the Lords approving Churchill's military requests, the alternative (that is, had Anne not appointed Wake and instead appointed the Tory-sympathetic bishops William Dawes) she would have faced increased political difficulty. It is impossible to predict how events may have unfolded if this had been Anne's course of action. For example, she might have held a larger influence over the Church by appointing bishops who shared her hopes, but with political consequences that could have involved Churchill's military exercises, the 1707 Acts of Union, or the 1711 Fifty Churches Act. Thus, Anne's political compromises did aid in her inability to see her aspirations for the Church be met, but she inherited a Parliament and Church where compromise was the only way forward if she hoped to have any political influence over her own kingdom.

This thesis examined how Anne's upbringing and education influenced how she led and was able to exercise her aspirations for the Church, but it is prudent to question whether Anne acted in a way deemed outside of the bounds of what one might expect of a monarch born and raised an Anglican Protestant in the 1660s. Even as a 20-year-old princess, Anne refused to convert to Catholicism as her father wished, and was noted as being very stern towards Catholics, but this cannot be considered a surprise considering her upbringing and the political and religious climate into which she was born and raised. When she reached the throne she also had clear aspirations for how

the Church might be influenced, which relied heavily on appointing Tory-sympathetic bishops. Again, though, this was very much in keeping with her upbringing and education, and as is discussed throughout the thesis, is exactly what one may have predicted would be the case as Anne had clear religious beliefs that were made public since her father's reign in the 1680s. However, if one considers Anne's role as Queen and position in Parliament, as is discussed throughout the thesis, her education and role in political affairs as a princess were entirely shaped by the fact she was a woman. When she reached the throne, her reliance on Godolphin and John Churchill occurred because she was a woman who was not raised or educated as a male would have been, and she did not have the same political standing or influence that a prince would have held before becoming monarch.

Thus, one could suggest that Anne lived and reigned completely within the bounds one might expect of a female royal born in the 1660s because Charles II's need to separate himself from Catholic suspicions shaped her childhood, and Anne's subsequently religious standing and experiences and as princess (rather than a prince) ensured she came to the throne under a certain set of circumstances that would likely be similar for most royals. However, it cannot be denied that a male royal born in the 1660s would have been raised and educated following Charles's same stringent anti-Catholic rules. As an adult though, they would have had a position as a prince significantly more involved in state affairs and politics that would have prepared them for the throne in a significantly different way, and potentially better way, than Anne.

The thesis ultimately argues that, for a queen whose religious convictions were so strong that she chose the Church over her father, and put his life and hers in jeopardy during the Revolution, parliamentary politics and episcopal polity left her as an almost powerless voice among many within the Church's governance. However, despite the setbacks that Anne faced, she never relented to her opposition. Her determination did not result in frequent victory, but it cannot be ignored that she was a leader who combatted the prejudices of her sex and abilities head on, was calculating, sought the small victories, and in the realm of the politics of religion frequently executed her biggest manoeuvres with precise timing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

British Library, Additional Manuscripts.

British Library, Althorp Papers, Spencer Manuscripts.

British Library Manuscript Collection, Blenheim Collection of Papers.

British Library, *Stowe Manuscripts*

Lambeth Palace Library

Pierpoint Morgan Library

Royal Society, London, *Letters & Papers.*

The National Archives – Domestic Records of the Public Records Office.

Print Sources

Abbey, Charles and John Overton. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Longman, 1876.

'Act of Settlement 1700', legislation.gov.uk (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2, accessed 24 Nov 2014.

An Act for Exempting their Majestyes Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certaine Lawes, Chapter XVIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 15', Statutes of the Realm: Vol. VI, 1685-94, (ed.), John Raithby, Great Britain Record Commission, 1819, pp. 74-76,

http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol6/pp74-76, accessed September 10, 2015.

Anonymous. *A Vindication of Their Majesties' Authority to Fill the Sees of the Deprived Bishops*. London: Ric Chiswell, 1691.

Ansell, Patricia. 'Harley's Parliamentary Management'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* Vol. 34, 1961, pp. 92-97.

Arnold-Baker, Charles. *The Companion to British History*. Routledge: New York, 2015.

Asch, Ronald, G. 'Elizabeth, Princess (1596–1662)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, April 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8638, accessed 10 September 2016.

Ascham, Roger. *The Scholemaster*. London: John Daye, 1570.

Ashley, Maurice. *James II*. London: J. M. Dent, 1977.

Barclay, Andrew. 'Mary (1658–1718)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18247, accessed 7 Feb 2017.

Beddard, R. A. P. J. 'Jane, William (bap. 1645, d. 1707)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14650, accessed 14 October 2015.

Beem, Charles. 'I Am Her Majesty's Subject: Queen Anne, Prince George of Denmark, and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', in Charles Beem (ed.), *The Lioness Roared: The Problems of Female Rule in English History*. New York:

Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, pp. 101-140.

Beem, Charles. 'Why Prince George of Denmark did not become a King of England', in *The Man Behind the Queen*, edited by Charles Beem and Miles Taylor, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, pp. 81-91.

Belsham, William, (ed.). *Memoirs of the Reigns of William III and Queen Anne: Vol. II*. London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1803.

Benger, Elizabeth Ogilvy. *Memoirs Relating to the Queen of Bohemia, Vol.1.* London: Longhurst, 1825.

Bennet, G. V. 'Conflict in the Church', in Geoffrey Holmes, (ed.). *Britain After the Glorious Revolution*. London: Macmillan, 1984.

Bennett, G. V. 'Robert Harley, the Godolphin Ministry, and the Bishoprics Crisis of 1707'. *English Historical Review* Vol. 82, No. 325, 1967, pp. 726-746.

Bennett, G. V. *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Bisset, William. *The Modern Fanatick: With a Large and True Account of the Life of Dr Sacheverell*. London: Baldwin, 1710.

Blanchard, Rae, (ed.). *Correspondence of Richard Steele*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Bostock, R. C. 'Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford'. *Notes and Queries* Vol. 10, No. 5, 1906, p. 391.

Boyer, Abel. *History of Queen Anne*. London: J. Roberts, 1722.

Braaten, Carl, and Robert W. Jenson (eds.) *The Catholicity of the Reformation*. Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1996.

Brasch, Christian. *Prins Georg af Danmark I Hans Aegteskab med Dronning Anna af Storbrittannien*. Copenhagen: C. A. Reitzel, 1938.

Brown, Richard. *Church and State in Modern Britain 1700-1850*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Browning, Browning. *English Historical Documents, 1660-1714*. Abingdon: Psychology Press, 1996.

Browning, Andrew. (ed.). *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*. London: Speck, 1991.

Bryant, Arthur. *The Letters and Speeches, and Declarations of King Charles II*. London: Cassell and Co, 1968.

Bucholz, Robert. 'Queen Anne: Victim of her Virtues', in Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002, pp. 94-129.

Bucholz, Robert. 'The 'Stomach of a Queen' or Size Matters; Gender, Body Image, and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne', in Caroline Levin and Robert Bucholz, (eds.). *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*. London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009, pp. 242-271.

Bucholz, Robert. *The Augustan Court*. San Francisco: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Buck, Clara, and Godfrey Davies. *Letters on Godolphin's Dismissal in 1710*. Los Angeles: Huntington Library, 1940.

Burnet, Gilbert. *History of His Own Time*. London: Thomas Ward, 1724.

Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 23, 1632-1636, ed. Allen B Hinds (London, 1921), *British History Online,*

http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol23, accessed 17 August 2016.

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, (ed.). *Queenship in Britain 1660-1637*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Carpenter, Edward. *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times*. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.

Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull, London, Penguin, [1528] 2004.

Chalus, Elaine. 'Ladies are often very good scaffoldings: Women and Politics in the Age of Anne'. *Parliamentary History* Vol. 28, No. 1, 2008, pp. 150-165.

Chamberlain, J. S. 'Long, Thomas (*bap.* 1621, *d.* 1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/16977, accessed 12 September 2016.

Chamberlain, J. S. 'Williams, John (1633x6–1709)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/29516, accessed 26 October 2015.

Chamberlayne, Edward. *Angliæ Notitia: Or the Present State of England*. London: S. Smith, 1704.

Childs, John. *The Army, James II and the Glorious Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980.

Churchill, Sarah. *Authentick Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Her Grace, Sarah, Late Dutchess of Marlborough*. London: Hooke, 1744.

Churchill, Winston. *Marlborough: His Life and Times Vol. I*. New York: Scribners, 1948.

Churchill, Winston. *Marlborough: His Life and Times Vol. IV*. London: Folio Society, 1991.

Claydon, Tony. *William and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Claydon, Tony. 'William III and II (1650–1702)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/29450, accessed 9 Feb 2017.

Coke, Roger. *A Detection Of The Court and State Of England During The Four Last Reigns*. London: Bell, 1697.

Coleby, Andrew. 'Mews, Peter (1619–1706)'. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18633, accessed 13 October 2015.

Collinson, Patrick. 'Elizabeth I (1533–1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8636, accessed 18 September 2016.

Connell, Neville. *Anne: The Last Stuart Monarch*. London: Thomas Butterworth, 1937.

Copies of Two Papers Written by the Late King Charles II together with a Copy of a

Paper written by the late Duchess of York. London: H. Hills, 1686.

Cornwall, Robert. 'Frampton, Robert (bap. 1622, d. 1708)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10061, accessed 1 January 2016.

Cowan, Brian. *The State Trial of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*. London: Wiley, 2012.

Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age: A History of England 1603-1714*. London: Longman, 1980.

Coward, Barry. *The Stuart Age*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Cowie, Leonard. 'Beveridge, William (bap. 1637, d. 1708)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/2321, accessed 10 September 2015.

Coxe, William. *Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough*. London: Longman, 1820.

Creighton, Louise. *Life of John Churchill – Duke of Marlborough*. London: Read Books, 2010.

Croft, Pauline. *King James*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Cross, Claire. *Church and People: England 1450-1660*. London: Wiley, 1999.

Cross, Claire. *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1969.

Cunningham, Alexander. *A History of Great Britain Vol. II*. London: Strahan, 1787.

Curtis, Gila. *The Life and Times of Queen Anne*. London: Book Club Association,

1972.

Dalrymple, John. *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*. London: J. Bell, 1790.

Davies, Godfrey. 'The Seamy Side of Marlborough's War'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* Vol. 15, No 1, 1951, pp. 21-44.

de Beer, E. S., (ed.). *Diary of John Evelyn*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.

de Cavelli, Campana. *Les Derniers Stuarts a Satin-Germaine-en-Laye Vol. II*. Paris: Didier and Cie, 1871.

Defoe, Daniel, and Walter Wilson, (eds.). *Memoirs of the Life and Time of Daniel De Foe Vol. II*. London: Hurst, 1830.

Devon, Frederick. *Issues of the Exchequer: Being Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue During the Reign of King James I*. London: Rodwell, 1836.

Ditchfield, G. M., David Hayton, and Clyve Jones, (eds.). *British Parliamentary Lists, 1660-1880: A Register*. London: A & C Black, 1995.

Doble, Charles. *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne: Vol. II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885.

Dover, George, (ed.). *The Ellis Correspondence Vol. I*. London, Colburn, 1828.

Dowling, Mark. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. Los Angeles: University of California, 1968.

Dunton, John. *The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London*. London: J. Nichols, Son, & Bentley, 1705.

Durston, Christopher. *Charles I*. Second edition, New York: Routledge, 2013.

Durston, Christopher. *James I*. London: Routledge, 2006

Eales, Jacqueline. *Women in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*. London: University College London Press, 2005.

Elliot, David. 'Garrard, Sir Samuel, fourth baronet (1651–1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10403, accessed 12 December 2016.

Elliott, George Percy, (ed.). *Diary of Dr Edward Lake: In the Years 1677-1678*. London: Camden Society, 1846.

Elton, G. R. *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

English, John. 'The Duration of the Primitive Church: An Issue for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Anglicans'. *Anglican and Episcopal History* Vol. 73, No. 1, 2004, pp. 35-52.

Eppley, Daniel. *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Evans, G. E. 'Adam Ottley, bishop of St. David's, 1713–23'. *Carmarthenshire Antiquary* Vol. 28, 1938, pp. 117-130.

Falkner, James. 'Churchill, Sarah, duchess of Marlborough (1660–1744)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008,http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5405, accessed 9 June 2015.

Fanu, Le and William Richard. *Queen Anne's bounty, a short account of its history and work*. London: Macmillan, 1921.

Farooq, Jennifer. ‘Preaching for the Queen: Queen Anne and English Sermon Culture, 1702-1714’. *Journal of Eighteenth Century Studies* Vol. 37, No. 2, 2014, pp. 159–169.

Feiling, Keith. *History of the Tory Party 1640-1714*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Foster, Andrew. *The Church of England 1570-1640*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Foxcroft, H. C., (ed.). *A Supplement to Burnet's History of my own Time*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1902.

Foyster, Elizabeth. ‘Gender Relations’, in Barry Coward (ed.), *A Companion to Stuart Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003, pp. 111-130.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel: Woman’s Lot in Seventeenth-Century England, Part Two*. London: Phoenix, 2002.

Fraser, Hamish, and Callum Brown. *Britain Since 1707*. Routledge: New York, 2014.

French, Roger. ‘Harvey, William (1578–1657)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/12531, accessed 9 September 2016.

Gibson, William. *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Giustiniani, Sebastiano and Rawdon Lubbock Brown. *Four Years at the Court of Henry VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Grafton, Richard. *Grafton's Chronicle, Or History of England Vol II*. London: Johnson, 1809.

Green, David. *Queen Anne*. London: History Book Club, 1970.

Green, Ian. 'Duppa, Brian (1588–1662)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/8303, accessed 9 September 2016.

Gregg, Edward. 'Anne (1665–1714)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/560, accessed 10 August 2014.

Gregg, Edward. 'James Francis Edward (1688–1766)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14594, accessed 1 January 2016.

Gregg, Edward. *Queen Anne*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980 (2014 reprint).

Gregg, Pauline. *Charles I*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Greig, Martin. 'Heresy Hunt: Gilbert Burnet and the Convocation Controversy of 1707', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 3, (1994), pp. 572.

Grew, E., and M. Grew. *The Court of William III*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.

Griffin, Richard, (ed.). *The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*. London: Camden Society, 1845.

Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson. *The Spirit of Compromise*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2012.

Haigh, Christopher. *Elizabeth I*. London: Longman Pearson, 2000.

Haile, Martin. *Mary of Modena*. London: J. M. Dent and Co., 1905.

Hamilton, Anthony. *Memoirs of the Comte de Gramount* (trans. Peter Quennell). Reprint, London: Literary Licensing, 2013.

Hamilton, David. *The Diary of Sir David Hamilton, 1709-1714*. Philip Roberts (ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Hamilton, Elizabeth. *The Backstairs Dragon: A Life of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford*. London: Taplinger, 1970.

Hamilton, Elizabeth. *William's Mary*. New York: Taplinger, 1972.

Handley, Stuart. 'Fleetwood, William (1656–1723)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/9691, accessed 27 October 2015.

Handley, Stuart. 'Villiers, Edward, first earl of Jersey (1655?–1711)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/28289, accessed 9 September 20160.

Harris, Frances. 'Masham, Abigail, Lady Masham (1670?–1734)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18261, accessed 10 December 2016.

Harris, Tim. *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715*. London: Longman, 1993.

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms 1660–1685*. London: Allen Lane, 2005.

Harris, Tim. *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy 1685-1720*. London: Allen Lane, 2006.

Hattendorf, John. 'Robinson, John (1650–1723)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/23849, accessed 6 November 2015.

Hayton, D. W. 'Nicolson, William (1655–1727)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/20186, accessed 2 September 2015.

Hazlitt, William. *The Eloquence of the British Senate*. London: T. Kirk, 1810.

Heffernan, Troy. '21 Days Later: Lady Anne and the Death of Charles Stuart' in *The Seventeenth Century Journal*, Vol. *31*, No. 1, (2016), pp. 57-70.

Heffernan, Troy. 'Never the Queen: Anne Stuart's Formative Years'. In Valerie Schutte, *Unexpected Heirs*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. (Forthcoming)

Heffernan, Troy. 'Propaganda in the English Civil War: Designing Emotions to Divide a Nation'. In S. Broomhall & S. Finn (Eds.), *Violence and Emotions in Early Modern Europe* (pp. 173-184). New York: Routledge.

Hibbard, Caroline, M. 'Henrietta Maria (1609–1669)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/12947, accessed 1 May 2015.

His Majesty's Stationary Office. 'House of Lords Journal Volume 14: 24 May 1689', *Journal of the House of Lords* Vol. 14, 1685-1691, pp. 217-218.

Holmes, Geoffrey, (ed.). *Britain After the Glorious Revolution: 1689-1714*. London: Macmillan, 1969.

Holmes, Geoffrey, and W. A. Speck, 'The Fall of Harley in 1708 Reconsidered'. *English Historical Review* Vol. 80, No. 317, 1965, pp. 673-698.

Holmes, Geoffrey. *British Politics in the Age of Anne*. London: Hambledon, 1967.

Holmes, Geoffrey. *Politics, Religion and Society in England: 1679-1779*. London: Hambledon, 1986.

Holmes, Geoffrey. *Religion, Politics and Society in England, 1676-1742*. London: Hambledon, 1687.

Holmes, Geoffrey. *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1973.

Holmes, Richard. *Marlborough: England's Fragile Genius*. London: Harper, 2008.

Hooper, George. *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation*. London: T Bennet, 1701.

Hopkinson, M. R. *Anne of England: The Biography of a Great Queen*. New York: Macmillan, 1934

Horwitz, Henry. 'Finch, Daniel, second earl of Nottingham and seventh earl of Winchilsea (1647–1730)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/9427, accessed 22 September 2016.

Horwitz, Henry. 'Luttrell, Narcissus (1657–1732)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/17226, accessed 5 December 2016.

Hutton, Ronald. *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Hyde, Edward and G. Huehns, eds. *History of the Rebellion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Hyde, Montgomery. *The Love That Dared Not Speak its Name*. London: Heinemann, 1970.

Israel, Jonathan, (ed.). *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essay on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Ives, E. W. 'Henry VIII (1491–1547)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/12955, accessed 19 April 2015.

Jacob, W. M. 'Trimnell, Charles (bap. 1663, d. 1723)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/27742, accessed 26 October 2015.

James I, *Dæmonologie, in Forme of a Dialogue, Divided Into Three Books*. Edinburgh: Hatfield, 1603.

James I, *The True Law of Free Monarchies*. Edinburgh; Robert Walde, 1598.

James II and F. Brettnon-neau. *An Abridgement of the Life of James II*. London: Wilson, 1704.

Jenkinson, Matthew. *Culture and Politics at the Court of Charles II, 1660-1685*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2010.

Jones, Clyve. (ed.). *British Politics in the Age of Holmes: 40 Years On*. London: Wiley, 2009.

Jones, Clyve. 'Debates in the House of Lords on 'The Church in Danger', 1705, and on Dr Sacheverell's Impeachment, 1710'. *The History Journal* Vol. 19, No. 3, 1976, pp. 759-771.

Jordon, Wilbur. *Edward VI: The Young King Vol. I*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Keeton, G. W. *Lord Chancellor Jeffreys and the Stuart Cause*. London: Macdonald, 1965.

Kenyon, J. P. *The Stuarts*. London: Fontana, 1966.

Knights, Mark. *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell*. London: Wiley, 2012.

Knox, John. *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. New York: DeCapo Press, 1972.

Le Neve, John. *The Lives and Characters of All the Protestant Bishops of the Church of England Since the Reformations Vol. I*. London: W. Bowyer, 1720.

Lever, Tresham. *Godolphin: His Life and Times*. London: John Murray, 1952.

Levin, Carol, and Robert Bucholz. *Queens & Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*. London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Loades, David. *Elizabeth I: A Life*. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.

Loades, David. *Elizabeth I: The Golden Reign of Gloriana*. London: National Archives, 2003.

Loades, David. *Mary Tudor*. Gloucestershire, Amberley, 2012.

Loades, David, (ed.). *Reader's Guide to British History*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2003.

Loades, David. *Tudor Queens of England*. New York: Continuum, 2009.

Lodge, Edmund. *Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain*. London: Harding and Lepard, 1835.

London Country Council. *Survey of London Vol. XIII, 1689*. London: P.S. King & Son, 1966.

Lossky, A. 'Political Ideas of William III', in H. Rowen and A. Lossky, *Political Ideas and Institutions in the Dutch Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, pp. 35-59.

Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs: From September 1678 to April 1714*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1857.

Maccubbin, Robert and Martha Hamilton-Phillips (eds.). *The Age of William III & Mary II: power, politics and patronage, 1688-1702*. Virginia: College of William and Mary, 1989.

Machiavelli, Nicolo. *The Prince*. Italy: Leydon, 1652.

Makin, Bashua. *An Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen in Religion, Manners, Arts, and Tongues*. London: Tho Parkhurst, 1673.

Mattingly, Garrett. *Catherine of Aragon*. Boston: J. Cape, 1941.

McInnes, Angus. *Robert Harley: Puritan Politician*. London: Littlehampton, 1970.

Meadows, Peter. 'Moore, John (1646–1714)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004,

http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/19126, accessed 26 Oct 2015.

Mechtild, Comtesse Bentrinck. *Lettres et memoires de Marie, Reine d'Angeleterre*. The Hague, 1880.

Miller, John. 'Anne, duchess of York (1637–1671)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14325, accessed 31 Dec 2015.

Miller, John. 'Queen Anne by Edward Gregg'. *English Historical Review* Vol. 96, No. 371, 1981, pp. 145-147.

Miller, John. *Charles II*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1991.

Miller, John. *James II: A Study in Kingship*. Sussex: Wayland, 1978.

Miller, John. *James II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Miller, John. *James II*. London: Methuen, 1989.

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Milne-Tyte, Robert. *Bloody Jeffreys: The Hanging Judge*. London: Carlton, 1989.

Mitchel, Donald. *Queen Anne and the Georges*. London: Scribner, 1895.

Mitchell, Rosemary. 'Strickland, Agnes (1796–1874)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26663, accessed 30 Aug 2016.

Morgan, W. T. *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920.

Muilenbury, James. 'The Embassy of Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykevelt, to England in 1687'. *University of Nebraska Studies* Vol. 20, 1920, pp. 85-155.

Overton, J. H. *The Non-Jurors*. London: Smith, 1902.

Parkin, Jon. 'Patrick, Simon (1626–1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/21568, accessed 16 Oct 2015.

Payne, George, (ed.). *Vernon Correspondence: Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III from 1696 to 1708 Vol. III*. London: Colburn, 1841.

Pepys, Samuel and Robert Latham and William Mathews (eds.). *The Diary of Samuel Pepys Vol I-XI*. London: Bell and Hyman, 1970-1983.

Perry, Henry. *The First Duchess of Newcastle and Her Husband*. London: Ginn and Co, 1918.

Pincus, Steven. *1688: The First Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Pincus, Steven. 'To Protect English Liberties', in *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, 1650-1850*, edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 67-88.

Plumb, J. H. 'The Organisation of the Cabinet in the Reign of Queen Anne', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Vol. 7, 1957, pp 137-157.

Plumptre, E. H. *The life of Thomas Ken, Vol. II*. London: W. Isbister, 1888.

Pollnitz, Aysha. *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2015.

Porter, Linda. *Mary Tudor: The First Queen*. London: Little, Brown, 2007.

Prall, Stuart. *Church and State in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: H. Davidson, 1993.

Pryor, Felix, (ed.). *Elizabeth I: Her Life in Letters*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Rack, Henry. 'Stratford, Nicholas (bap. 1633, d. 1707)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26646, accessed 14 Oct 2015.

Roberts, Clayton. 'Party and Patronage in Later Stuart England', in Stephen Gaxter (ed.), *England's Rise to Greatness: 1660-1763*. London: University of California Press, 1983, pp. 185-212.

Rose, G. H., (ed.), *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, 1685-1750* Vol. III. London: John Murray, 1831.

Russell, John, (ed.). *Private Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough Vol. II*. London: Colburn, 1838.

Russell, Rachel, John Russell, and John Martin, (eds.). *Letters of Rachel, Lady Russell*. London: Parry and McMillan, 1854.

Sacheverell, Henry. *The Character of a Low-church-man: Drawn in an Answer to The True Character of a Church-man*. London: Booksellers of Great Britain, 1702.

Sacheverell, Henry. *The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State*. London: Publisher not listed, 1710.

Sacheverell, Henry. *The Tryal of Doctor Henry Sacheverell*. London: Rhames & Dickson, 1711.

Sachs, William. *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Sankey, Margaret. 'Sheffield, John, first duke of Buckingham and Normanby (1647–1721)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/25297, accessed 22 September 2016.

Scarisbrick, J. J. *Henry VIII*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Seaward, Paul. 'Charles II (1630–1685)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5144, accessed 10 October 2016.

Sharp, John. *A Sermon Preach'd at the Coronation of Queen Anne*. London: H. Hills, 1708.

Sharp, John. *Coronation; Matthias Range, Ceremonials at British Coronations from James I to Elizabeth II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Sharp, Richard. 'Smallridge, George (1662–1719)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2011, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/25737, accessed 30 September 2016.

Sharp, Thomas, (ed.). *Life of John Sharp: Lord Archbishop of York Vol. I & II*. London: Newcombe, 1825.

Sinclair-Stevenson, Christopher. *Inglorious Rebellion: The Jacobite Risings of 1708,*

1716 And 1719. London: Faber, 2010.

Singer, Samuel, (ed.). *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon*. London: Coburn, 1828.

Sirota, Brett. *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Smith, Hannah. 'Last of all the Heavenly Birth: Queen Anne and Sacral Queenship'. *Parliamentary History* Vol. 28, No. 1, 2008, pp. 137-149.

Smith, James. *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Later Nonjurors: A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth-century Usages Controversy*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Snyder, Henry. 'Spencer, Charles, third earl of Sunderland (1675–1722)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26117, accessed 22 Oct 2015.

Snyder, Henry. 'The Formulation of Foreign and Domestic Policy in the Reign of Queen Anne: Memoranda by Lord Chancellor Cowper of Conversations with Lord Treasurer Godolphin'. *Historical Journal* Vol. 11, No. 1, 1968, pp. 144-160.

Snyder, Henry. *The Marlborough Godolphin Correspondence Vol. I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Somerset, Anne. *Elizabeth I*. London: Knopf Doubleday, 2010

Somerset, Anne. *Queen Anne: The Politics of Passion*. London: Harper Collins, 2012.

Sowerby, Scott. *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Speck, W. A. ‘George, prince of Denmark and duke of Cumberland (1653–1708)’. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10543, accessed 28 Sept 2015.

Speck, W. A. *James II*. London: Longman, 2002.

Speck, W. A. ‘James II and VII (1633–1701)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14593, accessed 10 October 2016.

Speck, W. A. ‘Mary II (1662–1694)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2012, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/18246, accessed 13 September 2016.

Speck, W. A. *Tory and Whig: The Struggle for the Constituencies 1701-1715*. London: Macmillan, 1970.

Stainer Clarke, James. *Life of James II: King of England Vol. I and II*. London: Longman, 1816.

Stanhope, Philip. *History of England Comprising the Reign of Queen Anne Until the Peace of Utrecht*. Leipaiz: Bernhard, 1870.

Stoughton, John. *History of Religion in England from the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century Vol. V*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1881.

Strickland, Agnes and Elisabeth Strickland. *Lives of the queens of England, from the Norman Conquest, Vol. 8*. London: H. Colburn, 1854.

Sturdy, David. 'The Royal Touch in England', in Heinz Duchhardt, Richard A. Jackson, and David J. Sturdy (eds.). *European Monarchy: Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times*. Leipzig: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992.

Sundstrom, Roy. *Sidney Godolphin: Servant of the State*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992.

Swift, Jonathan and Henry St John. *Good Queen Anne Vindicated*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1743.

Swift, Jonathan. *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift Vol. II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Swift, Jonathan. *Journal to Stella Vol. I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.

Sykes, Norman. 'Episcopal Administration in England in the Eighteenth Century'. *English Historical Review* Vol. 47, No. 187, 1932, pp. 416-446.

Sykes, Norman. 'Queen Anne and the Episcopate', *English Historical Review* Vol. 50, No. 199, 1935, pp. 433-464.

Sykes, Norman. *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

Sykes, Norman. *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Sykes, Norman. *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737 Vol. I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Szechi, Daniel. 'Jacobite Politics in the Age of Anne', in Clyve Jones (ed.). *British Politics in the Age of Holmes*. London: Wiley, 2008, pp. 46-55.

Tanner, Joseph Robson, (ed.). *Tudor Constitutional Documents: 1485-1603*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.

Tanner, Joseph Robson. *Samuel Pepys and the Royal Navy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920.

Tenison, Thomas. *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Thomas Tenison, Late Archbishop of Canterbury*. London: J. Roberts, 1716.

The Distinction of High-Church and Low-Church. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1705.

'The first parliament of Queen Anne: First session - Act preventing occasional conformity - begins 20/10/1702', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons*: Vol. III, 1695-1706, London, Chandler, 1742, pp. 212-217, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol3/pp212-217, accessed September 24, 2015.

Thomas, David. *A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph: General, Cathedral, and Parochial*. London: James Parker, 1874.

Thompson, Edward, (ed.). *Correspondence of the family of Hatton, chiefly letters addressed to Christopher first viscount Hatton, A.D. 1601-1704 Vol. II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1878.

Thomson, Mark. 'The Execution of Charles I and the Development of the Constitution', in K. H. D. Haley (ed.), *The Stuarts*. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1973, pp. 28-34.

Tindal Hart, Arthur. *The life and times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*. London: S.P.C.K., 1949.

Tindal, Nicolas and Paul de Rapin. *The continuation of Mr. Rapin's History of England: from the revolution to the present times, Vol. VI*. London: Osborne, 1763.

Trevelyan, G. M. *England Under Queen Anne Vol. I*. London: Collins, 1930.

Trevelyan, G. M. *England Under Queen Anne: The Peace and the Protestant Succession*. London: Collins, 1932.

Trevelyan, G. M. *England Under the Stuarts*. London: Putnam's, 1904.

Van Der Kiste, John. *William and Mary*. Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2006.

Verney, Margaret, (ed.). *Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century from the Manuscripts of Claydon House*. London: E. Benn, 1930.

Verney, Margaret, (ed.). *Letters of the Eighteenth Century Vol. I.* London: E. Benn, 1930.

Vives, Juan de. *Institutione Foeminae Christianae* (trans. Charles E. Fantazzi). Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Waller, Maureen. *Sovereign Ladies: The Six Reigning Queens of England*. London: John Murray, 2006.

Walpole. Horace. *Anecdotes of Painting in England, with Some Account of the Principal Artists, and Notes on Other Arts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849.

Walsh, Johan, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor. *The Church of England 1689-1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Warner, F. G. (ed.). *The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas in Four Volumes*. London: Camden Society, 1897.

Weil, Rachel. 'The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-Pan Conspiracy', in Lois Schwoerer, (ed.). *The Revolution of 1688-1689*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 65-82.

Weisener, Louis. *The Youth of Queen Elizabeth*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1879.

Weston, David. 'Smith, Thomas (1614–1702)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/25910, accessed 14 Oct 2015.

White, Michelle. *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Whitlock, Anne. *Mary Tudor: Princess, Bastard, Queen*. New York: Random House, 2010.

Wickins, P. L. *Victoria Protestantism and Bloody Mary: The Legacy of Religious Persecution in Tudor England*. London: Arena, 2012.

Winn, James Anderson. *Queen Anne: Patroness of Arts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Winton, Calhoun. 'Steele, Sir Richard (*bap.* 1672, *d.* 1729)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2005, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/26347, accessed 1 October 2016.

Wormald, Jenny. 'James VI and I (1566–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2014, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/14592, accessed 18 September 2016.

Wright, E. G. 'Humphrey Humphreys, bishop of Bangor and Hereford'. *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales* Vol. 2, 1950, pp. 72–86.

Wynne, S. M. 'Catherine (1638–1705)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008,

http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/4894, accessed 21 Sept 2015.