



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

An inflammatory match?

Citation for published version:

Murray, C 2016, 'An inflammatory match? Public anxiety and political assurance at the wedding of William III and Mary II' *Historical Research*, vol. 89, no. 246, pp. 730-750.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Historical Research

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



***An Inflammatory Match? Public Anxiety and Political Assurance at the Wedding of
William III and Mary II.***

Both the *Histories* of Gilbert Burnet and of David Hume comment on the ‘general satisfaction’ which greeted the marriage of William, Prince of Orange, to the Lady Mary of York.¹ Certainly, after Charles II’s declaration of 24 October 1677, advertising the forthcoming nuptials, reports of the union filtered through the English capital and that night the town was alive with ‘Bonfires, Ringing of Bells and other Publick Demonstrations of an universal Joy.’² Correspondents on both sides of the Channel reported the pleasure with which the announcement was met by all levels of English and Dutch society.³ Indeed, it was an announcement which had been long-awaited and much anticipated. Given her dynastic position as second-in-line to the throne after her father, James, Duke of York, the disposal of the young Princess’s hand had become an important and much debated issue. Three years earlier, a memorandum had been presented to the Lords and Commons, urging that Mary be given in marriage to her cousin, William. It argued that by so doing, the security of the succession would be protected and ‘all future disputes about the crown will be quieted, as were those bloody controversies between York and Lancaster by the prudent marriage of Henry VII.’⁴ Yet, despite all this, the course of the match was by no means as smooth as later accounts might suggest.

It was not until late 1677 that negotiations progressed decisively, with the Prince of Orange’s visit to the English Court. It would appear that William had been considering his future for several months, drawing up a will in June of that year and declaring the son of the Elector of Brandenburg his heir, should he die without issue.⁵ Few were under any misapprehension about the motives behind his journey. As the diplomat, Roger Meredith, wrote to Secretary Williamson: ‘All expect something extraordinary of this meeting of the

two Courts. And we gather both fro[m] the great number & quality of the Persons that waite upon his Highness, that he designs a Match.⁶ The marriage arrangements, concluded by the Prince and King Charles, were announced at a public Council meeting, during which the Duke of York, Mary's father, spoke frankly of his desire for and consent to the union.⁷ James' Catholic sympathies were believed to favour a French match – there were even rumours that such a match had already been contracted.⁸ However, he was persuaded to consent to the marriage by the King, who believed that the alliance would allay some of the popular suspicions which his brother's conversion to Catholicism had provoked, deeming it 'the only thing capable of helping the Duke'.⁹ The arrangements were negotiated without French knowledge or consent. Indeed, Barrillon, Louis XIV's ambassador, claimed he knew nothing of them until he saw the celebratory bonfires.¹⁰ That such a step had been taken without consultation was remarkable. For many years now the French had advised on English royal affairs. Relations between the Courts had become chilled, however, following a disagreement over the sum of the subsidy paid to Charles in return for keeping Parliament in abeyance, under the terms of the secret Treaty of Dover (1670). Although the French King's public response to news of the union was civil, he was, in fact, dismayed, writing to the Duke of York, 'you have given your daughter to my mortal enemy'.¹¹ The English ambassador to France reported that Louis had received the news: 'As he would have done the loss of an army'.¹² For now, Charles had chosen to distance himself from France and William was to be the major beneficiary.

Preparations were immediately begun for the ceremony, set for 14 November.¹³ Within days, however, the plans had changed. With little warning the wedding was brought forward to 4 November, William's birthday. It seems likely that the nuptials were to have been performed in the Chapel Royal of St James's Palace, as those of Mary's sister, Anne,

were to be six years later.¹⁴ Instead they took place in Mary's bedchamber, were conducted privately and with few in attendance – a turn of events which took the Court by surprise:

Many of the Nobility, Gentry & Principall Courtiers were furnishing themselves with rich cloths ag[ains]t that time and other preparations were making according, yet the Dutch Post arriving on Saturd[ay] night brought, it seems, letters of such contents, that his Ma[jes]tie thought fit to alter his resolution in reference to the time of the said marriage & on Sunday evening declared in Council that it should be celebrated that very night & it was celebrated accordingly . . . this was done so privately that the Dutch Ambass[ado]rs themselves knew nothing thereof till it was over.¹⁵

While the private nature of the ceremony has been attributed to William's insistence that an elaborate display, with its ensuing crowds and closeness, would precipitate one of his coughing fits,¹⁶ this report of disconcerting Dutch tidings indicates that political considerations may also have impacted upon the wedding arrangements. This article examines what those considerations might have been, probing a range of contemporary reactions to the union in Britain and in the United Provinces. By so doing, it offers new insight into the complexities of Anglo-Dutch relations in the late seventeenth century, elucidating the diplomatic significance of the match and its impact on European politics. Celebration was by no means universal and public disquiet exposed the limitations of both the Stuart and Orange propaganda machines. How then did representations of the marriage attempt to assuage prevailing anxieties and concerns? This article argues that, in these initial days, and in response to those misgivings, the foundations for a rich and potent imagery were developed, embodying the communal benefits of William and Mary's personal and political partnership. Focusing on festive and visual images of the match, many of which have been

disregarded until now, it extends analysis of early modern visual display as an important and meaningful means of political communication. The Dutch had a developed visual sensibility and, since their revolt against the rule of Phillip II of Spain, they had been the principal source of pictorial propaganda in Europe.¹⁷ Complex and innovative visual languages were utilised to reassure both Dutch and British audiences. Existing scholarship has tended to view the couple's regal portrayal following the Glorious Revolution in isolation.¹⁸ However, it drew upon well-established conventions. These early representational characteristics were refined and enhanced and, for almost two decades, would remain at the heart of images of their union.

Even before the match was announced there was suspicion surrounding William's motives for visiting the English Court.¹⁹ Despite his cultivated reputation as Protestant champion and challenger of French influence, in England some remained sceptical as to the Prince's political objectives and allegiances. For example, an anonymous letter of 18 September 1677 among the papers of Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, describes the rather bawdy discourse of a group of unidentified gentlemen. In it a certain Mr. Merry was reported to have declared that the Prince was in town to meet the 'great Turkes bassa', the French ambassador, adding that he would at last be rewarded for the service which he had done Louis XIV at Charleroi.²⁰ His remarks recalled William's failed siege against the French in August of that year. Having led the Dutch army to Charleroi's ramparts, on hearing that Marshal Luxembourg was advancing to relieve the town, the Prince raised his siege without fighting a battle.²¹ While William had credible military grounds for his withdrawal, this decision was met with suspicion and rumours circulated that he had, in fact, reached a secret understanding with France.²² In reply to Mr. Merry's avowal, a Mr. Goodenough opined that

William's journey was, indeed, a trick and that he dared not return to Holland.²³ The discussion was brought to a close with the company sardonically concluding that: 'the P[rince] had become a traytor to his country and was a Monster and they would have given as much to have seene him at Bartholomews Faire as they would have given to have seene the Eliphant.'²⁴ This final derisive point referenced that 'wonder of beasts' which had been brought from the Indies and publicly exhibited near Clerkenwell Green in 1675.²⁵ Clearly then, in certain quarters, William's professed ideology was held in some doubt.

Suspicious may, in part, be attributed to a prevalent English image of the Dutch as untrustworthy and dishonourable. Tony Claydon has described how, from the 1660s onwards, anti-Dutch rhetoric repeatedly charged them with treachery, asserting that they lacked principle and would readily break a treaty for material gain.²⁶ In particular, they were accused of insincerity in recent settlements with the English. They had not, for example, negotiated trade grievances as they were required to do under the Treaty of Westminster (1654), concluded following the first Anglo-Dutch War, and they had immediately broken the commercial terms of the peace brokered in 1667 after the second Anglo-Dutch War.²⁷ William's dubious behaviour at Charleroi may well have exacerbated enduring attitudes towards the Dutch, which figured them as men who prized personal gain over honour. At Court too, there were misgivings which were compounded when rumours began to spread that William was a Catholic. A letter from the lawyer, Richard Langhorne, to Christopher, Baron Hatton, described:

how coldly our malecontents looke upon and how malitiously they speake of that Prince. The whole may be wound upp in this short Character that he is a Papist and will certaynly declare himself to be so whenever the Ffrench King shall give him his direceons [sic] for that purpose.²⁸

The attentions which he had paid the Queen, Catherine of Braganza, when he had saluted her at Whitehall, were seen as confirmation of his secret religious leanings.²⁹ In particular, the Country Opposition viewed his union with the Stuarts as a betrayal, indicative of William's true political aims. For them, his association with Charles II and the Duke of York signalled the Prince's own predilection towards absolutism and Catholicism.³⁰ Thus the understanding which he had cultivated with those who opposed the Court and its French sympathies, only a few years before, was now under considerable strain.³¹ Perhaps the strongest indication of substantial discontent, in the capital at least, was the display which accompanied the customary pope-burning on the anniversary of Queen Elizabeth's accession. Shortly after the marriage, an effigy of the supreme pontiff was set alight with a string of oranges hung around its neck and a paper peace treaty in its hand which read: 'France helps me above all'. Its crude citrus rosary was accompanied by the inscription: 'What the great Duke of Alva could not do will be done by the skirts of a woman'.³² Referencing the brutal attempted eradication of Protestantism from the Low Countries under the Governorship of the third Duke of Alba a century earlier, the caption reveals the prevailing confusion surrounding the religious sympathies of both William and his bride. It also points to English anxieties surrounding the protean nature of the Popish threat. In his discussion of the first Anglo-Dutch War, Steven Pincus has shown how some English radicals viewed Dutch Presbyterianism as a ruse, interpreting the Republic's support for the Protestant faith as a 'disguise' for its actual popery.³³ Following the Restoration, fears over Catholic 'shape-shifting' persisted and some Protestant sects were suspected of serving as fronts for Papist sympathisers.³⁴ The religious accusations against William may well reflect these suspicions, consistent with fears over a Catholic conspiracy hiding in the open. Thus, for as long as the political purpose and implications of the union remained unclear, many feared the worst.

This foreboding was not confined to those north of the Channel. In the Dutch Republic too, there was significant suspicion of the marriage. Memories of William's mother, the first Mary Stuart, whose priorities were rarely in line with Dutch interests, no doubt played their part. Once more, however, misinformation and misunderstanding appear to have precipitated concern. In particular, the new fifteen-year-old Princess of Orange was the subject of misdirected aspersions. Mary had lived a relatively secluded existence, growing up at Richmond Palace, away from the Court, with her religious education committed to the supervision of Henry Compton, the staunchly Protestant Bishop of London. Despite this, both her virtue and her faith were to come under question. Indeed, a Dutch tract, written in 1677 and distributed in manuscript form contended that:

The Prince of Orange need not be a sovereign [sic] nor to marry a Papist Princess to the disturbance and devastation of the whole land, if he hath a mind to marry let him marry a pious princess but not a worldly one, & who being born out of an ungodly family [it] may be feared that she shall bring her judgments over to us in Holland.³⁵

It would appear that anxieties over increased Stuart influence were not isolated. As news of William's marital intentions filtered through the Republic share prices on the Amsterdam Bourse dropped.³⁶ In fact, an anonymous report on Dutch reactions to the proposed marriage, probably commissioned by the Secretary of State, Joseph Williamson, asserts that many of the people were 'highly displeased'.³⁷ It continued that the nation's Commonwealth-men feared that such an association indicated William's absolutist inclinations; clergy were concerned that he would be seduced into popery and debauched by the Stuart Court; while

merchants lamented that he would prize English over Dutch interests with their trade ruined as a result.³⁸ The friendship between the Houses of Stuart and Orange, which had been solidified by the marriage of William's mother and father, William II and Mary, Princess Royal, was a source of concern for Dutch Republicans. William II's zealous support of the exiled Stuarts during the Commonwealth and Protectorate, as well as his abortive coup in 1650, exacerbated anxieties that the Princes of Orange wished to establish themselves as monarchs.³⁹ Accordingly, following the death of William II a few months later, the States General moved to exclude the new infant Prince from the key offices of Stadholder and Captain-general.⁴⁰ For over twenty-years the Orange party fought to restore the rights of William III, at times with the collusion of the Stuarts, who wished to install a pro-English regime.⁴¹ When, in the midst of French invasion, the republican administration of Grand Pensionary de Witt fell and the Prince finally entered his estates in 1672, William's rise was tainted by Orangist involvement in De Witt's lynching and his own efforts to reward the principal instigators.⁴² Such actions did not dissipate the fears of those who believed that William lacked any commitment to the republican principle.

His involvement with the Stuarts also had implications for his religious standing. During the Interregnum, the Catholicism of some Stuart family members, such as Charles I's Queen, Henrietta Maria, had intensified doubts among the Dutch Reformed about the religious convictions of the English royal dynasty.⁴³ Charles II's marriage to a Catholic Portuguese princess and the Duke of York's conversion further complicated perceptions of Stuart religious identity in the Republic.⁴⁴ William's relationship with his Stuart relatives was also a cause for concern, given the long-term commercial and maritime rivalry between England and the United Provinces. After all, the past twenty-five years had witnessed three bitterly fought naval wars between the two nations. A combination of bellicosity and economic self-interest had led the English Parliament to declare war in 1652.⁴⁵ Following the

Restoration, Charles II's ministers had continued to pick quarrels with the Dutch and war soon loomed again, culminating in a two-year conflict.⁴⁶ The third Anglo-Dutch War, another premeditated campaign of English and French aggression, had ended only three years before the marriage contract was signed.⁴⁷ Competition for control of trade was a contributing factor to the outbreak of hostilities but the fighting, itself, had led to the disruption of international trade and commerce.⁴⁸ The Republic needed a leader who would defend Dutch interests against its rivals, not get into bed with them. The marriage, therefore, stirred long-standing anxieties over relations between the two royal houses and the perils of English influence. It may well be that it was tidings of this sort which convinced both Charles and William to hasten the marriage arrangements, thereby pre-empting any further opposition. Certainly, almost twenty years later, memories still lingered of the union's somewhat mixed reception. After Mary's death, her biographer, Daniel Defoe, recalled the disquiet which the marriage had provoked in the United Provinces, where it was feared that instead of bringing the English Court to a pro-Dutch understanding, the Prince had instead been lured to favour English interests and that ultimately, 'they had rather lost a Champion by it, than gained one'.⁴⁹

Thus, for some at least, William's public image as defender of the Reformed Church and protector of liberty had been undermined, while, despite the care which had been taken to distance Mary from her father's religion, as well as from her uncle's dissolute court, she had been tainted by association. In the light of these public misgivings, a new propaganda campaign was required – one which would underline the blessings of such a match and present both protagonists as the purveyors of its bounty. How then was the marriage to be recast? The anonymous report on Dutch reactions to the nuptials (cited earlier) concluded by advocating a remedy for those popular apprehensions:

If we have a Peace, so that our armyes may be lessened, Our extraordinary taxes laid aside, & our Trade opened; or your Court cordially comply with Our Interest, it will be apparent, that both they and he [the Stuarts and William] seek not to oppress Us, & carry on those designs w[hi]ch we are jealous & afraid of.⁵⁰

It was to address these concerns that representations of the marriage turned. Images of husband and wife articulated promises of peace and concord, renewed prosperity, united strength in religion and freedom from oppression. Crucially, the match was also positioned as a major impediment to French domination. In fact, the wedding and subsequent treaties between England and the Dutch Republic signified a considerable alteration in the alignments of the European powers.⁵¹ Prior to this, France's position in Europe had seemed unassailable. By 1677 the protracted Franco-Dutch War had taken its toll on the coalition forces united against Louis XIV. In the Republic support for the war had waned – commerce was in decline and coffers were depleted; yet a peace acceptable to all sides seemed a long way off.⁵² Charles II's French sympathies were well known, but with this new understanding between the English and Dutch, it was hoped that some form of balance could be restored.⁵³ It seemed to many that England had abandoned her former ally. Certainly, relations between the English and French Kings soured, when Louis stopped the payment of his most recent subsidy and, instead, began paying pensions to those who opposed Charles' chief minister and architect of the match, the Earl of Danby.⁵⁴ The bonds of this royal union, therefore, impacted upon both familial and international relations. Accordingly, it was portrayed as an alliance of nations, as well as of man and wife.

While the privacy of the wedding ceremony itself had precluded the opportunity for spectacle and display, beyond the confines of the English Court the authorities celebrated extravagantly. When the news of the intended match reached Plymouth and Chester it was greeted with bells, bonfires, discharges from the great guns and other expressions of joy.⁵⁵ In Edinburgh, on 30 October, the Duke of Lauderdale, Lord President of the Privy Council of Scotland, assembled the other Lords of the Council and the local nobility at the city gates.⁵⁶ Drums and trumpets heralded them as they processed toward the Mercat Cross, accompanied by the town councillors, the Lord Provost and baillies, all in their official robes, bearing the sword and mace, and followed by the Town Guard.⁵⁷ Around the Cross, adorned for the occasion with tapestries, a stage and an arbour, hung with hundreds of oranges, had been erected. From the stage and another, placed opposite, the Duke and the assembled quality drank the healths of the Prince and Princess and the royal family, while the Castle cannons roared and the conduits on the Cross ran with wine.⁵⁸ Bells rang, bonfires blazed and sweetmeats were thrown into the assembled crowds.⁵⁹ Meanwhile, in Dublin, on 5 November, the Duke of Ormond, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, after attending ‘the play’ extended an invitation to the nobility and gentry present to spend the evening at the Castle.⁶⁰ While the bells chimed, the bonfires flared and the city guns fired outside, a great ball was held inside, followed by a magnificent banquet.⁶¹

In addition to these grand civic gestures of loyalty and celebration, the match was also exalted in word and image. In Britain a number of commemorative poems were penned, proclaiming the political significance and mutual advantages of the match. According to their authors it was not simply a marriage but a ‘League’, which would assure peace in Europe.⁶² John Oldham’s verse described the couple as ‘Sure Pledges of a firm and lasting Peace’,⁶³ while Edmund Waller’s ode compared their union to the walls which had protected Ancient Athens.⁶⁴ Emphasis was also placed upon the fruits of the match – a much hoped-for male

line which would promise the security of the Protestant succession. After four years of marriage, the failure of the Duke of York's second wife, Mary of Modena, to produce a male heir meant that her step-daughter's reproductive responsibilities were pressing.⁶⁵

Accordingly, eulogists prayed that she might prove as fertile as her grandmother, Henrietta Maria.⁶⁶ Comparing the events of the wedding day to the deliverance of Protestantism from the Gunpowder Plot, one writer predicted that the couple's offspring would guarantee the preservation of the reformed faith:

And so the 4th day of November now
Doth in desert & fame the 5th out-do;
That sav'd the Princes from the fatall blow,
This will new princes on our land bestow;
That to the true Religion help did lend,
This will display it unto nature's end.⁶⁷

Visual representations of the match followed suit. Up until her betrothal Mary's portraiture had been confined to painted renderings, a handful of attractive pictures of the young Princess, executed primarily by or after Charles II's principal painter, Peter Lely.⁶⁸ Following her wedding, a number of printed portraits were published, all based upon later compositions by Lely, commissioned to mark her marriage and forthcoming departure for Holland. The emphasis of these images was upon Mary's assumption of her conjugal duties, portraying her as the fertile source of a new royal line. Increasingly casual states of *déshabillé*, revealing neck-lines and an abundance of flora combined to create some pointed and surprisingly sensual portraits.⁶⁹ A case in point is an anonymous mezzotint, after a lost portrait by Lely, published by Richard Tompson (c.1678, See Figure 1). The new Princess of

Orange is depicted three-quarter length, in a state of undress, her loose-fitting *sacque* arranged to expose her youthful *décolletage* and the curve of her right breast. In her right hand she cradles a small basket of flowers and in her left she grasps some of the buds. The prominence of Mary's breasts underscores her potential fruitfulness, while the significance of the strategic positioning of the blossoms over her reproductive organs could hardly be more blatant. Amidst increasing pressure to produce a male heir and to secure a Protestant line of succession, therefore, Mary was portrayed, in very deliberate terms, as the future progenitrix of a new generation of Stuart offspring. Tompson's printed portrait of William (c.1678, See Figure 2), also derived from a composition by Lely, depicted the Prince in armour, gripping a baton of military command, with a battle waging in the distance.⁷⁰ Given the protagonist, the identity of the enemy was heavily implied – William was represented here leading his troops against the French. As a pair then the portraits portrayed the newlyweds in conventional yet politically-charged gendered roles. Together they proclaimed the anticipated legacy of this union: the preservation of Protestantism and the suppression of French dominion.

The imagery associated with these engravings was extended in more complex allegorical images. Thus a Dutch medal, cast in silver, by O. Müller (1677, See Figure 3), pressed to commemorate the marriage, expands on the various implications of this alliance. The obverse depicts the couple, right hands clasped and holding a flaming heart. The heart serves a dual purpose, denoting both loving affection and the sacred heart of Christ.⁷¹ This double theme of emotional and religious devotion is continued in the periphery, where rays of light cascade from the sun above - indicative of God's blessing - and a Cupid spouts water in a nearby fountain. The Dutch legend reinforces this message: 'In marriage with love and faith, God crowns with his blessing man and wife.'⁷² The reverse shows two armed female

figures, each bearing a spear topped with a liberty cap. The figure on the right, a personification of the Dutch Republic, holds seven arrows representing the seven united provinces, while the Dutch lion lies at her feet. Her counterpart, who represents Britain, holds the English flag of St. George with a harp and thistle at her feet, denoting Ireland and Scotland. Peace unites the shafts of their spears with an olive garland, while the legend reads: ‘Here Holy Peace unites Britain and Holland; let the world respect their alliance and dread their standards.’⁷³ At the end of the legend an upturned *fleur-de-lys* is just perceptible. This subtle feature makes a pointed statement. William and Mary’s match is presented as a political alliance between two nations – one which will not only bring an end to conflict in Europe but also to French supremacy. This reverse type with minor adjustments had occurred on two other medals commemorating the Peace of Holland in 1654 and the peace between Holland and the Bishop of Munster in 1666.⁷⁴ Thus, to all intents and purposes, their marital union has been presented as if it were a ratified peace treaty.

Dutch propaganda, in particular, adopted these notions of concord and retribution. An intriguing and iconographically rich etching by Romeyn de Hooghe (1678, See Figure 4), further underlines the wide-ranging benefits of the royal match. De Hooghe’s image constitutes a complex, visual manifesto for the advantages of Anglo-Dutch co-operation and it is worth analysing it in some detail. William and Mary take central stage on a series of elevated plinths. The lowest depicts an imagined rendering of the marriage ceremony at St. James’s Palace, while the next has been left blank and, in this case, a ‘Princely Almanac’ for 1678 pasted in. Above, William is dressed as a Roman general, his pauldrons emblazoned with the Belgic lion, and his head crowned with a laurel wreath. Mary is portrayed in an ornate jewelled gown, lined with ermine, and clutching an olive branch in her hand. As such, husband and wife are presented in corresponding roles – he as martial victor and she as royal peace-maker. Both gesture to the elaborate altar which stands behind them. At its base is a

round plaque showing a group of seven cattle, signifying the seven Dutch Provinces. They stand in close formation, baring their horns against two French wolves. The inscription which encircles the scene explains, 'We keep watch lest we become slaves.' This motif asserts, therefore, that the Dutch remain vigilant against French oppression. Above the medallion, a snake, denoting heresy, writhes in flames. William focuses his gaze on a female personification of the Republic, holding a liberty cap and the seven arrows of the United Provinces. She fixes a banner to the altar which proclaims 'Stronger in unity'. Over the shields of the Provinces, a pair of clasped hands expresses the couple's personal and dynastic alliance, while a bust of Hercules, traditionally associated with heroic virtue, sits at the top of the totem. Hercules would, in fact, become a favourite iconographic conceit of William III, who adopted the motif as a metaphor for his fight to protect Protestantism from the malevolent forces of Catholicism, headed by Louis XIV.⁷⁵ Thus the subtext of this central grouping portrays the marriage as a harmonious partnership – an instrument of peace, protector of religion and barrier to French dominion. These themes are continued throughout the print.

At the top of the image, perched on a cloud, Hymen, god of marriage, presides over the scene.⁷⁶ Two turtle doves fly overhead, signifying loving devotion, while Hymen's followers bear symbols of peace, wealth and victory – an olive branch, a cornucopia, overflowing with coins, and a palm leaf. These are the shared prizes of this union. Just below, illuminated by rays of light breaking through the clouds, are several busts depicting the Republic's allies. *Anglia* too is present, drawn closer to the Dutch interest as a result of the match. Beneath this pantheon, the walls are decorated with scenes which illustrate the recent victories of those allies, including the successful siege of Stettin (1678) and the capture of Carlslen Fortress (1677). The implication is surely that William and Mary's marriage represents another such victory, one which can only benefit the fight against Louis XIV. The

Republic's confederates are even present among the wedding guests, with a female personification of the Holy Roman Empire positioned just behind Mary. The two-headed eagle is displayed upon her robe and she wears an imperial crown-helmet on her head.

Yet not all of those in attendance are so pleased with the marriage. At the bottom right, France gestures in alarm as her foothold becomes increasingly precarious and her military baton slips from her lap. Gripping the French cockerel in one hand, her dress is covered with ears and lips in reference to slander and sedition. Behind her, a Catholic prelate looks on in dismay. In his hands is a pair of bellows with which he blows foul air into a large book, probably a bible. By inference, the priest is pictured blasting the word of God with popish falsehood, stoking ignorance and delusion.⁷⁷ He, in turn, is accompanied by a hag-like woman, with the ears of an ass, representing error.⁷⁸ She raises her hand in anguish. A scarf, embellished with a sun, covers her head so that there can be little doubt that this allusion refers to *Le Roi Soleil*, himself. Once more then, the marriage has been portrayed as significantly more than a partnership between man and wife; rather it is an alliance between nations. Together, the English and Dutch will overcome French belligerence and reap the mutual benefits of their joint ascendance.

Three years earlier, de Hooghe had executed another etching - which shares many of the motifs and themes of this image - already advocating an Orange-Stuart match and a closer relationship with Britain.⁷⁹ Taken as a whole therefore, this remarkable print portrays the marriage as a transformative union. Its dense iconography proclaimed that the match would establish peace, preserve Protestantism and revive prosperity. It further asserted that with Britain's new-found support French power and aggression would be curbed.⁸⁰ As its accompanying poem proclaimed, 'love conquers'. Here, the affectionate marital bonds of William and Mary represented a significant shift in the European political landscape.

It was not only commemorative paraphernalia, however, which portrayed the match in these terms. Following the couple's arrival in Holland, similar iconography was employed during their magnificent entry to The Hague on the 14 December. Throughout the city triumphal architecture, firework displays and tableaux proclaimed the advantages of the match. The entry itself began in the afternoon. Drawing up to The Hague Bridge the newlyweds were saluted by twelve companies of burghers. Beyond, twenty-four young girls, dressed in white - half from the public orphanage and half from the poor house - walked two by two beside their coach, singing and strewing sweet-smelling herbs.⁸¹ As the couple approached the City Hall, they passed through a triumphal arch, decorated with foliage and adorned with their arms and two hands clasped together. Its Latin caption, rather pointedly, read:

AVRIACI HIS THALAMIS BATAVIS DOS REGIA PAX SIT

– 'Let the royal dowry by the marriage of Orange bring peace to the Dutch.'⁸² An acrostic within the inscription gave the year of the marriage in Roman numerals.⁸³ As they crossed the Market Place and entered the High Street another triumphal arch received them with these words:

Long Live Nassau's Hector for his wife and for the Dutch,

Long live the Britannic Princess for Orange and her native land.⁸⁴

That evening they were entertained with pyrotechnics and bonfires on the river. Among the displays, the crowned red and gold lion of the Dutch Republic was set alight. Its right paw gripped the customary gilded sword, while, instead of the seven arrows of the

United Provinces, it held in its left a laurel branch, a symbol of victory. The meaning was clear – as a result of this match, the martial lion, set to defend Dutch liberty, was now triumphant. After this, the crowds were offered the spectacle of St. George on horseback, battling a massive dragon, some twelve feet long.⁸⁵ Other displays were held outside the houses of the Count of Nassau, the Spanish and Danish ambassadors, and those of the representatives of the Dukes of Brandenburg and of Lorraine.⁸⁶ Indeed, the author of a pamphlet describing the celebrations informs the reader that across the city so many bonfires blazed that it seemed that The Hague was on fire.⁸⁷ Finally, an ox was roasted and the curious Dutch bystanders were served traditional English roast beef.⁸⁸ Overall, the imagery of Orange and Stuart alliance appealed to both international and domestic concerns. At its heart lay the promise of European concord and a shift in the balance of power which would assure peace. In fact, peace was the union's greatest reward and the most consistent aspect in its portrayal. With the conclusion of hostilities, the preservation of liberty, the protection of the reformed faith and a renewed prosperity were ensured. Messages of peace were underwritten, however, with an explicit statement of the geopolitical threat represented by the emerging universal monarchy of Louis XIV. France was depicted as belligerent, superstitious and morally corrupt. With her allies, including the Catholic Habsburg powers, the Republic would curb French ambition and expansion. In correspondence with this trans-confessional league, the religious legacy of this marriage was imagined not as a crusade but as the security of a new generation of Orange and Stuart Protestant heirs.

With the signing of the Treaty of Nijmegen in August 1678, the Dutch at last secured peace – but not without cost. While the Treaty was a political coup and a significant step towards economic recovery, the agreement to a separate peace with France left the Republic's allies in the lurch and reinforced the Dutch reputation for self-interest and untrustworthiness.⁸⁹ The impact of the Orange-Stuart match on the conclusion of hostilities is

difficult to gauge. Although the Anglo-Dutch Alliance of January 1678 signalled a closer relationship between the two nations, Charles II's commitment to an anti-French coalition was to prove unreliable.⁹⁰ Those misgivings which the marriage had initially provoked, however, do appear to have gradually subsided. Yet, it is difficult to gauge fully the impact which this intensive propaganda campaign, encompassing word, image and spectacle, had on reducing public disquiet. Perhaps the greatest indication of its appeal is the persistent projection - well after 1677 - of its associated imagery of international alliance, the preservation of Protestantism and the defence of liberty against tyranny. Indeed, it seems likely that this early utilisation of the persuasive arts prepared William for the extensive promotional operation which he later employed during, and after, the 1688 Revolution. His experiences of public anxiety and political assurance in the period surrounding his wedding left him well-equipped to press his case in the future with both Dutch and British audiences.

Kevin Sharpe has rightly observed that during the reign of William and Mary the royal marriage was central to representations of monarchy.⁹¹ The Queen was joint ruler with her husband and, while executive authority rested with him, Mary's image was a valuable bolster to the new regime. As elder daughter of the deposed James II she lent legitimacy to the post-Revolution government, while as an Englishwoman she served, in part, to mitigate William's foreignness.⁹² In terms too of appearance and temperament she was a more attractive figure than her spouse. Representations of the Queen, therefore, balanced and complemented those of the King. William had justified the Dutch invasion of England as a move to secure Mary's hereditary rights to the throne.⁹³ From the outset, therefore, he had positioned himself as a husband protecting the property of his wife. With Mary's arrival in England in February 1689, this marital rhetoric was extended. Thus an anonymous broadside

proclaimed ‘The Church and Crown’s Felicity Consumated [sic]’ by her joyful reception.⁹⁴

The author re-employed the parallels used in 1677 between the marriage of Henry VII, which united York and Lancaster, and that of William and Mary, a ‘more Glorious Union’, which had at last secured the religion, liberty, peace and happiness of the English nation.⁹⁵

Following the couple’s coronation, Henry Bruges’ poem drew upon the biblical tenet that husband and wife are united in one body to reflect on their unique joint sovereignty:⁹⁶

Thrice happy pair: whom ev’n a very Crown
(That source of all divisions) renders one,
So jointly one, that England seems to me,
Even while two reign to be a monarchy.⁹⁷

Performed shortly after, Thomas Shadwell’s *libretto* to Henry Purcell’s birthday ode for Queen Mary, *Now does the glorious Day appear*, casts the joint monarchy as a harmonious union, contrasting William’s martial aspect with Mary’s domestic charms – a recurring theme in Purcell’s six birthday odes for the Queen.⁹⁸ By promoting a portrayal which underlined their marital bonds, the public were presented with a familiar and reassuring image, at once both private and public.

Amidst these matrimonial allusions, the well-defined characteristics of their representation persisted. Eulogists again invoked their unwavering commitment to Protestantism, lauding husband and wife as ‘Religious Champions’, set against ‘that Monster Pope’, and ‘God’s Agents’, who battled ‘the Popes great Hopes, Priests, Monks and All’.⁹⁹ References to liberty and freedom from oppression were also reiterated. The couple were exalted as ‘mighty champions’ who had courageously secured ‘lasting freedom’.¹⁰⁰ In *Britain Reviv’d*, the anonymous author stressed the providential nature of the Revolution by

employing meteorological imagery. The ‘stormy weather’ of the former regime had at last been replaced by ‘bright days’ and the ship of state now sailed a straight course:

O’ happy we! Since You’ve your Reign begun
Our LAWS shall now in their old Channel Run;
LIBERTY no more shall fettered lye,
Nor PROPERTY with close confinement dye.¹⁰¹

The theme of international aid and alliance returned too, except that this time it was the Dutch who had come to the defence of the British. Verses heralded ‘The British and Belgick Lion join’d’,¹⁰² celebrating the protection which their combined naval powers promised:

Whilst kind Dutch Tarpaulin,
With English-boys fall in,
And both our stout Navys proud Britain shall wall in.¹⁰³

Visual imagery followed in this vein, underlining the security, freedom and concord brought about by William and Mary’s marital monarchy. An anonymous silver medal of Dutch origin (1689, See Figure 5), is of special interest for its unusual representation of the pair. The majority of medals depicting the couple, present their conjoined busts in right profile, with William in the foreground and Mary behind.¹⁰⁴ Significantly, husband and wife are portrayed here facing each other, chest-to-chest and eye-to-eye. William is shown in armour, his ermine mantle draped so as to reveal a lion’s face emblazoned on his shoulder. A laurel wreath crowns his long curls and he wears a star suspended from a riband, possibly an approximation of the Lesser George. Opposite, Mary’s hair is entwined with pearls, symbolic

of purity, with a lovelock resting on her shoulder, denoting affectionate devotion. On her breast is a small pearl and gem brooch in the shape of a cross. Again King and Queen are presented in complementary gendered roles – William cast as martial champion and Mary as a model of pious virtue. Their conjugal relationship is implicit and it is this partnership which underpins the felicity of their rule. The accompanying legend proclaims: ‘A noble pair greater than their sceptres.’¹⁰⁵ The point is simple – William and Mary are not elevated by their accession to the crown; rather it is the crown which is elevated by their custodianship. The reverse reinforces this image of alliance, although, here, it is the British and the Dutch who are united. With the British royal arms at her feet and wearing a robe decorated with roses and thistles, Britannia moves to embrace a female personification of the Republic, dressed for battle and carrying a shield bearing William’s arms. Heavenly rays illuminate the pair, while the Dutch fleet is visible in the distance. Behind Britannia a column stands, representing fortitude. Instead of a capital it is topped with the heads of the British and Dutch lions above which rests a liberty cap. If the viewer were in any doubt as to the significance of this arrangement, it is underscored by the legend: ‘Great Britain delivered, restored and supported by the naval expedition of the Dutch.’¹⁰⁶ Thus, the binding Anglo-Dutch league, so long-awaited, was now deemed a reality.

It is worth considering one final image which further demonstrates the continuity of representations of William and Mary. Adriaan Schoonebeek, a student of Romeyn de Hooghe, published a series of etchings depicting the events of the Revolution, entitled *The Theatre of England* (1689). The print issued as the title page to Part One of the series (1689, See Figure 6) employs a complex allegory to represent the change of royal regimes. The King and Queen are depicted having just arrived on the scene, hands clasped and dressed in their coronation robes. Just behind them, Triton blows his shell trumpet, while the Dutch fleet is visible in the distance. William steps forward to assist Britannia, who beseeches him to

release her from her shackles. With his right hand he unlocks her restraints, while trampling some discarded fetters with his foot. On the opposite side of the print, James II makes to escape – a wolf pelt wrapped round his waist denotes his duplicity. In his wake lie three lifeless bodies - one beheaded, one hanged and one disembowelled - as well as the remnants of a smouldering building. Here are the vestiges of his reign. As he flees he drops his sceptre and his crown falls from his head. However, he retains the mark of his tyranny, a firebrand, which he grips in his left hand. James runs to the safety of his ally, Louis XIV, who is shown decked in armour with the French cockerel crowning his helmet. His armies lie beyond. Louis receives the firebrand from James – a symbolic passing of the baton, which signifies Louis' status as Europe's foremost despot. Above, in the Heavens, two allegorical figures represent Liberty and Justice. Liberty bears William's royal arms upon his shield, from which beams of light emanate, striking James below. Beside him, blind Justice is guided by the eye of providence, floating above her head and surrounded by a snake eating its own tail - an *ouroboros* - symbolising eternity. Once more then, William and Mary have been positioned as Britain's saviours. The executors of God's will, King and Queen are the liberators and protectors of their subjects. Yet amidst this background of deliverance and hope, one adversary still lingers. France and Louis XIV remain the enemies of peace. After over ten years then, the royal match was still defined as much by what it stood against as by what it stood for.

It is important to recognise that early modern propaganda was, by its very nature, designed to counter opposition, responding to doubts and anxieties. The imagery surrounding the marriage of William and Mary was no different. On both sides of the Channel, suspicions regarding the couple's political motivations, religious inclinations and personal conduct provided an impetus for the fashioning of re-assuring representations, intended to endorse

and persuade. Negative reactions were answered with images which figured the couple as upholders of liberty, committed Protestants and paragons of moral virtue. Rich and complex portrayals, loaded with symbolism, presented the match as an alliance which would promote international peace, restore wealth and safeguard national security. Significantly, it was also positioned as an obstacle to French dominion and to the supremacy of Louis XIV. The propaganda campaign which accompanied the Revolution of 1688 has been put forward as the first instance of the close association between England and Holland which would characterise William III's rule.¹⁰⁷ Yet, as we have seen, over a decade earlier, the Orange-Stuart match had demanded its own focused promotional programme, directed at both British and Dutch audiences. Helmer J. Helmers has demonstrated how the 'traffic' of texts and images circulating between the United Provinces and Britain, during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum, strengthened Anglo-Dutch networks, fostering a transnational public sphere.¹⁰⁸ As this article demonstrates, cultural dialogues and exchanges persisted after the Restoration, playing upon political and religious connections and influencing public opinion in both nations.

The images which William had employed to justify his choice of bride continued to circulate in the years following. They were revised and refined to validate his assumption of sovereign power. With this development, however, representational emphases and nuances shifted. William's established portrayal as Dutch nationalist stadholder was reconfigured as English patriot king. First and foremost, the royal couple were now portrayed as Britain's deliverers, restoring the laws and liberties of the nation. Domestic and international concerns once more coalesced, with William's rival, James II, depicted as an agent of the French aggressor, Louis XIV. Despite the couples' failure to produce the long-awaited Stuart-Orange heir (probably as a result of complications arising from Mary's miscarriage in 1678), their Protestant legacy was now assured in their defence of the English throne from the forces of

Catholicism. Thus, the joint monarchy of William and Mary was presented as a perfectly balanced partnership which guaranteed those values central to their marital portrayal. Indeed, when the Queen died in 1694, clergyman, William Bates, preached that the fates had aligned to bring about this auspicious match, ‘Our Serenity and Tranquillity, the flourishing of Peace and Truth, are from the benevolent Aspect and favourable Influence of these two bright Stars in Conjunction.’¹⁰⁹ When husband and wife became king and queen then, their representation was not created anew but rather built upon a potent iconography which had been developing for years. William was, by now, ‘an experienced publicist’, who fully comprehended the important role of the visual in mass political communication.¹¹⁰ The images which accompanied both match and monarchy enticed, entertained and informed. They had an immediacy which, supplemented by layers of deeper meaning, could be understood on a number of levels. These innovative depictions of royal marital union, therefore, also underscored the potential of visual display for the development of propaganda in Britain.

¹ G. Burnet, *Bishop Burnet’s History of his Own Time* (6 Vols., Edinburgh, 1753), ii. p. 173; D. Hume, *The History of Great Britain* (4 Vols., Dublin, 1754-61), iv. p. 35.

² *The London Gazette*, Issue 1245, 22-25 Oct, 1677, p. 2.

³ See for example, The National Archives of the UK: Public Record Office, SP 29/397/182; Bodleian Library, Carte MS 70 fo. 458; British Library, Additional MS 32095 fo. 44; Bod. Libr., Carte MS 72 fo. 314; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 84/205 p. 176.

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series) 1673-5*, January 1674, p. 132.

⁵ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 84/205 p. 22.

⁶ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 84/205 p. 142.

⁷ Brit. Libr., Add MS 32095 fo. 44.

⁸ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 29/366/219.

-
- ⁹ Bod. Libr., Carte MS 47 fo. 246. The King's view on the match is recorded in a letter from Thomas Butler, Earl of Ossory, to his father, James Butler, Duke of Ormonde, during previous unsuccessful marriage negotiations with the Prince of Orange in early 1675.
- ¹⁰ C. Grose, 'The Anglo-Dutch Alliance of 1678', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 39, No. 155 (Jul. 1924), 349-372, at p. 350.
- ¹¹ W. Troost, *Sir William Temple, William III and the Balance of Power in Europe* (Dordrecht, 2011), p. 128.
- ¹² Grose, p. 350.
- ¹³ Bod. Libr., Carte MS 79 fo. 140. Anon., to William Wharton, 28 Nov. 1677.
- ¹⁴ E. Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven and London, 2001).
- ¹⁵ Bod. Libr., Carte MS 79 fo. 140.
- ¹⁶ J. Van Der Kiste, *William and Mary* (Stroud, 2003), p. 47.
- ¹⁷ L. Schwoerer, 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 82, No. 4 (Oct., 1977), 843-874, at p. 848.
- ¹⁸ See for example, R. Maccubbin and M. Hamilton-Phillips (eds), *The Age of William III and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688-1702* (Williamsburg, 1988); L. Schwoerer, 'Images of Queen Mary II, 1689-95', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter, 1989), 717-748; K. Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchies, 1660-1714* (New Haven and London, 2013).
- ¹⁹ Brit. Libr., Add MS 28091 fo. 61. The letter has been identified by K.H.D. Haley as from Robert Southwell to James Butler, Duke of Ormond.
- ²⁰ Brit. Libr., Add MS 28091 fo. 61. The term 'bassa' refers to a pasha, a high-ranking Ottoman official.
- ²¹ O. Van Nimwegen (Andrew May trans.), *The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688* (Woodbridge, 2010), p. 504.
- ²² K.H.D. Haley, 'The Anglo Dutch Rapprochement of 1677', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 73, No. 289 (Oct., 1958), 614-48, at p. 636.
- ²³ Brit. Libr., Add MS 28091 fo. 61.
- ²⁴ Brit. Libr., Add MS 28091 fo. 61.
- ²⁵ Anon., *A Full and True Relation of the Elephant that is Brought Over into England from the Indies and Landed at London, August 3rd 1675* (London, 1675), one sheet.
- ²⁶ T. Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 141.
- ²⁷ Claydon, p. 143.

-
- ²⁸ Brit. Libr., Add MS 29556 fo. 243. The letter is dated 16 Oct., 1677.
- ²⁹ Brit. Libr., Add MS 29556 fo. 243.
- ³⁰ Haley, p. 648.
- ³¹ Haley, p. 648; Troost, p. 125.
- ³² Haley, p. 648.
- ³³ S. Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 129.
- ³⁴ D. Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (Oxford, 2013), p. 287.
- ³⁵ Bod. Lib., Clarendon MS 87 fo. 299v. The tract, penned by John Rothe, is entitled: *A Short and brief relation from whence the War betwixt France, England and this State is arisen for instruction of the peaceable mynded Subjects.*
- ³⁶ W. Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King: A Political Biography* (Aldershot and Burlington, 2005), p. 138.
- ³⁷ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 84/205, p. 178.
- ³⁸ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 84/205, p. 178.
- ³⁹ H. Rowe, *The Princes of Orange, The Stadholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 93.
- ⁴⁰ Rowe, p. 96.
- ⁴¹ Rowe, p. 117.
- ⁴² Rowe, p. 129.
- ⁴³ H.J. Helmers, *The Royalist Republic, Literature, Politics and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge, 2015). p. 96.
- ⁴⁴ Helmers, p. 264; Rowe, p. 137.
- ⁴⁵ S. Groenveld, 'The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640-1652', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 30, Issue 3 (Sept., 1987), 541-566 at p. 566.
- ⁴⁶ Claydon, p. 133.
- ⁴⁷ J.R. Jones, *The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the Seventeenth Century* (London and New York, 1996), p. 180.
- ⁴⁸ S. Pincus, 'From Butterboxes to Wooden Shoes: The Shift in English Popular Sentiment from Anti-Dutch to Anti-French in the 1670s', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 2, (June, 1995), 333-361 at p. 340.
- ⁴⁹ D. Defoe, *The Life of that Incomparable Princess, Mary, our late Sovereign Lady, of ever Blessed Memory* (1695), p. 35.

⁵⁰ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 84/205, p. 178v.

⁵¹ Haley, p. 614; J. Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis 1677-1683* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 40.

⁵² Van Der Kiste, p. 28; J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic, Its Rise, Greatness and Fall 1477-1806* (Oxford, 1995), p. 822.

⁵³ Haley, pp. 615-6.

⁵⁴ Scott, p. 40.

⁵⁵ *The London Gazette*, Issue 1249, 5-8 Nov, 1677, p. 2.

⁵⁶ D. Defoe, p. 16; Anon., *Relation Veritable, De ce qui s'est passé au Sujet du Voyage de Son Altesse Monseigneur le Prince d'Orange en Angleterre, & de Son Mariage avec la Princesse Marie Fille ainee de S.A.R. Monseign(eu)r le Duc d'Yorck* (The Hague, 1678). p. 22.

⁵⁷ Defoe, p. 16; *Relation Veritable*, p. 22.

⁵⁸ Defoe, p. 17; *Relation Veritable*, p. 22.

⁵⁹ Defoe, p. 17; *Relation Veritable*, p. 23.

⁶⁰ Defoe, p. 19; *The London Gazette*, No. 1257, 3-6 Dec., 1677, p. 1.

⁶¹ Defoe, p. 19; *The London Gazette*, No. 1257, p. 1.

⁶² J. Oldham, *Upon the Marriage of the Prince of Orange with the Lady Mary* (1677), p. 2; T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 29/398/13. These anonymous manuscript verses are entitled *To the Right Hono(ur)able Sr Joseph Williamson, principall Secretary of State, on the Marriage of His Highnesse, the Prince of Orange with the Lady Mary*.

⁶³ Oldham, p. 2.

⁶⁴ E. Waller, *Of the Lady Mary* (1677), p. 4.

⁶⁵ This may explain the interest in the wedding-night exertions of the newlyweds, who reportedly consummated the match five times – see T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP 29/397/182.

⁶⁶ Oldham, p. 4.

⁶⁷ T.N.A.: P.R.O., SP/29/398/13.

⁶⁸ See, for example, Lely's portrait of her as the goddess Diana, *Mary II, when Princess* (1672), Royal Collection, London; another canvas by Lely, of her sitting in an Arcadian landscape, *Mary II, when Princess of York* (1674), Berkeley Castle, Berkeley, Gloucestershire; and an oval portrait after Lely, *Princess Mary, later Queen Mary II* (c.1673), Lady Lever Art Gallery, Port Sunlight.

⁶⁹ See, for example, Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (c.1677), Portland Art Museum, Portland, Oregon, U.S.A.; Abraham Blooteling's mezzotint after this portrait, *Maria Princeps Auriaca* (c.1678), Museum

No. 1902,1011.234, British Museum, London; Peter Lely, *Mary II, when Princess of Orange* (c.1677), Syon Park, Brentford, Middlesex; and an anonymous mezzotint, after Lely's earlier portrait of Mary at Berkeley Castle, published by Richard Tompson, *Her Highness the Princess of Orange* (c.1678), Museum No. 1902,1011.5297, British Museum, London.

⁷⁰ See a copy after the original painting - after Peter Lely, *William III* (1677), National Portrait Gallery, London.

⁷¹ While this imagery is more commonly associated with Catholicism, it was also employed in Protestant art. A print of Charles II (1661) shows the newly restored monarch within a flaming heart – see D. Solkin, 'Isaac Fuller's Escape of Charles II: A Restoration Tragicomedy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 62 (1999), 199-240, at pp. 217- 218.

⁷² E. Hawkins, *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the Death of George II* (4 Vols., 1885), Vol. I, p. 568.

⁷³ Hawkins, Vol. I, p. 568.

⁷⁴ Hawkins, Plates I, Plate LVIII.

⁷⁵ S.B. Baxter, 'William III as Hercules: the political implications of court culture' in L. Schwoerer (ed.), *The Revolution of 1688-89, Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 2003), 95-106 at p. 97.

⁷⁶ Decked in garlands, Hymen carries a flaming torch and a large ring, inscribed with a quotation, adapted from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 'majesty and love dwell in one place.'⁷⁶ This caption is taken from Ovid's account of the story of Jupiter and Europa in the second book of the *Metamorphoses*. De Hooghe has pointedly adjusted the original meaning of Ovid's text which asserts: 'majesty and love go ill together, Nor long share one abode'. See Ovid (A.D. Melville trans.), *Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 1986), p. 50.

⁷⁷ De Hooghe employs this device frequently. In his broadside satirising James II's arrival at the French Court, for example, the King's Jesuit advisor, Father Petre, is shown with bellows suspended from his belt, see *La Feste de Trois Rois, aux Invalides* (1689), Museum No. 1887,1010.18, British Museum, London. Similarly, in another image by de Hooghe, depicting the flight of Popery from England, following the 1688 Revolution, a small devil blows in Petre's ear with a pair of bellows, see *De Vlucht Van T' Pausdom Uit Engelant* (1689), Museum No. 1982,U.4089, British Museum, London.

⁷⁸ De Hooghe resurrects this imagery in another print marking the Glorious Revolution, in which Father Petre is rendered with the ears of an ass, see *Arlequin sur l'Hypogriphe a la Croisade Lojoliste* (1689), Museum No. 1868,0808.3379, British Museum, London. James II is also depicted with ass's ears in de Hooghe's *Les Monarches Tombants* (1689), Museum No. 1855,0114.196, British Museum, London.

⁷⁹ This etching is included in de Hooghe's book, *Schouwburg der Nederlandsche Verandering* (Amsterdam, 1674) – see *Allegory of an Anglo-Dutch Alliance* (1674), Museum No. Y,1.84, British Museum, London.

⁸⁰ These themes are developed in the bottom left of the print, where, dominating the foreground, a soldier delivers a death-blow to a man thrashing on the ground at his feet. The snarling guard dog on the warrior's helmet may identify him as a personification of national security, while his target, with snakes gripped in his hands, represents Discord. The warrior's shield displays the respective arms of husband and wife, with two *putti* entwining the English rose and Dutch orange trees, which blossom together below a princely coronet. The border of the shield reads: 'This flower and fruit; this image of power and glory.'

⁸¹ Defoe, p. 28; *Relation Veritable*, p. 77.

⁸² *Relation Veritable*, p. 78.

⁸³ With thanks to Dr. Tom Tolley (History of Art, University of Edinburgh) for his kind assistance with this aspect of the entry's iconography.

⁸⁴ *Relation Veritable*, p. 78.

⁸⁵ *Relation Veritable*, p. 81. The entry of the Prince and Princess, as well as the celebratory fireworks are depicted in Jacobsz van den Aveele's engraving, *Huwelijk Prins Willem en Maria Stuart, 1677* (1677), Museum No. RP-P-1907-2925, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

⁸⁶ *Relation Veritable*, pp. 84-89.

⁸⁷ *Relation Veritable*, p. 79.

⁸⁸ *Relation Veritable*, p. 92.

⁸⁹ Israel, p. 825.

⁹⁰ Troost, p. 142.

⁹¹ Sharpe, p. 384. Given Sharpe's comment and the prominence of marital imagery, it is surprising that his own analysis of representations of monarchy focuses on William's individual portrayal and tends to overlook depictions of the royal union, see pp. 353-480.

⁹² Sharpe, p. 383.

⁹³ R. Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680-1714* (Manchester and New York, 1999), p. 105.

⁹⁴ Anon., *The Church and Crown's Felicity Consumated: or England's Happiness Compleat, in the Joyful Reception of the Princess of Orange* (1689), single page.

⁹⁵ *The Church and Crown's Felicity Consumated*.

⁹⁶ 'They shall be two in one flesh', Matthew 19:5, KJV.

⁹⁷ University of Oxford, *Vota Oxoniensia Pro Serenissimis Guilhelmo Rege et Maria Regina M. Britanniae* (Oxford, 1689), Sig. X2r.

⁹⁸ A. Miller, 'The Roman Triumph in Purcell's Odes', *Music and Letters*, Vol. 83, No. 3 (Aug., 2002), 371-382 at pp. 373-4.

⁹⁹ Anon., *Britain Reviv'd, In a Panegyrick to their Most August Majesties William and Mary* (1689), p. 1; T.S. *England's Great Deliverance* (1689), one page.

¹⁰⁰ Anon., *The Subjects Satisfaction being a New Song of the Proclaiming King William and Queen Mary* (1689), single page.

¹⁰¹ *Britain Reviv'd*, p. 2.

¹⁰² *Vota Oxoniensia*, Sig. U1r.

¹⁰³ Anon., *The Court of England, or, The Preparation for the Happy Coronation of King William and Queen Mary* (1689), one page.

¹⁰⁴ For examples of this more conventional arrangement, see Jan Smeltzing, *Silver Medal Commemorating the Coronation of William III and Mary II* (1689), Museum No. M.7742, British Museum, London; and George Bower, *Silver Medal Commemorating the Coronation of William III and Mary II* (1689), Museum No. 1919,0431.1, British Museum, London.

¹⁰⁵ Hawkins, p. 672.

¹⁰⁶ Hawkins, p. 672.

¹⁰⁷ Schwoerer, p. 874.

¹⁰⁸ Helmers, p. 262.

¹⁰⁹ W. Bates, *A Sermon Preached upon the Much Lamented Death of our late gracious sovereign Queen Mary* (London, 1695), p. 18. For a similar representation of the marriage see Thomas Dawes, *A Sermon Preach'd at the Parish-Church of St. Chad's in Shrewsbury, March 5, 1694/5, being the funeral day of our most gracious sovereign Queen Mary* (London, 1695), p. 22.

¹¹⁰ Schwoerer, p. 848.