ROYAL STUDIES JOURNAL

2021 VIII

From William and Mary to William III: Transitioning the Monarchy at the Funeral Rituals of Mary II, 1695

Mark Walker

WINCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

From William and Mary to William III: Transitioning the Monarchy at the Funeral rituals of Mary II, 1695

Mark Walker
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Abstract: When Queen Mary II of England died in December 1694, she left her husband, William III, as her successor, though unlike traditional transition periods after the death of a monarch there was no coronation, only a funeral. William was not a new monarch, but rather he assumed the mantle of sole monarch after five years of a unique dual monarchy known as William and Mary. The funeral rituals of Mary, from lying in state to the burial, which played out between February and March 1695, acted as both funeral and succession, ending one form of monarchy and securing a new one. This article explores how this transition took place through a reconstruction of the major funerary rituals and the included images and messages, analysis of which provides valuable insight into how the regime of William III secured itself without the traditional rites of an accession. These acts demonstrate the multitude of ways in which monarchies in the early modern period relied on rituals to preserve, uphold, and promote their legitimacy and prominence to their subjects and critics.

Keywords: Mary II; William III; rituals; funerals; England

On 28 December 1694, Mary II of England, Scotland, and Ireland died. William III, who reigned alone from Mary's death until his own in 1702, was not proclaimed King at this time. This was because William was not a new monarch in 1694; rather, he and Mary had shared the British thrones since their joint accession in 1689, though now he began his own sole reign. Unlike other times in history, the death of a sovereign was not coupled by the traditional public ceremonies that marked the ritual transition between rulers, such as proclamations given in London and a coronation. What occurred in 1694 upon Mary's death was a re-configuration of the monarchy: William and Mary became just William III. Under the law, William's reign simply continued, but for an institution where ritual permeated into every aspect, acknowledgement of this shift had to occur to secure him on the throne in his own, sole right. The funeral of Mary II acted as that opportunity.

When William of Orange landed with his army in England in November 1688 to confront his father-in-law James II, he did so as the third-in-line to the British thrones. Once a Convention Parliament was assembled under William's orders in 1689, it quickly swept aside James II and his infant Catholic son in favour of James's Protestant heirs, but how this unusual

situation was to be resolved after James's removal split opinion. Advocates for William argued with those who supported Mary's greater claim to legitimacy. This discord mostly played out in the Lords, where the Earl of Nottingham led an effort to establish a regency under Mary, and the Earl of Danby headed a faction who pushed for Mary's sole rule. While historical precedent for female rule existed, political opinion and culture skewed against it and the men in Parliament attempted to avoid this occurrence. In the end, William forced their hand by threatening to leave with his army and told them he refused to act as Mary's 'gentleman usher' should the settlement elevate his wife above him.[1] Similar to how their marriage was portrayed as a way to secure peace and restore the wealth and security of the nation, so their accession to the thrones was also justified.[2] William secured an arrangement whereby he and Mary became King and Queen Regnant, respectively, under the subsequently passed Bill of Rights (1689).[3] This configuration of the monarchy was unique in British history, the closest example being the King Consort role created for Mary I's husband Philip of Spain in the 1550s, though this role that never extended their equality under the law to the same extent. Mary and William shared the royal title and dignity by law, but, in practice Mary's own role and exercise of royal powers were curtailed to that of a consort.[4]

Despite a restricted role in governing, Mary proved to be useful and influential as a symbol of legitimacy to the new regime. Despite William III's image as the Protestant champion of Europe and as the saviour of English liberties due to his role in the Revolution of 1688-1689, his English subjects never truly warmed to him. William's position was, according to Tony Claydon, always under threat from the anti-Dutch attitudes of his xenophobic English subjects.[5] Efforts were made to shape and manipulate William's image to try and overcome this prejudice, but the residual distrust remained. This attitude was best shown during the accession of Queen Anne in 1702, when she reminded Parliament that one of her great strengths was her own thorough Englishness, a slight against the recently deceased William III's foreignness.[6] One way to bolster William's position in the aftermath of the Revolution was to use his wife's greater claim to the throne, her native Englishness, and her Protestant virtues (particularly her specific commitment to the Church of England) as propaganda weapons. It was a role Mary

---

[1] Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (New York: Pegasus, 2008), 168–173; Tim Harris, *Politics under the Late Stuarts* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 133; Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy*, 1685-1720 (London: Allen Lane, 2006), 323–328, 333–334.

[2] Catriona Murray, "An Inflammatory Match? Public Anxiety and Political Assurance at the Wedding of William III and Mary II," *Historical Research* 89, no. 246 (November 2016): 730–750.

[3] "Bill of Rights, 1689," and "Act of Recognition, 1690" in *English Historical Documents, vol. VIII*, *1660-1714,* ed. Andrew Browning (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1953), 124, 128–9.

[4] Richard Price, "An Incomparable Lady: Queen Mary II's Share in the Government of England, 1689-1694," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (Autumn 2012): 307–326; W.A. Speck, 'William–and Mary?,' in *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, ed. Lois G. Schwoerer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 131–146.

[5] Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 122.

[6] *London Gazette,* 9 March to 12 March 1701(2), 1.

was active in cultivating.[7] Abel Boyer, commentating on William and Mary's dynamic as monarchs, summed it up that William 'was to oppose and conquer enemies' while Mary was 'to maintain and gain friends.'[8] She played this role well. Even her death did not end her use in propaganda.[9]

The opponents to William's kingship were keen to exploit the weakness caused by the loss of Mary. Jacobites openly flaunted the public mourning and King James' supporters in France sought to gather supporters only willing to support William and Mary because of Mary.[10] For early modern monarchies, rituals were powerful rhetorical and visual weapons to emphasise and communicate their legitimacy and power to their people and enemies. Similar to other physical manifestations of monarchs, such as statues, rituals familiarised their subjects with their rulers.[11] Usually deaths and successions went hand-in-hand and operated together as ritual opposites that moved societies from one monarch to another with the transition manifested in the separate funerals and coronations.[12] In 1694-1695, this transition was not possible because the king before Mary's death was still the king afterwards. As William had already had a coronation in 1689, he was not going to have another. The only public rituals performed at this time were the funerary rituals associated with Mary's death. This meant that the funeral's role had to operate not as part of a larger ritual transition from one distinct monarch to another, but as the sole performance that shed one half of the existing monarchy and affirmed that the remaining half was now the one whole.

This article explores how that transition took place in the context of the 1695 funeral. Through visual cues and heraldic messages that emphasised first Mary's legitimacy and that of her husband, the funeral moved through time and space to shift focus from Mary to William, directing people's loyalty and affection from one to the other. In the process, William and

---

[7] Lois Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II," *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (Winter 1989): 717–748; Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England, 1680–1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 105–120; Melinda S. Zook, *Protestantism, Politics and Women in Britain, 1660–1714* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 128, 145.

[8] Abel Boyer, quoted in Price, "An Incomparable Lady," 308.

[9] Alex Garganigo, "William without Mary: Mourning sensibly in the Public Sphere," *The Seventeenth Century* 23, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 105–141; Melinda S. Zook, "The Shocking Death of Mary II: Gender and Political Crisis in Late Stuart England," *British Scholar* 1, no. 1 (September 2008): 21–36.

[10] For examples of this behaviour, see: Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, Volume 3* (Oxford, 1857), 421, 423; "J. Caryll to Bishop Ellis, March 21 1695," in *Calendar of the Stuart Papers belonging to His Majesty the King, preserved at Windsor Castle, Volume 1* (London: HMSO, 1902), 99–100; "A Memorial Concerning the State of England, 19 January 1695. An Examination of the P. of O—'s right to the Crown at Queen Mary's Death," in *Original Papers; Containing the Secret History of Great Britain, from the Restoration, to the Accession of the House of Hanover. To which are prefixed extracts from the life of James II as written by himself, Volume 1*, ed. James MacPherson (London, 1776), 505.

[11] Catriona Murray, "Raising Royal Bodies: Stuart authority and the Monumental Image," in *The Routledge History of Monarchy*, ed. Elena Woodacre, Lucinda H. S. Dean, Chris Jones and Zita Eva Rohr (London: Routledge, 2019), 352.

[12] For examples of this ritual relationship between royal funerals and the succession, see: Ralph Giesey, *The Royal Funeral in Renaissance France* (Geneva: Libraire E. Droz, 1960); and Jennifer Woodward, *Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of the Royal Funeral in Renaissance England, 1570–1625* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997).

Mary became just William III. To demonstrate this shift, the following article focuses on the three rituals performed in public: the lying in state, the funeral procession and the funeral service. By reconstructing and interpreting each ritual's messages, this article will argue that the effort to draw attention to Mary's legitimacy and popularity and connecting it to William produced a narrative of transition rather than succession, one that was told as they progressed through each stage. It created, as one observer later noted, a 'very melancholy, pompous sight.'[13]

Mary's Status on Display: The Lying in State

At the time of Mary II's death in December 1694, no 'public' or heraldic funeral had been held for a reigning monarch in England since that of James I's in 1625. After 1660, the preference had been for funerals defined as 'private', meaning they lacked the public heraldic display and were usually held at night for a much lower cost.[14] The funeral of Charles II in 1685 was performed this way, as had all the royal family members who had died since the Restoration. Unsurprisingly, it was initially reported that the funeral for Mary II was to follow this precedent. The shift was recorded by Narcissus Luttrell, who described in early January that the Council had revised its original plans and was now opting for a public funeral.[15] Historians have accepted that this shift was done purely for political means.[16] Nearly twenty years earlier, William and Mary's wedding ceremonies had also been adapted to meet the political concerns of the day.[17] Adopting this style of a grand heraldic funeral traditions previously used for Elizabeth I (1603) and James I (1625) allowed for greatest propaganda use and revived the publicity and theatricality of these earlier events which had been staged to promote visions of monarchy and stability.[18]

The first of the rituals was the lying in state, where the body of Mary II concealed within its coffin was placed on view for all to see. Luttrell described that all 'without distinction' could visit the scene every day between noon and 5pm.[19] The lying in state took place at Whitehall Palace and lasted for ten days from 21 February until 4 March, 1695 and attracted crowds of thousands. Such was the frenzy to view the royal body that a few

---

[13] "A Pye to Abigail Harley, 13 March 1694/5," in *The Manuscripts of His Grace, The Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey, Volume 3, Harley Papers, Volume 1* (London, 1894), 562.

[14] For description and analysis of this trend for 'private' funerals, see: Paul S. Fritz, "From 'Public' to 'Private': The Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830," in *Mirror of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death,* ed. Joachim Whaley (London: Europa Publishing 1981), 61–79; Michael Schiach, "The Funerals of the British Monarchy," in *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Michael Schiach (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 421–450.

[15] Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, 420.

[16] Fritz, "From 'Public' to 'Private'," 79; Schiach, "The Funerals of the British Monarchy," 423; Matthias Range, *British Royal and State Funerals: Music and Ceremonial Since Elizabeth I* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2016), 88–93.

[17] Murray, "An Inflammatory Match?," 731–732.

[18] For a detailed analysis of Elizabeth's and James's funeral see: Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*.

[19] Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation,* 3:442.

individuals were reported injured or killed.[20] The accessibility of this public display provided an excellent opportunity to promote the legitimacy of the regime through the display of majesty and the use of heraldic imagery. Placing these images around the body linked the heraldic message to Mary herself and began the ritualized transition of her legitimacy and majesty from her to William.

There are no accurate visual depictions of the scene. While purported images of the scene in Whitehall were produced, these have been determined to be inaccurate, having been created either before the events began or for consumption by those in foreign markets by artists who were more than likely not present.[21] The majesty on display was therefore more accurately preserved by the written, printed descriptions designed to satisfy the curiosity of those in society who could not attend. These accounts provide us with insight into the exact appearance and presentation of the royal body and the space around it:

> After we ascended Whitehall, we pass several rooms hung with mourning, lighted with was lights in silver sconces. In the antechamber, before we come to the Queen's corpse, sit her six Maids of Honour by a throne, in a mournful dejected posture. In the next room is the Queen's corpse upon an elevated place or table. The coffin is very large, covered with rich tissue of gold and silver. At the foot of the table are place helmets and other ensigns of honour; at her head an embroidered cushion, on which is placed the crown and sceptre. At the four corners of the coffin stand four great ladies of the bedchamber, veiled to the ground. The spectators have only a view in passing, being hasted on by the yeomen of the guard, and descend at the other side of Whitehall.[22]

The queen's crown, sceptre, and orb were delivered each day from the Tower of London by the Master of the Jewel House and all were on display.[23] The ladies who attended in the room were issued twelve yards of black cloth and twenty-six yards of crepe by the Great Wardrobe to fashion their mourning garments for the event.[24] The materials used throughout the lying in

[20] Michael Schiach, "The Funerals of the British Monarchy," 424.
[21] For discussion of the images produced before the lying in state that were supposedly of it see: N.M. Lawson "The Death Throes of the Licensing Act and the 'Funeral Pomp' of Queen Mary II, 1695," *The Journal of Legal History* 26, no. 2 (August 2005): 119–142; for images created for foreign markets see: Ralph Hyde, "Romeyn de Hooghe and the Funeral of the People's Queen," *Print Quarterly* 15, no. 2 (1998): 153.
[22] *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William III July 1-December 31 1695, and Addenda, 1689-1694. Preserved in the Public Record Office,* ed. William John Hardy (Neldelm, Lichtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1969), 314.
[23] The National Archives of the United Kingdom (hereafter TNA) Privy Council (PC) 2/76 Privy Council Registers: William III, vol. 4, December 2 1694-April 23 1697, 67.
[24] TNA Lord Chamberlain Papers (LC) 2/11/2 Expense at the Funeral (& Mourning) of her Majesty Queen Mary 1694, warrant 28.

state and subsequent rituals were acquired from the merchants of London, increasing economic output for the city's merchants and manufacturers.[25]

The use of heraldic symbols in the room provided an important display of legitimacy, continuity, and prestige that made them useful propaganda. Such extensive use of heraldry helped distinguish Mary's funeral from the 'private' funeral for Charles II that had preceded it. This included use of both physical heraldry such as the banners and heraldic images and officers from the College of Arms. Royal funerals defined as 'private' may have still used the College's heralds, but their involvement was always severely limited, if not outright avoided.[26] Heralds were ordered to attend throughout the ten-day period the body was on display to ensure that the 'Decency and Order as becometh this Solemne Occasion' was complied with throughout.[27]

Details of the heraldry can be found from multiple sources. Luttrell observed that there were 'banners and escutcheons hanging around' the room in which the Queen lay.[28] Celia Fiennes recorded after her visit that she saw 'the armes of England curiously painted and gilt' in the middle of the canopy, 'the head piece embroidered richly with a crown and cyphers of [the Queen's] name.'[29] Records from the Lord Chamberlain documented that smaller heraldic shields called escutcheons decorated the funerary materials. Examples of these included 'a large pall of velvet…to be garnished with Escocheons of Sattin' and a rail to be put around the bed 'of five foot distance covered with black velvet and garnished with Escocheons within and without'. The Lord Chamberlain had also ordered that larger heraldic symbols be on display within the rail around the bed where they were:

> to be placed at the feet [of the coffin] the Great Banner and the Great Banner of the Union painted on Sattin and on the sides four lesser Banners of the 4 Kingdoms [England, Scotland, Ireland, France] and 12 bannerolls of their Majesties descent with 12 black stands.[30]

---

[25] For the relationship and link between the Court ceremonies and the City of London's economy see: Paul S. Fritz, "The Trade in Death: The Royal Funeral in England, 1685-1830," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 15, no. 3 (Spring 1982), 291-316, and Ian W Archer, "City and Court Connected: The Material Dimensions of Royal Cermonial, ca. 1480-1625," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (March 2008), 157-179.

[26] In an example from 1671 the young Edgar, duke of Cambridge, was buried privately in Westminster Abbey, one witness recalled that "the heralds were ready to attend [the funeral], but no use was made of any of them." the heralds were ready to attend, but no use was made of any of them: "Henry Ball to Williamson," in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, January to November, 1671,* ed. F.H. Blockburne Daniell (Nendeln, Lichtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968), 317–318.

[27] TNA PC 2/76, 71.

[28] Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relations,* 3:442.

[29] Celia Fiennes, *The Journeys of Celia Fiennes, edited and with an introduction by Christopher Morris, with a foreword by G.M. Trevelyan* (London: The Cresset Press, 1947), 294.

[30] TNA LC 2/11/2 Expense at the Funeral (& Mourning) of her Majesty Queen Mary, 1694, "As to the Lying in State."

Such symbolism allowed for a clear association between Mary, the British state, and her status as Queen. Displaying her coffin alongside this heraldic imagery made the association between them clear to spectators: here lays the rightful Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland in all her splendour.

Mary on the Move: The Procession

The lying in state, though open to the public, was ultimately static, and so the message it conveyed remained static around Mary herself. With the imagery surrounding her body emphasising her position and legitimacy, the next step for the rituals was to transfer this emphasis to William III. This transition began to occur as the body was physically moved from lying-in-state to the funeral itself. While Mary's static body on display in Whitehall had emphasised the Queen's personal titles and majesty, in the procession those images began to shift emphasis from Mary to William and blended them together

Similar to the lying in state described above, heraldic symbolism was also prominent in the enormous procession to the funeral service. As befitting a 'public' funeral, the procession involved hundreds of participants to produce a spectacle that encouraged attendance by spectators. The procession began at 12.00pm and, being in the middle of the day, encouraged public observation of the event and consumption of its messages. The length of time it took to complete the procession's journey is unclear. If it is compared to similar events from earlier in the seventeenth century when 'public' funerals were more common, it likely lasted several hours. As a comparison, the 1612 procession for the deceased Prince Henry took four hours to complete.[31]

Mary's procession was similar to those held for other Stuart monarchs and included both servants and public officials, along with official mourners and the displays of royalty. What made Mary's procession different from those contemporaneous ones was the extent of each aspect. A published plan of the procession allows scholars to see who was involved and where they marched, although the exact number cannot be determined because either entire groups or types of officials were listed instead of the specific individuals within those groupings.[32] The exception to this was that the plan of procession for Mary stated that 300 women marched 'four and four' at the head of the procession.[33] All of these women were recommended to the Lord Chamberlain 'with particular regard that they may be widows or relations of such whose Husbands and relations have suffered in his Majesty's Service by Sea or Land' and were issued appropriate clothing and payment for participation.[34] This was a traditional component of the medieval heraldic funeral. Philippe Ariés has identified this as a

[31] Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, 149.
[32] *The form of the proceeding to the funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary II. Of blessed Memory, from the royal palace of Whitehall to the Collegiate church at Westminster; the 5th day of this instant March, 1694/5* (London: 1695).
[33] *The form of the proceeding*, 1-2.
[34] TNA LC 2/11/2, Expense at the Funeral (& Mourning) of her Majesty Queen Mary, 1694.

"last act of charity" that reflected the deceased's wealth and generosity.[35] The number of poor women used, though large, was not unusual; for example, at Elizabeth I's heraldic funeral in 1603 there were 240 poor women who acted in a similar role.[36]

Following these women came a series of male office holders of increasing rank and stature until reaching the body. Jennifer Woodward has described the heraldic funeral procession as a crescendo effect with the status of the participants rising towards the body, reaching its peak around the coffin itself, and then trailing off with those after the body.[37] Woodward's observation is useful for interpreting the funeral of Mary II. As the procession moved through the streets it was structured to show that each participant's rank and importance rose as it got closer to the body borne on a chariot. The enormous chariot that formed the centrepiece of the procession, as well as the carriage for the royal body, was preceded in the procession by the banners, coats of arms, and symbols of chivalry, which were all borne by peers of increasing rank in black mourning.[38] Between each banner were officers of arms in their armorial tabards to add to the effect. While it could be argued that such a display was simply a way to demonstrate the regime's power, through analysis of the precise symbols used throughout the procession it showed how the entire event was carefully choreographed to communicate about Mary's legitimacy and begin transferring that to William through an association between the two.

The specific heraldic materials used in the procession appear to be the same as those used in the laying in state. Now removed from their static position, they could be rearranged to communicate about the transition from Mary to William. The first banners simply displayed the territories over which William and Mary reigned in order of political importance carried by increasingly senior peers. The procession began with banners of Chester, Wales, and Cornwall carried by barons and a viscount, and then those of Scotland and Ireland carried by earls from the respective kingdoms; next came the banner of France and England quartered, the Great Banner, and the banner of England which were all carried by earls.[39]

Following these banners, getting closer to the body, were symbols associated with monarchy and royal legitimacy. As the preceding banners had told a spectator, the territories this deceased monarch ruled over in ascending importance, so the succeeding symbols reinforced their legitimacy to rule and their position as monarch. These symbols, or the 'ensigns of honour' as they were called in the description of the lying in state, were historically associated with masculine qualities of kingship and chivalry and included the target, crest, helmet, and sword.[40] In 1689, at the coronation of William and Mary, these symbols were

---

[35] Philippe Aries, *The Hour of Our Death*, trans. Helen Weaver (New York: Vintage, 1982), 168.
[36] Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, 210.
[37] Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, 17.
[38] TNA LC 2/11/2, warrant no. 29.
[39] *The form of the proceeding*, 3.
[40] *The form of the proceeding*, 3; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, William III July 1-Dec 31 1695, and Addenda, 1689-1695*, 314.

solely reserved for William as the male monarch, and were to illustrate Mary's inferiority in the new dual monarchy arrangement.[41] This was deliberate in 1689 because they later featured at Anne's coronation in 1702.[42] Using them in this context removed the disparity from the coronation because they could now be associated with Mary as much as William. They were used as symbols of legitimacy and so these images of masculine kingship were deliberately deployed to emphasise the legitimacy of Mary's rule. Their use coupled with the heraldry fully vested Mary with the images of royal power that was denied her in life. Through this asserted legitimacy she could sanction the continued legitimacy of the husband.

Following on from these banners and symbols was The Coat of Arms which was carried by Norroy King of Arms.[43] Smaller versions were used on the pall and on other elements such as the drums and trumpets.[44] Interestingly, none of the orders using the design explained which coat of arms was to be used. As a result of the dual monarchy there were two main options, both derived from the Stuart dynasty coat of arms designed for James I and then used by his successors, which used the four kingdoms the Stuart dynasty claimed as their own: England, Scotland, Ireland, and France. Mary's personal coat of arms was this design since she was the daughter of a Stuart king. William, as the grandson of Charles I but through Charles's daughter, incorporated his father's House of Nassau arms along with thouse of the House of Stuart. Upon William and Mary's joint accession to the throne, a new coat of arms for the new dual monarchs impaled the two coats of arms together to symbolise the new arrangement. This joining of the two was retired upon Mary's death.[45]

Either coat of arms would have been a good candidate for use, but it is likely that Mary's personal one featured to some degree. Prior to the funeral, the Privy Council, under guidance from the Earl Marshal, had ordered posthumous edits to Mary's coat of arms before the funeral. Such revisions would not be necessary unless it was to be put on display. It was now ordered that "the Garter … be put about the Queen's Arms."[46] This was the blue buckled garter with the phrase *HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE* inscribed within it in gold lettering that was to be placed around the shield on Mary's arms. This represented Mary as a part of the Order of the Garter and the fact it had to be specially ordered suggested that it was not originally present despite the queen being the sovereign of the order by virtue of being queen regnant. It can be assumed that this honour had fallen under William's exercise of regal powers. Between the reign of Henry VII and Edward VII, only queens regnant were considered members as the sovereign of the order and while some displays of them exist in

---

[41] Lois G. Schwoerer, "The coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689," in *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives,* ed. Lois G. Schwoerer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 117.
[42] *London Gazette*, April 23 to April 27, 1702, 1.
[43] *The form of the proceeding*, 3.
[44] TNA LC 2/11/2, warrant no. 25 (escutcheons on trumpets).
[45] Charles Boutell, *Heraldry, Historical and Popular* (London, 1864), p. 298; Charles Boutell, *Boutell's Manual of Heraldry*, revised and illustrated by V. Wheeler-Holohan (London: Frederick Warne and Co., 1931), 164-5.
[46] TNA PC 2/76, 42.

Garter imagery,[47] it was Mary's sister Anne who was the first queen to regularly wear the Order's regalia in everyday public appearances and not just ceremonial occasions.[48] William, who was made a member of the Order years before becoming King, would have already had it on his arms and, now imposing it on Mary's, would have confirmed her status as equal to his own.

The display of the banners and these symbols of royalty helped emphasise that Mary was not simply William's consort, but also queen in her own right early on in the procession. This was the first overt assertion of Mary's position since the coronation of 1689, and the presence of it here demonstrates how the Williamite regime was again using Mary's greater claim to legitimacy to bolster the legitimacy of the remaining regime. If one of the dual monarchs was legitimate, it follows that the other was, too. But this legitimacy needed to be transferred wholly to William during the process. This was achieved through the use of the bannerolls, which were used in heraldic funerals to secure succession rights and emphasised hereditary rights, which here were edited to benefit William. The message was strengthened through their physical location around the body at the centrepiece of the event. [49]

Records from the Lord Chamberlain describe that bannerolls were ordered for use at the laying in state that showed 'their Majesties descent'.[50] Twelve were created for the first event and were then placed in the procession with six on each side of the coffin carried by knights. [51] Records from the College of Arms offer exact information about how 'their Majesties descent' was to be shown. Each of these bannerolls showed the arms of kings and queens beginning with Henry II's and Eleanor of Aquitaine's on the front left and then each one moved through the major line of succession of English and Scottish monarchs from left to right until they William and Mary's reign at the rear right. [52] The complete order and placement is shown in Table 1.

---

[47] As an example for Elizabeth I, see: Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder, Procession of the Knights of the Garter, one of nine sheets: the ninth sheet of the procession with the Sword-Bearer and Queen Elizabeth, with a view of Windsor Castle in the background. 1576, British Museum, https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/procession-of-the-knights-of-the-garter, accessed 30 April 2021.

[48] Boutell, *Heraldry, Historical and Popular*, 16, 107; Nicholas Harris Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire; of the Order of the Guelphs of Hanover; and of the Medals, Clasps, and Crosses, conferred for Naval and Military Services, vol. 2* (London, 1842), 267, 271; Peter J. Begent and Hubert Cheshyre, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter: 650 Years* (London: Spink, 1999), 101; Geroge Frederick Beltz, *Memorials of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, from its foundation to the Present Time. Including the history of the Order; Biographical Notices of the Knights in the regions of Edward III and Richard III; and the chronological succession of members…*(London, 1841), cxviii.

[49] Woodward, *The Theatre of Death*, 50-51, 212; Julian Litten, *The English Way of Death: The Common Funeral since 1450* (London: Robert Hale, 1991), 177.

[50] TNA LC 2/11/2, "As to the Lying in State."

[51] *The Form of the Proceeding to the Funeral of Her late Majesty*, 3.

[52] College of Arms (hereafter CA), I Series, Volume 4 "Funerals of Kings, Princes &c.," fol. 85.

Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine	T H E B O D Y	Edward I and Eleanor of Castile
Edward II and Isabel of France		Edward III and Philippa of Hainault
Henry VII and Elizabeth of York		James IV of Scotland and Margaret of England
James V of Scotland and Mary of Guise		Mary, Queen of Scots and Lord Darnley
James I of England and Anne of Denmark		Charles I of England and Henrietta Maria of France
Mary, Princess Royal and William Prince of Orange		William III and Mary II

Table 1. *The Bannerolls and their Position Around the Body of Mary II in her Funeral Procession*. College of Arms, I Series, vol.4 'Funerals of Kings, Princes &c.', fol. 85.

The basic pattern was the Stuart claim to the throne of England (excluding the separate Scottish descent prior to James IV) until it reached William and Mary's common ancestor, Charles I. After that, instead of using Mary's parentage (James II and Anne Hyde), it featured William III's parents instead. This change allowed for William's line of inheritance to be publicly displayed and to show how connected it was to Mary's own.[53] The link to Mary was made stronger by its physical proximity to her body at the core of the procession. The use of this imagery sent a clear message about William's place in the hereditary line and by connected his own legitimacy as king by physically surrounding the body of his wife with his own lineage as opposed to hers.

Heraldry was the only medium through which political messages were communicated to spectators during the procession. Unique amongst all previous reigning monarchs' funeral processions was the inclusion of both Houses of Parliament, who marched as two distinct bodies for the first time. The conventional practice was that upon the death of the monarch any Parliament that was still in session at the time automatically dissolved itself. It was argued that since the legal authority upon which they were assembled expired with the sovereign they no longer existed as a body and thus new elections were required. Parliament was in session at the time of Mary's death. According to the prevailing conventions, this meant it should have dissolved since the monarchy that had summoned them (William *and* Mary) no longer existed and with it their legal authority. This fact was not lost on the Jacobites abroad, who argued that the continuation was as unconstitutional as William himself.[54] After this event, Parliament passed laws allowing them to continue for a brief time after a monarch's death to ensure a

[53] CA I Series, vol. 4 "Funerals of Kings, Princes &c.," fol. 85.

[54] For examples of this see: "Earl of Middleton to the Marquis de Croissy," in *Original Papers vol. 1,* ed. MacPherson (London, 1776) 506; "Mr Vernon to Lord Lexington, Whitehall, Dec. 28, 1694," in *The Lexington Papers; or, Some Account of the Court of London and Vienna; At the Conclusion of the Seventeenth Century. Extracted from the Official and Private Correspondence of Robert Sutton, Lord Lexington, British Minister at Vienna, 1694-1698,* ed. H. Manners Sutton (London, 1851), 35.

smooth transition.[55] But in 1694-1695, Parliament appearing in public as a body within the procession sent a clear message about the continuing legitimacy of William III as they transitioned from William and Mary to William alone, and also acted as an opportunity to show their solidarity with the King.

Conforming to the general structure of the funeral procession described above, the House of Commons came first followed by their Speaker (the highest ranked person in their body), and he was then followed by the House of Lords. While other funeral processions of the period included the sons of peers, since the peers marched as their parliamentary body, only the title holders were included here. The Members of the House of Commons had never been involved in a reigning monarch's funeral just by virtue of being MPs, and had only done so if they held government office, had a position in the royal household(s), or were Privy Councillors.[56] Since Parliament had still been in session it was likely that a large number of each House was able to attend, though similar to the rest of the procession, exact numbers are unknown. As an approximation, by 1700 there were 170 members of the House of Lords with around 500 MPs in the Commons.[57]

As much as Parliament's presence sent a message about the continuation of William's authority, this message was reinforced as they marched through other visual cues. The Commons wore black with each member issued six yards of mourning cloth to make their outfits.[58] They demonstrated their loyalty to the king by wearing a medallion of the king's image upon their mourning robes. Peers, in contrast to the black mourning of the MPs, were described instead as being dressed in 'their robes' suggesting their parliamentary robes of scarlet which would have stood out amongst the black of the procession.[59] This mirrored a tradition in French royal funerals where the Parlement of Paris, the central French law court, wore their ceremonial red robes instead of mourning for a public demonstration of the permanence and continuance of royal power and authority.[60] The cumulative result was the Parliament asserting its loyalty to William's continued reign and emphasising the continuity of monarchy from William and Mary to William alone.

The cumulative effect of both the heraldry and the procession's participants was a visual affirmation of Mary's status, continuing the practice seen when the body was on display at the lying in state. However, unlike the stationary display, this moved on to emphasise both

---

[55] "William III, 1695-6: An Act for the continueing meeting and sitting of Parliament in case of the Death or Demise of His Majesty His Heirs and Successors [Chapter XV. Rot. Parl. 7&8 Gul. III p.s. n.1]," *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7, 1695-1701* (London, 1820), 84, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46822.
[56] *London Gazette*, 5 March to 7 March 1694(5), 1; *The Form of the Proceeding to the Funeral of Her late Majesty*, 2; Alan Mansfield, *Ceremonial Costume: Court, Civil and Civic Costume from 1660 to the Present Day* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1980), 3-4.
[57] Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603-1714* (London: Penguin, 1996), 57, 59.
[58] TNA LC 2/11/2, warrant no. 164.
[59] Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relations, Volume 3*, 438.
[60] Giesey, *The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France*, 57–58, 185.

William's connection to this and his continued legitimacy without Mary. The next part of the ritual began once the cortège arrived at Westminster Abbey and the funeral service itself began. The liturgy followed the Book of Common Prayer, but the sermon delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, shifted focus from Mary to William in the same place where kings are buried and crowned.

Articulating the Shift: Mary's Funeral Sermon

The funeral sermon was delivered by Thomas Tenison, the recently installed Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been present at Mary's death. Tenison's sermon was later published to allow for wider dissemination of its message which focused on the transition from Mary II, whose loss was great and meaningful, to William III, who would provide comfort to the nation moving forward. Unlike at Charles II's funeral which proceeded immediately to the Henry VII Chapel for the burial service, Mary's body was placed "under a magnificent Mausoleum, Erected in the middle of the Cross of [the Abbey], and there remained during the service and the Sermon" near the spot the two were crowned in 1689.[61]

The sermon used Ecclesiastes 7:14 as its basis: "In the Day of Prosperity be Joyful, but in the Day of Adversity consider: God, also, hath set the one over against the other." Though Tenison claimed he was only focused on the adversity part of the verse since he argued prosperity was "by no means, a fit subject … in the House of Mourning."[62] He structured his sermon around four considerations: the greatness of Mary's loss, the principal cause of it, the good God offers in exchange, and the duty owed to turn the affliction into joy. Delving into the first consideration the Archbishop praised Mary's virtues, listing amongst them knowledge, piety, charity, grace, wisdom and humility which all conformed to contemporary feminine virtues and to conventional images associated with Mary II.[63] Tenison's sermon emphasised the queen's piety and faith. For example, Tension noted that while her knowledge was'"fed and improved by Reading" the Bible was "the Oracles which she chiefly consulted."[64] Mary's exemplar religiosity contrasted with what Tenison referred to as their "Athetistic and Profane Age" of "foreign War and domestick Discontent."[65] In this sense Mary not only was associated with an idealised womanhood, but was set apart as an example of goodness amongst troubled times.[66]

---

[61] *London Gazette*, 7 March to 11 March 1694(5), 1.

[62] Thomas Tenison, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary of Ever Blessed Memory, In the Abbey-Church in Westminster, Upon March 5, 1694/5* (London, 1709), 3.

[63] Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II"; Weil, *Political passions*, 109-117.

[64] Tenison, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary of Ever Blessed Memory,* 3–8, specific quote on 4.

[65] Tenison, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary of Ever Blessed Memory*, 9–11.

[66] Robert Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (Harlow: Pearson, 1998), 23; Jacqueline Eales, *Women in early modern England, 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press, 1998), 23–24.

The Archbishop went on to place blame for Mary's death on "the Immorality, the sin of the Nation." He argued that God "shewed what a mighty Blessing he had for a People, if they would become reform'd; but we were not sufficiently sensible nor thankful" and so God had taken away the exemplary Mary.[67] Tenison's line of argument here was a common one during the public discussions of Mary's death. Alex Garganigo has argued that this approach of linking Mary's death to the nation's sin, was an extension of an existing narrative about the Glorious Revolution which stressed the Providential nature of the event. It was argued that God had saved the nation then from tyranny through William's actions in 1688-1689 but had since then not reformed itself enough and so their pious and virtuous queen was taken from them.[68]

But while Tenison lamented the death of the Queen as punishment for failing to reform the nation, he reminded them of the good that remained to alleviate their loss. He listed the good state of affairs in the kingdoms, including the health of King William and that he was still pursuing a war aimed at "securing the Liberties of Europe." Tenison was keen to emphasise both the stability of the kingdoms under William and accepted continuity of the regime. He named the other good things including the end of the years-long family feud between William and Princess Anne, the supportive Parliament and Council, and the loyalty William's British subjects had shown towards him.[69]

Tenison's sermon allowed for both a reflection on the gift of Mary's life and virtues and the benefits of loyalty to William and made that loyalty a part of consoling their loss. In his conclusion, the Archbishop described the duties now owed to God, the deceased queen, and to the still-living king. Many were standard Christian expressions and the duty owed to Mary was to follow her example. But, in closing, Tenison focused on the duty owed to the king: to be loyal and to ask God to double the blessings on him.[70] By emphasising the loyalty owed to the king after describing the loss of the queen, Tenison's words were chosen carefully to direct any emotional responses towards Mary and political loyalty summoned towards the surviving king.

After the main funeral service and the sermon were over, the royal body was moved to the Henry VII Chapel to be buried. The final steps were described in *The London Gazette*:

> After Sermon the late Queens Secretary and Treasurer, Master of the Horse, and Lord Chamberlain, the Dean and Prebendaries of Westminster, and both Quires, with the Officers of Arms, and those that bore the Achievements and Regalia, proceeded before the Body to King Henry VII Chapel, which was attended only by the Supporters of the Pall, and followed by the Chief Mourner, her supporters, and

[67] Tenison, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary of Ever Blessed Memory*, 11.
[68] Garganigo, "William without Mary," 107–108.
[69] Tenison, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary of Ever Blessed Memory*, 12–15.
[70] Tenison, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Her late Majesty Queen Mary of Ever Blessed Memory*, 16.

> Supporters of her Train, and the Ladies, the rest remaining in their places. The Dean of Westminster performed the Officer of Burial, which ended, Garter [King of Arms] Proclaimed the Royal Styles, and the Body was interred in a Vault on the South side of the said Chapel.[71]

Thus ended the rituals of Mary II's internment. As Mary's body was lowered into her tomb in Henry VII Chapel the 'Royal Stiles' proclaimed would have included Mary's followed immediately by William's to illustrate the continuity. The Queen was gone but the King was still there.

In early modern monarchies, the death of a monarch was often time of great political insecurity and, as a result, the transition from one ruler to another was often played out through multiple, elaborate rituals that symbolised the transfer of titles and power. The death of Mary II in December 1694 provoked another time of insecurity and transition that would not be accompanied by these rituals. As William III took the throne alone after five years of dual monarchy, a message had to be sent that emphasised his continued legitimacy and continuity, but that also transferred these solely to him. The decision to stage a large and ornate heraldic funeral for Mary provided the opportunity to perpetuate these ideals. As these events moved through time and space from Whitehall to Westminster in early 1695, they performed this transition. Mary's title and legitimacy, the key foundation to the establishment of the dual monarchy, was depicted at the lying in state through the procession and shifted this emphasis to William III as it moved Mary from display to burial. This transfer was then articulated more forcefully in the funeral sermon. Her public funeral filled with the imagery and symbolism of legitimate monarchy promoted William III's sole-rule and acted as the last use of Mary II for the post-Revolutionary regime's benefit. It demonstrated not only Mary's importance to this regime, but also the vital role played by rituals in the presentation and legitimisation of monarchical power.

[71] *London Gazette*, 5 March to 7 March 1694(5), 1.