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This study of the way in which the “image” of Mary of Modena was constructed, and then deconstructed, examines the changing ways in which this late seventeenth-century Italian Catholic aristocrat was represented, both visually in portraits, prints and engravings, and textually in verse and prose, opera, masque and pamphlet plays, after her arrival in England in 1673 as the wife of James, Duke of York (later James II). The images and texts are placed within the cultural context of the age: contemporary artists, writers, patronage, conventions and expectations, including those relating to women, are discussed.

The focus of the first chapter is James's first wife, Anne Hyde. A comparison of the manner in which these two women, both Catholic, were represented, one coming from an ancient and noble foreign house, the other from an undistinguished country family, is instructive. The next four chapters examine the themes of “beauty”, her “otherness”, her patronage of music, artists and writers, and her court, during the years 1673 to 1685 when Mary of Modena was Duchess of York.

The contrast between the portraits, music and poetry produced at the time of James II's coronation in 1685 and the representations produced as part of the adverse propaganda campaign waged by James’s son-in-law, William of Orange which culminated in the “warming pan scandal” after the birth of Mary of Modena’s son (“The Old Pretender”), and led to the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688 are the subject of chapters 6 and 7. The final chapter shows how Mary of Modena was represented during her exile in France from 1689 until her death there in 1718.
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Mary of Modena: A Biographical Outline

Mary of Modena, the second wife of James, Duke of York, was born Maria Beatrice Anna Margherita Isabella d’Este on 5 October 1658 at the Palazzo Ducale, Modena, Italy, the only daughter of Alfonso IV d’Este, Duke of Modena (1634-1662) and his wife Laura, née Martinozzi. She was a great niece of Cardinal Mazarin through her maternal grandmother Margherita Mazarini. When her two year old brother Francesco II succeeded his father Alfonso IV who died in July 1662 aged twenty eight her mother became regent of the Duchy and her uncle, Prince Rinaldo d’Este, Mary of Modena’s guardian. She was educated by nuns and intended to enter the Convent of the Visitation close to the ducal place.

In the summer of 1672 her name was added to the list of possible brides for James, Duke of York whose first wife Anne Hyde had died on 31 March 1671. Her mother, and finally Mary of Modena herself were persuaded to accept the offer from England only after protracted negotiations and the intervention of Pope Clement X. Henry Mordaunt, second Earl of Peterborough (1624-1697), James’s groom of the stole, stood proxy at the wedding on 30 September 1673 in Modena. On her fifteenth birthday five days later, accompanied by her mother and uncle, she set out for England, arriving at Dover on 21 November.

As Duchess of York she had five years of qualified happiness in England which ended in 1678 when Titus Oates denounced Catholics supposed to have played a part in
the so-called Popish Plot. During the crisis of James’s future succession to the throne
James and Mary of Modena were sent into exile by Charles II, first to Brussels and then
to Edinburgh, until they were allowed to return to England in February 1680. A second
exile in Scotland followed from October 1680 to May 1682, during which time her only
surviving child Isabella, nearly five years old, died at St. James’s Palace, London having
not been allowed to accompany her parents to Scotland.

On the death of Charles II on 6 February 1685 Mary of Modena became James
II’s Queen Consort. Her health gave serious concern; from April 1685 the month of the
coronation until December 1687, the Tuscan envoy to London Abate Francesco Terriesi
reported frequently that she was ill. Uncharitable observers commented on her haughty
behaviour, and her anger at her husband’s elevation of his mistress Catharine Sedley to
Countess of Dorchester in 1686 offered ammunition to her critics. Her stepdaughter
Princess Anne compounded the image of wicked stepmother with female Machiavel and
helped to disseminate the “warming pan” plot that the Queen’s pregnancy, confirmed in
December 1687, was false.

The birth of James Francis Edward on 10 June 1688 meant that he, a Catholic,
took precedence in the line of succession to the throne over James II’s eldest daughter,
the Protestant Mary of Orange whose husband William of Orange decided to invade, and
who landed in Devon on 5 November. James II, Mary of Modena and their son became
refugees.
Disguised as a laundry woman she and her son left Whitehall in the early hours of 10 December 1688 and fled to France to be greeted by Louis XIV at Chatou on 6 January 1689. She was later joined by her husband. On 28 June 1692 she gave birth to a daughter Louise-Marie which confirmed that the “warming pan” plot was in fact a falsehood. James died in September 1701 and Mary of Modena became regent until James Francis Edward reached his majority in June 1706. She lived the rest of her life at the palace of St. Germain-en-Laye, with occasional visits to the monastery of Chaillot of which she was patroness, until her death on 7 May 1718.
Introduction

Mary of Modena was aged 15 when she married the Duke of York and became his second Duchess. James was already 40 years old, and there were many reasons to expect that the marriage would prove a failure. Apart from the great difference in age and background, the marriage had been hastily arranged and, more seriously, had provoked bitter hostility in England. James’s unpopularity increased with what proved to be a conspicuously successful and happy marriage to this Italian Catholic princess who, (rumour had it), was the Pope’s daughter.¹

Maria Beatrice Anna Margherita Isabella d’Este² had had no wish to marry and had planned to enter a convent, but “duty” was the guiding principle of her life and, so the story is told, she was encouraged by the Pope, Clement X, to marry and produce a Catholic heir for England.³ It was her eventual success in this duty, with the birth of James Francis Edward, Prince of Wales in 1688, that caused the subsequent trials of her family.

Mary of Modena arrived at Dover on 21 November 1673 and three days later received a mixed reception in London; the court was bitterly divided, her husband’s
future was in jeopardy, some church bells rang all night, but at Southwark an effigy of the Pope that had cost £50, was burned.  

This is not a biography of Mary of Modena, but a study of her image as it was constructed during her life at and after her marriage to James Duke of York, later James II and VII, when she became his Queen Consort. In the twentieth century Jean-Paul Sartre wrote *The Family Idiot, Gustave Flaubert, 1821-1857*, the subject of which was "what can we know about a person"? But the "truth" of a person is multiple; there are objective facts, both social and economic confirmed by official documents, and there are interpretations such as letters, experiences and layers of "irreducible meaning" as Sartre called it. Sartre thought that since God does not exist man has to make himself; there is no "a priori" human essence and we are not born virtuous, lazy, greedy or pious, we choose these for ourselves. He did not believe that the unconscious makes us unknowable and in an interview said that his aim was to show that "Flaubert" and "... every human being is perfectly capable of being understood if the appropriate methods are used and the necessary documents are available". I am unconvinced since no narrative can remain uncontaminated by the many voices, stories, and images of the subject and the interpretation of the historian.

My project is to look at the different ways this late Stuart Catholic "outsider" has been represented in paint, in prints and engravings and on medals, as well as in textual portraits both verse and prose, opera, masque, song and pamphlet plays. Mary of Modena was the recipient of flattering dedications and poems by, for example, Aphra
Behn (who was a Catholic), Anne Kingsmill (who was not), by John Dryden (who converted to Catholicism after the accession of James II) and Edmund Waller. Poetry had its own conventions, with which the audience would have been familiar and which shaped their interpretation and expectation. Cliché, such as effusion in praise of beauty, was commonplace and was often used in a quest for patronage. Waller’s frequent use of the word “matchless” described many women, not only Mary of Modena, since she was only one of a number of “matchless” women.

A Note on “Representation”

Mary of Modena chose to be painted by the fashionable portrait painters of the day, such as Lely and Kneller, and also patronised Catholic artists such as Benedetto Gennari. Some portraits are relatively informal in the conventional “undress” with the problematic corollary of the mistaken identity of women who were portrayed in poses of remarkable similarity. Others are more formal; for example the portraits in her coronation robes. These conform to the genre known as the state portrait developed during the Renaissance from the representation of the aristocracy with the symbolic columns, curtains, chairs and crowns and the rich clothes signifying high status. One of the meanings of “representation” was “performance”, and “to represent” meant to take the place of someone in that portraits and medals, prints and engravings represented her even when she was absent. Representation does not imply that it was artificial, since, as Erving Goffman shows, we can all “construct ourselves”. However, representation as a term not only refers to Mary of Modena’s textual and visual portraits, the projected image of her, but the image of her received by the people in their collective imagination, or the
reports by individuals of their perceptions, even if these are, in the seventeenth century, by educated individuals.

**Documentary evidence**

Many letters and documents survive; Mary of Modena’s first major biographer was Agnes Strickland who went to Paris in 1844 as the guest of M. Guizot, the foreign minister. Falconer Madan, Bodley’s Librarian, edited for the Roxburghe Club in 1889 in 2 volumes, the “cache” of letters and recollections that Strickland had studied in France from the destroyed monastery of Chaillot, under the title *Stuart Papers, relating chiefly to Mary of Modena and the exiled court of James II*. Marchesa Emily Campana di Cavelli’s 2 volume *Les Derniers Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye* is not a biography either but a collection of documents, footnotes, engravings and a preface. Seven volumes of Stuart Papers have been published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission from the Royal Collection at Windsor. Martin Haile (the pseudonym of Marie Hallé) published many letters in 1905 in her work *Queen Mary of Modena: her life and letters*, while the only other lives have been by Mary Hopkirk in 1953 and Carola Oman in 1962. Otherwise Mary of Modena is reduced to a footnote. The exile of the Stuarts at St. Germain-en-Laye has been well documented by Edward Corp in articles and books, and he has also curated two major exhibitions. This is why this study covers only the aspects which reflect on Mary of Modena herself in the concluding chapter on the years in exile. No letters from Mary of Modena to James II survive. Many of her letters at Chaillot vanished in the French Revolution of 1789, as did her body which was still at Chaillot awaiting burial in Westminster Abbey.
It is Lord Macaulay, more than any other historian, who has determined how subsequent historians and the public have understood James as a villain who espoused Roman Catholicism, was a friend of political absolutism and French and papal power, and who was the enemy of Protestants. James II’s memoirs edited by J.S. Clarke, Peterborough’s memoirs, and the distorted and partisan view of Bishop Gilbert Burnet published as *History of His Own Time* have all been examined. The letters between Mary of Modena’s vindictive step-daughters, Mary II and Queen Anne, were published as *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne* (1935), edited by Beatrice Curtis Brown and a selection relating to the supposititious Prince of Wales can be found in John Dalrymple’s *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland* (new edition, 1790). These textual portraits together with the visual images all serve to build up a portrait of this Italian “outsider”, contaminated as it is by prejudice and subjectivity.

**Propaganda**

The “representation” of Mary of Modena’s image changed when she became Queen Consort. There was an English tradition of anti-Catholicism which was a lethal weapon in the propaganda arsenal against the Stuarts. Mary of Modena had no living children until 1688, but between 1679 and 1681 a group of exclusionist parliamentarians had already advanced a bill to exclude the heirless Catholic James from the throne. The association of Catholicism with foreign threats to national independence had been a touchstone of English political culture since the Elizabethans. Mary of Modena was both Catholic and Italian and the fear was she might have a son. There was scepticism about
her taking the waters at Bath said to help conception, a very public spectacle of a queen as a woman attempting to give the nation an heir. The despatches of the Florentine and Venetian envoys contain evidence of English political leaders deluding themselves and others into accepting the myth that the son of Mary of Modena and James II was supposititious having been smuggled into his mother’s bed in a warming pan. The very public ritual of giving birth in the seventeenth century confirms that the myth of a fraudulent Prince of Wales can be dismissed as a fabrication of lies.

The myth however worked to the advantage of everyone along the political spectrum who wanted to avoid a Catholic dynasty. This political bias was of great importance because it was helped, if not initiated, by Mary of Modena’s vindictive and jealous stepdaughter Princess Anne of Denmark. She was obsessed by the prospect that she and her sister Mary, Princess of Orange, (James’s daughters by his first wife Anne Hyde), would be deprived of the right of succession. During 1685 Anne had become estranged from her mother’s family, and 1686 saw this stubborn and ostentatiously Protestant woman become increasingly estranged from her father and stepmother.

There had been a calculated and intensive propaganda campaign carried on by Anne’s brother-in-law William of Orange who, with the help of his Dutch and English friends, insinuated himself onto the throne of James II. While the concept of “propaganda” and public opinion was not so advanced in the seventeenth century as it is today, with the stress on rhetoric in the education of the elite, they would have been aware of attempts at persuasion. Many of the prints, satires, tracts, and broadsheets in
circulation were also aimed at the lower classes as were the staunchly anti-Catholic "pamphlet plays" which were intended to reach a wide audience through readings aloud in coffee houses rather than in performances. This is because visual spectacle has a potentially broader impact than the language of prose and poetry which is directed at the reason and intellect. This testifies to the political power of non-elite social and political classes and the power of visual propaganda in particular. While this can also call into question the view that the Revolution of 1688/9 was in essence a "coup d'etat" carried out by a few people, I am of the view that it was a dynastic, not a parliamentary, revolution. Although some historians, for example William A. Speck in *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*, (1988), have strongly argued the contrary view, others such as Robert Beddard in *A Kingdom Without a King*, (1988), J.C.D. Clark in *Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, (1986) and J.R. Jones in *The Revolution of 1688 in England*, (1972) have all argued that the Revolution itself, in terms of constitutional results, was not of major importance.

More recently, Edward Vallance has argued in *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty*, (2006) that the revolution was caused not only by the power of anti-Catholicism to disrupt English politics, but by William of Orange's desire to use English resources in a European dynastic war. This echoes John Child's commemorative essay "1688" in the October 1988 issue of *History*. He wrote that William was disinterested in England and its politics and concerned "... only to milk his adopted country of every pound and every man to bolster his war against Louis XIV ...". Tim
Harris's Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720 also published in 2006 concludes that there was a dynastic crisis in 1688-9 that generated separate English, Scottish and Irish revolutions. Sometimes referred to as "bloodless" this is a narrow, Anglo-centric view of the events which were certainly not bloodless in Ireland or Scotland. Harris also concludes that the conventional value judgement "glorious" should not be endorsed. "Glorious" can be deemed insulting to those, particularly the Roman Catholics, who were denounced by Protestants as mere "papists" not worthy of the civil rights claimed as the essential liberties safeguarded by the Revolution Settlement. Essentially it was a dispute within the Stuart royal family in which the senior family members, the Catholic James II and Mary of Modena, were opposed by the younger Protestant members of the family, Anne, and Mary and William of Orange.

Mary of Modena's enemies kept up the hostile assault even after she and James were in exile in France; there was for example, a famous satirical print, of her with the Jesuit priest Father Petre attributed to Pieter Schenck. Even as late as 1745 a broadside was published showing the Young Pretender holding an open warming pan revealing a portrait of James Francis Edward, the Old Pretender; this was an obvious reference to the rumours surrounding his birth in 1688.

This thesis is an attempt to place images and texts in the cultural context of the age and discusses artists, writers, patronage, conventions and expectations. The role of women is discussed with reference to notions of grace, beauty and harmony; did these
mirror the "real" woman, or were they simply ideals current in the seventeenth century?
The first chapter has Mary of Modena's predecessor as its focus. James, Duke of York's first wife Anne Hyde was a paradigm of everything Mary of Modena was not: coming from an undistinguished country family Anne Hyde was not acceptable, but then neither was Mary of Modena for different reasons, so a comparison of the representations of the two women is instructive. The next four chapters cover the years Mary of Modena was Duchess of York from 1673 to 1685. This is not a strictly chronological arrangement but deals with themes and issues within these years: for example, the themes of "beauty", her "otherness", her patronage of artists, writers and musicians, her court and the many visual and textual portraits of her produced by women. Chapters six and seven deal with the short reign of James II and Mary of Modena: firstly the coronation and the portraits, music and poetry produced at the time, and secondly the "warming pan" scandal and its far-reaching consequences, culminating in the so called "glorious revolution" of 1688/9. The final chapter summarizes the representations of her in exile.

There were changes in both the visual and the textual representations of Mary of Modena, as well as changes in the function of these representations from her arrival in England from Italy in 1673 to her death in France in 1718. It appears to be a case of "self fashioning" or construction of the self only in part, for the majority of her multiple representations, whether as Catholic whore and Catholic alien, Venus or Laura, heroic woman or Virgin Mary, have all been constructed by others.
CHAPTER I

Mary Of Modena’s Predecessor:
Anne Hyde, The Phoenix Duchess

John Dryden described Mary of Modena as “Our phoenix queen” in his ode To the Pious Memory of Mrs Anne Killigrew, one of her Maids of Honour. A staunch defender of the Stuart dynasty, and aware of the poet’s role in creating great and heroic characters, he was secure in his position as Poet Laureate when he wrote that phrase.¹³

This was not Dryden’s first use of the image of the phoenix, since he had used it on several occasions previously, notably in his poem to James, Duke of York’s first Duchess, Anne Hyde, on her husband’s victory at Lowestoft, Verses to Her Highness the Duchess on the Memorable Victory Gained by the Duke against the Hollander, June the 3, 1665, and on Her Journey Afterwards into the North:

And country beauties by their lovers go,
Blessing themselves and wond’ring at the show.
So when the newborn phoenix first is seen,
Her feathered subjects all adore their queen.
And while she makes her progress through the east,
From every grove her numerous train’s increased:
Each poet of the air her glory sings,

And round him the pleased audience clap their wings.

(Lines 50-57)\textsuperscript{14}

This was one of the prefatory texts to Annus Mirabilis which was published in January 1667 as a panegyric interpretation of some of the disasters of the mid 1660s, including the “Great Fire”, the plague, and an incompetent naval strategy seen by others as divine intervention for the misconduct of the English court. It was also a response to the vicious and damaging satiric “advice-to-painter” poems unleashed by Edmund Waller’s ill-judged Instructions to a Painter (1666) discussed below. In particular, Dryden responded to the libelling of Anne Hyde in the second and third “advice-to-painter” poems, most probably as a bid for court patronage that was successfully realized in his appointment in 1668 as Poet Laureate and in 1670 as Historiographer Royal.

The image of the phoenix is used by Dryden to represent both Mary of Modena and Anne Hyde in the old English sense of meaning: that is as a unique person. Both women of course were unique in the sense that they were “self-made” and as unlike each other, apart from their espousal of Catholicism, as it was possible to be. Mary of Modena was from the noble and ancient Italian House of Este, Anne Hyde was an English commoner. Her father, the lord chancellor, Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, was a university educated scion of a minor gentry family from Wiltshire, with legal connections. She was the eldest daughter of his second marriage to Frances Ailesbury and was named after his first wife Anne Ayliffe who died of smallpox in 1632.\textsuperscript{15} Anne
Hyde was pregnant when she married James, Duke of York, consequently gaining a reputation as a whore and subsequently for infidelity; in the last few years of her life she was described as obese and given to gluttony. Mary of Modena was married to the Duke of York by proxy in Italy, and, although she wanted to enter a convent instead, became a faithful wife noted for her elegance.

However, both women were the subject of allegations about their personal conduct from time to time, particularly Mary of Modena who was subject to a barrage of accusations from English Protestant propagandists about her lovers, when in exile in France after the 1688 “revolution”.

They were alike in that they were spirited and intelligent women, but apart from patronage, had limited opportunities to display that intelligence. They both died of breast cancer, although Mary of Modena was almost sixty years old at the time of her death while Anne Hyde died relatively young at the age of thirty four. Between 1660 and 1671 the year of her death, Anne bore eight children, six of whom died in infancy or early childhood and only two girls, Mary born in 1662 and Anne born in 1665, survived, but they became queens of England. The lot of seventeenth-century woman appears to have been permanent pregnancy; Mary of Modena had five miscarriages and six children, and as with Anne Hyde, only two survived beyond childhood. In her exile in France, Mary of Modena told the nuns of the convent at Chaillot that she had never been happy in England except between the ages of fifteen and twenty years, adding the qualification:
"But in those five years I was always pregnant and I lost all the children I had. Judge for yourself what happiness that was". 

The Phoenix Journeys to the North

Certainly for John Dryden, these two women were not simply ordinary females suffering mundane births and deaths, but each was a phoenix, a fire bird symbolic of the sun and signifier of divine royalty, nobility and uniqueness. He compared Anne Hyde's "progress" through the north to a journey by a female phoenix with her feathered attendants. In "Leaving our Southern Clime, you march'd along The Stubborn North, ten thousand Cupid's strong." (II, 44-45), Dryden suggested that the tour to this northern region, (and York particularly was not noted for loyalty to the Crown), was a staged political journey to gain support for the Duke and Duchess. While Charles II had moved with the Court and Parliament to Oxford in June 1665 because of the plague in London, James and Anne had travelled north in July with their court to spend late summer in York. On their way they were welcomed in state by the Duke and Duchess of Newcastle who accompanied them for miles along the road; on their return journey from York, they were invited to stay at Welbeck, the Newcastles' Nottinghamshire seat. James was absent on political concerns, but Anne Hyde was "splendidly entertained" there since the Newcastles had known her in exile in Antwerp as commoner Anne Hyde, the eldest daughter of Charles II's chief minister. 

It is alleged by J.H. Jesse in Memoirs of the Court ... that this northern journey by the "phoenix" Duchess was proposed by Anne Hyde (of formerly "irreproachable
character") to James so that she could have "more favourable opportunities for the intrigue" that she was apparently conducting indiscreetly with Henry Sidney "... the hansomest youth of his time" whom the Yorkshire squire, Sir John Reresby observed "... was soe (sic) much in love with her". James refused to speak to Anne although he was busily pursuing Frances Teresa Stewart himself, and had Sidney dismissed from court. Anne had administered a dose of infidelity to her unfaithful husband, and James saw the advantage to himself of excusing his own infidelities. Reresby however dismissed the flirtation as "very innocent" and thought Anne herself "a very hansome woman, had a great deale (sic) of wit".

Dryden's reference to Anne as a phoenix in Verses to Her Highness ... is timely, given the Sidney affair, and appropriate to a "royal" personage. The symbol had an impeccable provenance: in c.1575 Nicholas Hilliard had executed a pair of nearly symmetrical portraits of Elizabeth I, one showing her wearing a jewel in the shape of a pelican, the other a phoenix. Crispin van de Passe engraved an image of Elizabeth in 1596 standing between two columns; on one perches a phoenix (fig.1). It had multiple meanings clearly applicable to her: its primary characteristics were that only one was alive at any time, it lived for centuries, was celibate and fertile and able to asexually regenerate its own dynasty. As such it was associated with the resurrection of Christ and with the chastity and uniqueness of the Virgin Mary. The connotations of virginity and singularity made it applicable to Elizabeth, and to women such as Mary of Modena and Anne Hyde. Dryden could praise Anne for her triumphant emergence from the disgrace of her pregnancy and subsequent "forced" marriage, for her beauty and, whatever the
rumours vis-à-vis Henry Sidney, for her virtue. The phoenix was associated with the rose in the gardens of Paradise, and this is made clear in the Hilliard portrait of Elizabeth who holds a rose in her right hand below the jewelled pendant representing the phoenix. The rose was the flower of the feminine deities and of the Virgin Mary who was referred to as both “the mystic rose” and “the rose of heaven”; it symbolized love, fertility, creation and beauty.

**Power in Her Hands**

Comparisons of female beauty with the rose were commonplace in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both being spectacular and short-lived; it is almost impossible to say who did not use it, since for example Edmund Spenser, Samuel Daniel, Sir John Harington and Robert Herrick all used the simile, and most famously Edmund Waller in his four verses *Go, Lovely Rose!* Mary of Modena as the second Duchess of York was widely agreed to be a beauty, and her fragility contrasts in a striking way when her portraits are compared with the heavier features of Anne Hyde. Lady Vaughan recorded her impressions of Mary of Modena in a letter to her second husband: “... and now we may say she has more wit than ever woman had before; as much beauty, and greater youth than is necessary”. Sir John Reresby, on close acquaintance with Anne Hyde when she was 28, recorded that he thought her both handsome and witty in a volume offered as family reminiscences and not intended to flatter Anne for a general audience. However, it has become a commonplace to assert that Anne Hyde, on Pepys’ estimation, was no beauty, although intelligent and witty; he saw her at Whitehall on April 20 1661:
"So back to the Cockpitt, ... and there saw the King and Duke of York and his Duchess (which is a plain woman, and like her mother, my Lady Chancellor)".  

This was endorsed by the Count of Grammont whose recollections were entertaining rather than reliable. She had "... a majestic air, a pretty good shape, not much beauty, a great deal of wit, and so just a discernment of merit, that, whoever of either sex were possessed of it, were sure to be distinguished by her". So apart from Reresby’s estimation, the assessment of the witty Anne Hyde handed down to the twenty-first century appears to be based on Samuel Pepy’s malicious diary entry, since he appears neither to have admired Anne nor her painted portraits, which themselves provide conflicting evidence.

These portraits are of a woman who is not conventionally beautiful; for example she had smallpox scars on her face and Andrew Marvell had virulently indicted the magnitude of her appetite and body in his insulting portrait of her in The Last Instructions to a Painter:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Paint her with Oyster Lip and breath of Fame,} \\
& \text{Wide Mouth that Sparagus may well proclaim:} \\
& \text{With Chanc’lor’s Belly, and so large a Rump.} \\
& \text{There, not behind the Coach, her Pages jump.} \\
& \text{(Lines 61-64).}
\end{align*}
\]
Marvell's crude and vulgar connection here to the popular print culture trade is difficult to reconcile with the writer of his more lyrical verse. He imputes "whoredom" and greed, charges never levelled at Mary of Modena, until the birth of the "Old Pretender" and after her exile in France. As she grew fatter and less attractive, Anne's portraits do show a marked decline in her latter years. It is only in textual portraits that we learn she used her considerable intelligence to influence the Duke of York's political activities and she managed his finances to their conspicuous advantage. Like her father she was a strong character, and, contrary to malign reports of her profligacy, she looked after James's finances successfully; he had an income of c.£30,000 per annum, they spent £11,000 on food and drink and kept out of debt. James was fortunate in both his wives. In their exile in France in 1690 Mary of Modena acted as James's "factor" during his absence in Ireland, negotiating with England, Scotland, and Louis XIV as well as attempting to obtain subsidies from Rome. Lord Melfont informed James that his wife had both excellent business and political sense:

"I confess I never saw any one understand affairs better than the Queen, and she has really gained so much esteem from the King here and his Ministers, that I am truly of opinion, that if it had not been for her, the wicked reports spread here had made your affairs go entirely wrong at the Court".29

A well-known portrait of Anne Hyde is now in the National Portrait Gallery, London (fig.2); the original of this may be the one recorded in the Clarendon collection, (fig.2a). Figure 2 is a studio version painted after Sir Peter Lely about 1670 shortly before her death, which, compared with her earlier portraits, for example the miniature by
Richard Gibson c.1665 (fig.3), emphasises her decline. In this late portrait leaning her head on her left hand she is represented as a rather sleepy, sensuous and plump woman. It shows features typical of Lely and his studio: long fleshy face, heavily lidded eyes, thick eyebrows, full lips and the accentuated extra flesh under the chin, termed “soggiogaia” in Agnolo Firenzuola’s *On the Beauty of Women* (1548). Because this is a typical “Lely” and studio portrait it may not be a very good likeness of Anne Hyde; Lely, like Van Dyck, was an unquestionable flatterer of royalty. Richard Brilliant has argued that the term “likeness” is problematic since the idea of a likeness “... assumed some degree of difference between the portrait image and the person, otherwise they would be identical and no question of likeness would arise”. In March 1666, Pepys had gone to Whitehall where Anne was sitting to Lely probably for the portrait now in the Royal Collection (fig.4) on which Gibson may have based his miniature (fig.3). Pepys observed that Lely had not in his estimation achieved a good “likeness”:

"I was well pleased to see that there was nothing near so much resemblance of her face in his work, which is now the second, if not the third time, as there was of my wife’s at the very first time. Nor do I think at last it can be like, the lines not being in proportion to those of her face.”

There may be a resemblance between the sitter and the portrait but there is necessarily an incomplete correspondence between them. No matter how close the resemblance, Anne’s portrait seen by Pepys was a representation of her determined by the perceptions of Lely and Pepys himself. Apparently she had abundant chestnut hair and a voluptuous figure and both are represented in fig.4, as are her eloquent hands. Her
outstretched left hand, palm upwards, seems to reproduce the gesture recommended by Quintilian for the beginning of a speech. This would match nicely with her reputation as “a very extraordinary woman” who had “great knowledge and a lively sense of things” and who “soon came to understand what belonged to princes, and took rather too much state upon her”. As Vico so succinctly put it: “Among all nations the hand signified power”. Becoming “stately” was a charge levelled at both women: Anne Hyde on becoming a Duchess, and Mary of Modena on becoming Queen. Mary of Modena had been praised for her charming manner and for keeping out of politics when she was Duchess of York but when she was “exalted” John Evelyn complained that “her outward affability [was] much changed to stateliness”. She became “haughty” and politically unwise, torn between the competing factions of the English court to use her influence on James.

For all her alleged haughtiness, Mary of Modena’s hands rest in her lap, on a lamb’s head, or hold a sceptre, but they are never a central feature of her portraits. Anne Hyde’s hands are displayed to great effect: her right hand touches her loose and abundant hair in the portrait by Lely (fig.4); to emphasise her pride in her chestnut hair a full-length copy of this portrait in the Royal Collection shows her seated at a table in front of a mirror (fig.4a). In the later portrait of c.1670 (fig.2) her left hand supports her head; while this is not a particularly attractive representation, Allan Fea’s description of her as “coarse and fat ... a vulgar, cook-like person with her hand up to her head, an attitude she principally affected, presumably to show her plump arms off to advantage”, misses the point. An intelligent and educated woman such as Anne Hyde would know
that she would evoke the frequently imitated poems of Petrarch who wrote of his beloved Laura's beautiful naked hand:

\[
O \text{ lovely hand, gripping my heart so tight, } \\
\text{my life enclosing in a little space, } \\
a \text{ hand in which both Heaven and Nature place } \\
\text{all study, every art, to show their might; } \\
\text{and those five orient pearls so smooth and light, } \\
\text{in my wounds only leaving such sharp trace, } \\
\text{sweet slender fingers, now Love has the grace } \\
to bare you for a while to my delight.^{37}
\]

Anne Hyde’s hands are eloquent and expressive and were noted by Pepys in 1665 “whose hands I did kiss. And it was the first time I did ever or did see anybody else kiss her hand; and it was a most fine white and fat hand”.^{38} Portraits do not necessarily mirror physical or social reality, but are much more indirect and communicate signs representing attitudes and values as a means to “the presentation of the self” or “impression management”.^{39} Castiglione discussed in his book The Book of the Courtier (1528) the importance of “giving a good impression” and particularly the “first impression”, well aware that he was telling the reader how to become another person, or how to put on a mask.^{40} We do not see Anne Hyde’s smallpox scars, but we see the beauty of her “white and fat hand”, her abundant chestnut hair is shown to advantage as is her voluptuous figure.
The Melancholy Intellectual

The pose of the head-on-hand is used again in a similar Lely and studio three-quarter length version (fig.5) in which Anne Hyde holds a book in her right hand; there is yet another similar, three-quarter length (fig.6) in reverse in several versions, but without the book. All three versions represent her in the traditional pose of melancholy. In Renaissance Italy both poetry and the philosophy of Marsilio Ficino's *De Vita Triplici* (1489) had abstracted inwardness as an inherent quality of creative genius. Attitudes and attributes of melancholy were indispensable adjuncts of any Renaissance Englishman with intellectual pretensions; in England in the 1590s it began to manifest itself in the visual arts bringing into being a series of representations of melancholic men and women. It became fashionable to be melancholy, and although Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier* was a guide to self-fashioning, there are no instructions for learning the body language of propping one's head on one's hand in this or other courtesy books, since it was not correct to appear melancholy in public.41 In order to acquaint others with one's intellect the portrait made the private public, so Anne Hyde's portrait adjusts her appearance and she is represented in the role of an intellectual, that is at least as faithful a representation as that of the "vulgar, cook-like person". So in her portraits Anne Hyde draws attention to her beautiful hair, the power of her hands and now in (fig.5) the power of her intellect, since in holding a book in a society where literacy was restricted to an elite, books were not only symbols of the contemplative life, but symbols of power.

Mary of Modena had been educated by the Jesuits, for whom she had a lifelong respect, and was an intelligent woman with an aptitude for languages; as well as Italian
she was fluent in French and English and knew Latin. She was a reader of biographies, for example of Elizabeth, and the Memoirs of James I, and particularly of devotional works, the Bible, prayers, "the psalms, in Latin, the litanies of the Saints and of the Blessed Virgin, "the Imitation of Christ", and the Sermons of Bourdaloue, Massillon ...". Anne Hyde's portraits perhaps offer evidence of wanting to be admired rather than to be loved, and her strength of character is corroborated by an impressed Reresby in his Memoirs for August 5 1665:

One evening haveing (sic) a little snake (which I kept in bran in a box) in my hand as I was in the presence, one of the maids of honor seing (sic) of it was frightened. The Duchesse, hearing the noise and what was the occasion, desired to see the snake, and took it into her hand without any fear". It was not unusual for women to carry a snake in their sleeve for coolness in hot weather, as Edmund Waller makes clear: "Thrice happy snake! that in her sleeve/May boldly creep; we dare not give/Our thoughts so unconfined a leave." He wrote this poem at about the time of the incident referred to by Reresby and called it To a Fair Lady, Playing With a Snake alluding to the fear that snakes excited: Strange! that such horror and such grace/Should dwell together in one place;/A fury's arm, an angel's face! Anne Hyde's own literary ability is recorded by Horatio Walpole (1717-97): she had begun to write the memoirs of James, Duke of York which she never completed. After her death Gilbert Burnet, who had seen the first volume, refused James's instruction to continue her work. Burnet records that "she wrote well, and had begun the
duke's life, of which she showed me a volume. It was all drawn from his journal; and he intended to have employed me in carrying it on. Horatio Walpole had not seen an example of her work or James's memoirs, but in 1759 he printed a light-hearted Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England; in the edition of 1806 enlarged by Thomas Park the memoirs are referred to, and the entry also quotes from a poem of Edmund Waller about Anne Hyde's “character” of the Princess of Orange. Edmund Waller had made a reference to Anne Hyde writing the “character” of her former employer, since she was her Maid of Honour, and her subsequent sister-in-law, in his poem Of Her Royal Highness, Mother to the Prince of Orange; he subtitled it “And of her Portrait, written by the late Duchess of York while she lived with her”. It may be that Waller had become so used to flattering his Royal patrons that it was habitual, but he, like Burnet, thought the Duchess of York an able wielder of the pen:

“But, above all, a nymph of your own train
Gives us your character in such a strain,
As none but she, who in that court did dwell,
Could know such work, or worth describe so well.”

(lines 13-16)

Anne Hyde's claim to intelligence and dignity both in the portraits painted by Lely and in the various textual descriptions of her by a variety of people, was upheld by Le Comte de Cominges in a letter written to Louis XIV on August 7 1664, on the subject of her father Edward Hyde, who as Lord Clarendon, was accused of High Treason by
George Digby, the unscrupulous Earl of Bristol, once his old friend metamorphosed as his embittered detractor:

"The thing goes on for weeks and months. The Chancellor is faithfully supported by his daughter, "Madame la Duchesse d'York, who is as worthy a woman (aussi brave femme) – the word “honnête” is not strong enough – as I have met in my life; and she upholds with as much courage, cleverness, and energy the dignity to which she has been called, as if she were of the blood of the kings, or of Guzman at the least, or Mendoce".48

She undoubtedly had an independence of mind which led to Pepys’s oft-quoted cliche that the Duke of York “...in all things but in his codpiece, is led by the nose by his wife”.49 The “portrait” of her “drawn” by J.S. Clarke in his transcription of James II’s memoirs “writ of his own hand” is of an intense woman who was very religious and who “upon all occasions had shewn (sic) herself very zealous in her profession”. Maurice Ashley argues that it was she, rather than anyone else, who was responsible for James’s conversion to Roman Catholicism. This is the view of John Miller: “By January 1670 he was impatient to declare himself, and was now under added pressure from his wife”; he was received into the Catholic Church early in 1672, just before he left to command the fleet.50

Anne Hyde had stopped taking Anglican communion late in 1669, and in 1686 James, then King, published her private papers. Among them was one dated St. James’s Aug. 20. 1670 in which she explains for her husband’s benefit her reasons for believing
that the Church of England was not a true church; in her view there were no reasons

"why we left the church, but for three the most abominable ones": 1) because Henry
VIII wanted to get rid of his wife 2) because Edward VI was governed by an uncle who
built his own estate out of confiscated church lands, and 3) because Queen Elizabeth, in
the view of the Church was not the lawful heiress of the Crown and could therefore keep
it only by renouncing the Roman Catholic church which could not permit an unlawful
succession.\textsuperscript{51} This paper was printed in what is known as Bishop White Kennet's \textit{History}
(1705, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. 1719), who, as a Protestant, attributes her conversion unsurprisingly to her
husband, rather than allowing that as a strong-minded woman she would have her own
ideas (see Appendix A). Contemporary gossip explained her conversion as an anxiety to
retain her husband's affections, and more interestingly, to her friendship with the recently
converted Barbara Villiers, Lady Castlemaine.\textsuperscript{52} Dryden as Poet Laureate defended the
documents as being authentic. She had been his one time patron and he praised her
writing and clear simple language as "... extremely moving, plain, without Artifice, and
discovering the Piety of the Soul from which it flow'd. Truth has a Language to it self,
which 'tis impossible for Hypocrisie to imitate: Dissimulation could never write so
warmly, nor with so much life".\textsuperscript{53} When she died in 1671 she wished James to stay with
her so that she could take the last sacrament and to prevent Anglican bishops
attending her. Charles II required James to keep Anne's Catholicism "a great Secret".
In his Memoirs James records that nobody knew about her conversion except Father Hunt
"a Franciscan who reconcil'd her", the Lady Cranmore, and Depuy one of his servants.
Lord Cornbury, her brother "a violent Church of England man", declined to visit her
during her last illness since he suspected that she had become a Catholic.\textsuperscript{54}
Within days of her death, discussions began about James's remarriage, and he managed to increase his unpopularity with his marriage to an Italian Catholic princess, Mary of Modena. She was the recipient of hostility in England (where they burned the head of her church, the Pope, in effigy) as well as at court as Anne Hyde had been. "The noise of this Match coming to the ears of the House of Commons, who at times were mightily heated against that which they called Popery, ..., enter'd into a hot Debate about it, and at last resolved upon an Address to the King to break the Match, because the Princess was a Roman Catholic, and that it was promoted by France". Unlike Anne and despite her religion, Mary of Modena was beautiful, young and kept out of politics, at least until she became Queen, and quickly became far more popular than her husband.

Mary of Modena had been encouraged by Pope Clement X to accept the Duke of York's offer of marriage, rather than to go into a convent, and to view the match as a mission to help English Catholics suffering religious persecution and discrimination. To advance the Catholic cause she would be an exemplary wife, a model of propriety at the centre of court life, rather than retiring from it in prayer at Somerset House as Queen Catherine of Braganza had done. However by the time she herself was Queen, her unpleasant youngest step-daughter Anne, the protestant Princess of Denmark (later Queen Anne) was busily fostering hostility against her, writing to her sister the Princess of Orange that "One thing I must say of the Queen, which is, that she is the most hated in the world of all sorts of people; for everybody believes that she presses the king to be
more violent than he would be himself; which is not unlikely, for she is a very great bigot in her way, and one may see that she hates all Protestants".56

While Mary of Modena had a mission, Anne Hyde was motivated by religious zeal firstly as a Protestant and later as a convert from Protestantism to Roman Catholicism.

**The Young Courtier Anne Hyde**

Anne Hyde begins the entries made in her “account book” which she kept from the age of about 15 years old: “I was born the 12th day of March (O.S.) in the year of our Lord 1637, at Cranborne Lodge, near Windsor, in Berkshire, and lived in my own country till I was twelve years old, having in that time seen the ruin both of Church and State and the murthing of my King”. She lists the different places the family resided, and she records that on April 30, 1649, (O.S.) the family, her mother and three brothers, left England to join her father and by May 6, (O.S.) were in lodgings in Antwerp.57

While they were in exile during the Protectorate, Mary, Princess of Orange showed goodwill to the Hydes and assigned them a house at Breda rent free to which they moved from Antwerp in the autumn of 1653. A vacancy occurred among her maids of honour, and in May 1654 she took into her service Edward Hyde’s daughter, much to the annoyance of Queen Henrietta Maria who loathed Hyde, having a “notorious prejudice to him”.58

Although, according to Clarendon’s account, he at first refused this honour, since he was not inclined to allow his daughter to lead a Court life, eventually he was persuaded by Charles, brother to Anne’s future employer. After her appointment Anne’s aunt “Babs”,
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Barbara Ailesbury wrote to Clarendon that the "... unkind gerle hath robed me of all my Galants".  

That Anne Hyde’s vivacity and good looks began to attract attention at Court is reinforced by the unreliable recollection of the entertaining Count of Grammont with his comment that: "Though the bride was no perfect beauty, ... there were none at the court of Holland who eclipsed her ...". While at the Princess of Orange’s court this imperfect "beauty" was captured in what is now believed to be a portrait of Anne Hyde by Adriaen Hanneman. Hanneman’s clientele were mainly English citizens living in the Netherlands, possibly because his work appears to be inspired by Van Dyck, and it is probable that he had been an assistant in Van Dyck’s workshop since Hanneman had settled in London in 1626 until his return to the Hague in 1638. His clients would have been familiar with the style of his work, and from the late 1640s onwards, were primarily the royalist exiles who spent periods of time at The Hague where Hanneman had joined the painters’ guild in 1640.

Hanneman painted Charles II when Prince of Wales (1648-9), Henry, Duke of Gloucester (1653), Princess Mary of Orange (1659 and 1660) and Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon (c.1655). As she was to see her parents only at rare intervals after she became a Maid of Honour in 1654, it was hardly surprising that Hyde was to commission a portrait of his favourite child. He was in Aachen and Cologne, finally settling in Bruges only in 1656, and staying there until the Restoration. The portrait by Hanneman is inscribed Madame de Cante Croix, but Robin Gibson claims this half-length portrait
cannot possibly be "the stately matron painted by Van Dyck in his 1635 portrait at Windsor". The portrait is of a young girl dressed in the fashion of about the Restoration period, her brown hair curled on her forehead, with pearls and a pink bodice with pink open sleeve and a grey drape held by her left hand (fig.7). Edward Hyde had written to his friend and fellow exile Sir Charles Cotterell, the Secretary to the Duke of Gloucester, that he had "... humbly besought the girle to sitt att Hunneman's for her picture, but my wife says, that excepte you governe the whole affayre, order the tymne of her sittinge, when shee lookes most like an angel, directe her dressinge, and posture and the like, it will be but a sorry picture, therfore looke to it". This portrait in the collection of the Clarendon family, was painted by an artist patronised by Anne Hyde’s employer. Since the artist Hanneman also painted her father’s portrait, there is little doubt that this is the portrait of "the girle" that Edward Hyde thought to commission. This is probably the only portrait of Anne Hyde painted during her eleven years of exile from England, a short time compared with Mary of Modena’s exile in France of thirty one years, although she too was rarely painted during her time there.

An example of a subject picture by an artist known for his portraits and whom Anne Hyde came to patronise during her time at the English court is Sir Peter Lely’s The Music Lesson (1654) (fig.8). This is a three-quarter length portrait of a young woman in a yellow robe with an orange cloak; she is seated playing a guitar from a music book held by a young man on her right, against an architectural background. It is of interest primarily because, as Beckett records, it also used to be called Anne Hyde and Her Music Master. This is unsurprising since it is signed in full by Lely, later her favoured artist,
and not only is it dated 1654, the date of her appointment as Maid of Honour to the Princess of Orange, but as Oliver Millar observes "... the composition and mood are reminiscent of Gabriel Metsu"\(^{65}\), which puts it firmly in the tradition of scenes of young people making music in interiors that were popular in Dutch art of the Golden Age. These paintings conventionally exhibit an aura of opulence, as musical instruments were considered luxury items imputing high status to the owner. The Music Party (c.1675) (fig.9) by Gerard ter Borch is an example of a Dutch genre picture showing an educated young woman’s many accomplishments, in particular an ability to sing and play music. However as Alison McNeil Kettering has convincingly argued, in classic Petrarchan fashion the conventions entail the man as victim "... the martyr, driven by arrows of love; the woman is the hard-hearted bewitcher ... Unreachable in her beauty and superiority, she is powerful in the ways she can wound". Petrarchan rhetoric had become the accepted language of love throughout Europe by the seventeenth century, and Dutch symbols and emblem books were described as "vehicles of Petrarchism"\(^{66}\). In this picture the figures incline toward each other, the girl seems indifferent to anything but the music, inferring that she not only controls the music making but the man as well. This reading would accord with what we know of Anne Hyde’s character during her time later at the English court, and her control of her husband in all areas except one. While it is interesting that it was once known as a portrait of Anne Hyde and Her Music Master recent research has concluded that there is no firm evidence to suggest that this is in fact the identity of the sitter.
The Duchess of York

Anne Hyde’s transition to the English court, like that of her successor Mary of Modena, was not a happy one. Mary of Modena, finding herself in a cold and barbarous country, expressed her unhappiness in a letter written 8 January 1674 to the Mother Superior of the Visitation Convent in Modena:-

*I am in very good health, dear Mother, thank God, but I cannot yet accustom myself to this state of life, to which, as you know, I have always been averse; therefore I cry a good deal and am much afflicted, not being able to rid myself of melancholy; however, God be praised, this is my cross! ... the Duke is a very good man and wishes me well and would do anything to prove it to me.*

She thought the married state was her cross and her forty-year old husband James’s piety and kindness her only consolation. This is in marked contrast to Anne Hyde’s experience of the same, albeit younger, man’s behaviour. They had met in Paris in 1656; on 24 November 1659 he had promised to marry her and at the Restoration, 30 May 1660, she was pregnant with a son conceived outside marriage and he had come to England morally obliged to marry her. This he did on the night of 3 September 1660 at Worcester House, in the Strand, witnessed by Dr Joseph Crowther, the Duke of York’s chaplain who officiated, Thomas Butler, Lord Ossory (son of the Duke of Ormonde) who gave Anne away and Ellen Stroud, Anne’s maid. In his preface to his 1661 diary Pepys reported that “*The Duke of Yorke lately matched to my Lord Chancellor’s daughter, which doth not please many*”; one of “the many” it did not please was her father, and another was her husband.
Compared with Mary of Modena who was from an illustrious and noble dynasty, Anne Hyde was not fit to be a royal bride, although eminently suited to be a royal mistress; a marriage between this daughter of an undistinguished country family, albeit a respectable one, was deemed scandalous. Her father confirmed as Lord Chancellor had many enemies, at Court and in the York household. He was accused not only of engineering this marriage of his daughter into the royal family, but with responsibility for the subsequent marriage of Charles II to what proved to be the barren Portuguese princess, Catherine of Braganza, so that his grandchildren would inherit the throne. Anne Hyde’s father, rather melodramatically, thought his eldest, cleverest, favourite child should be sent to the Tower and be executed rather than disgrace the Stuarts. He was devoted to his daughter and had a long-held antipathy to the unpleasant character of James, Duke of York who had deeply offended Hyde: “And yet it is very true, that in all that time, the duke never spake one word to him of that affair.” His outrage at the “...loose idleness of Court life that had undone her, the Court of the King’s indiscreet and wilful sister Mary of Orange, no doubt made yet more giddy by the presence of his aunt Elizabeth of Bohemia, the Winter Queen” is manifest in Clarendon’s autobiography.

Edward Hyde’s characterisation of the Duke of York’s manner towards him as “never any thing of grace in it, but very much of disfavour” is born out by the fact that in early October 1660 James was having second thoughts about his marriage, and had begun to deny its validity, even though both James and Anne gave formal declarations after they were married to the effect that on November 24 1659 they had been
"contracted". Friends and members of his household fabricated stories about Anne’s promiscuity and “whoredom” that would put Anne’s child’s paternity in doubt. In his Memoirs James himself stresses how unsuitable the marriage was for the brother of a restored king now able to pursue a suit in any European court. He cites not only the king and his own friends, but “... most especially some of his menial (sic) Servants with a violent Zeal [who] opposed the match”. He was to get a chance to scour the European courts for a more suitable match, (Mary of Modena), once Anne was dead, but this was an unpromising start to an unhappy “mésalliance”. Charles II refused James leave to renge on his obligations, the false allegations were withdrawn, but the child, Charles Duke of Cambridge, born 22 October 1660 died at a few months old.

Mary of Modena and Anne Hyde were both intruders into this narrow-minded, idle world. Anne was recognised as Duchess of York and claimed precedence above all other women, (apart from the Queen Dowager Henrietta Maria, and later the new Queen, Catherine of Braganza who arrived eighteen months after Anne’s marriage), which did not endear her to court society. Aphra Behn made a sly allusion to Hyde’s embarrassment, the court’s dismay and the old Queen’s fury in The Forc’d Marriage published in 1671 by closing the play with two members of the royal family marrying two commoners. Although in Behn’s book unions between royalty and commoners were desirable if their common elements are worthy.

Edward Hyde’s horror at his daughter’s match cannot have lasted long: he commissioned a beautiful portrait of Anne Hyde from Sir Peter Lely, which was possibly
intended to celebrate her marriage since it was painted c.1660 (fig.10). A miniature by Samuel Cooper was based on this portrait (fig.10a); as was frequently the case at this time Cooper produced miniatures close in both date and pose to an important portrait by Lely. Her father, in his own words, was of the opinion that his daughter’s marriage did not help his family or establish his fortune and that he “... was not in the least degree exalted with it. He knew well upon how slippery ground he stood, and how naturally averse the nation was from approving an exorbitant power in any subject”76. It seems odd then, that given these thoughts he should not only commission his daughter’s portrait, but that of his reviled son-in-law as a pendant (fig.11) in not only a conventional celebration of marriage, but also in a much larger format than Lely was at that time producing; Anne Hyde’s portrait is 71¼ x 56¾ ins, the Duke of Yorks 71¾ x 56¾ ins compared with the more usual three-quarter length size of Elizabeth Butler, Countess of Chesterfield painted c.1660 at 48¾ x 40½ ins for example. Their allotted roles as husband and wife are displayed in the usual way: while her husband’s outstretched hand palm upwards is a gesture of power, the beginning of “rhetoric”, the language of objects can be decoded too and he holds the baton of authority, but unlike so many who used that “attribute” at least he was entitled to it, having seen battle at first hand. She wears a saffron coloured gown associated with Roman brides, and dips her hand in a fountain. The “hand in the fountain” motif previously used by Van Dyck, Diana Dethloff observes was “... an appropriate allusion to Anne’s potential as wife and mother, recalling Proverbs, chapter 5, verse 18: ‘Let thy fountain be blessed and rejoice in the wife of thy youth’”.77 On the basis of these pendant portraits, smaller double portraits were produced by Lely and his studio at a later date after the registration of the marriage by the
Privy Council on 18 February 1661 (fig. 12). The signs of wealth, the classical column and velvet curtains are still there but the position of James’s hands has changed. She is undoubtedly married to a noble military commander who sits opposite her in a buff doublet, breastplate and scarlet sash, while she wears a blue-green gown and holds her husband’s helmet, heavy with symbolic significance: valour was an appropriate virtue for a royal husband.

Mary of Modena first had her portrait painted with her husband only after she was in exile in France and she had been married for twenty years. In this portrait the artist Pierre Mignard included her two children James Francis Edward and Louise Marie, so that the family group echoes that based on Anne Hyde and James Duke of York’s double portrait begun by Lely and completed nine years after Anne’s death by Bendetto Gennari in c.1680; he brought into the design their two daughters Mary and Anne, probably at the request of James, (although it is possible that Lely may already have been asked to sketch them in), and a much larger dog than the one sitting in the Mignard family group (fig. 13).

A Common Parentage: Satire

Anne Hyde’s father saw his York grandchildren frequently, and he was obviously delighted with the future Queen Anne who had been born in February 1665, as he wrote “... I must tell you I have gotten a girle into it since I saw you that is the best natured and best humor’d childe in the world”78. He was the grandfather of two queens, but the Hydes were minor gentry with professional connections; they were not even aristocrats and the standing of the royal family at home and abroad was easily disparaged. One
manuscript satire was aimed at the York “girles”, Anne and her older sister Mary, because they were impure and dirty as a result of their mother’s background:

On the Two Sisters

In vain the Bourbon and Plantagenet

Great Bloods are in your Royal Father met;

To be but half a Hyde is a Disgrace,

From which no Noble Seed can purge it’s Race:

Mix’d with such Mud the clearest Streams must be

Like Jordan’s Sacred Flood lost in the Sodom-Sea.

Ambition, Folly, Insolence and Pride,

Prove you no Changelings from the surer Side:

But yet not infamous to be

Your poisoning Mother’s doubtful Progeny.79

The only child of Anne whose paternity was ever really doubted was that of the first-born, Charles, Duke of Cambridge; Anne Hyde’s former tutor, the Dean of Christ Church had been sent to discuss the baby’s antecedents with her. It was only after he had been satisfied that James was the father was the child created Duke of Cambridge and his birth made public at Christmas 1660, when it was also announced that the marriage of his parents on a date unspecified had taken place. The two daughters were the targets of both Anglican and Catholic satire: they were tainted in Anglican satire by their parents’ conversion to Catholicism, and after James and Mary of Modena had gone into exile in 1688 they were satirised in Catholic writings as being responsible for their father’s
deposition. A satire that appears in manuscripts of the 1690s was called *The Duchess of York's Ghost* in which the ghost of Anne Hyde goes to Whitehall with a warning for her daughters of "Britannia[s] ... Sinking Crowne" and of the "vengeance heav’n provides/To punish unrepening Paracides". Mary, particularly as her husband was on the throne, and her sister Anne, were accused of parricide since they had wrested the crown from their father and so had engaged symbolically in regicide.

James had been labelled "... a kind Husband, and an indulgent father", even by Protestant historians. But it can be argued that he was "kind and indulgent" at his second attempt at marriage and fatherhood, since he drew up a set of rules and regulations for the children of his years in exile in 1696 that can be considered an attempt to compensate for his negligence of Mary and Anne by excessive supervision for his second family by Mary of Modena. Edward Gregg’s biography of Queen Anne suggests that available evidence points to Anne Hyde having even less interest than James in their two daughters. The "available evidence" he offers is that she left a "shadowy and indistinct impression with Lady Anne" who recorded that she had "seen my Mother’s picture, & believe tis a very good one, tho I do not remember enough of her to know whether it is like her or no, but it is very like the one the King had, which every body said was so". Since the future Queen Anne was only six years old at the time of Anne Hyde’s death, and was notoriously short-sighted, it is hardly surprising that her mother left an "indistinct impression" on a daughter who was writing at a distance of twenty-two years later to her great friend Sarah Churchill.
Anne Hyde's daughter may have been referring to a full length portrait of her, wearing a white satin dress and seated in a chair of state, that Pepys told his diary he had seen in Sir Peter Lely's studio on 18 June 1662. There are several copies and portraits said to be of Anne Hyde sitting in grand chairs or standing arrayed in robes trimmed with ermine and looking every inch the duchess (figs. 14, 15 and 16).

Edmund Waller “painted” her as an Aphrodite or Thetis, goddess of the sea, when “... to Harwich we resort./And meet the beauties of the British court./The illustrious Duchess, and her glorious train/(Like Thetis with her nymphs) adorn the main./The gazing sea-gods, since the Paphian queen/Spring from among them, no such sight had seen”. (lines 79-84) However, Andrew Marvell “repainted” the ermined Duchess not as a goddess, but as a whore in The Second Advice to a Painter and The Last Instructions to a Painter. He libelled her with allusions to her sexual career prior to her marriage to the Duke of York, her ambition to be queen, her supposed hand in the murder of one of her husbands' mistresses, Lady Denham, her gross appetite and consequently gross body. In The Second Advice he writes:

But, Painter, now prepare, t'enrich thy piece,

Pencil of ermines, oil of ambergris:

See where the Duchess, with triumphant tail

Of num'rous coaches, Harwich does assail!

So the land crabs, at Nature's kindly call

Down to engender at the sea do crawl.

See then the Admiral with navy whole,
To Harwich through the ocean caracole
So swallows, buri'd in the sea, at spring
Return to land with summer on their wing.
One thrifty ferry-boat of mother-of-pearl
Suffic'd of old the Cytherean girl
Yet navies are but properties, when here
(A small sea-masque and built to court you, dear)
Three goddesses in one: Pallas for art,
Venus for sport, and Juno in your heart.
O Duchess! if thy nuptial pomp were mean,
'Tis paid with int'rest in this naval scene.

(Lines 53-70)

The Cytherean girl, Venus had managed with one "Thrifty ferry-boat" but Anne Hyde had for her "masque" entire "navies" as stage properties. He addresses her as "dear" indicating that she was not fit to be the wife of a Duke, and was cheap and soiled goods. Her licentious conduct before and after her marriage is alluded to with particularly bad taste in Last Instructions to a Painter, where Marvell satirizes her ability to give birth a mere two months after her marriage:

Paint then again her Highness to the life,
Philosopher beyond Newcastle's wife.
She naked can Arch'medes' self put down,
For an experiment upon the crown.
She perfected that engine, oft assay'd,
How after childbirth to renew a maid,
And found how royal heirs might be matur'd
In fewer months than mothers once endur'd.

(Lines 49-56)\textsuperscript{85}

Marvell calls Anne "philosopher", at that time meaning a "scientist" or "natural philosopher": according to him she had invented a device for restoring virginity, which made her a superior being, cleverer than both Archimedes and her friend the writer Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle\textsuperscript{86}. The "Advice-to-a-Painter" genre was modelled on Waller's eulogy "Instructions to a Painter" where the poet's instructions to the artist was a framework on which to drape quantities of topical material. The second and third "advices" were the earliest anti-government verse satires, a genre that continued into the next century. The Second Advice was the first in a series of poems in the genre, and neither did Mary of Modena escape the satirists' venom: Advice to a Painter to Draw the Duke By followed the conventions offering an anti-Catholic satire on the Duke of York, his circle and his unwelcome marriage. The furore over the Modena marriage was exacerbated and stoked by the satirists and propagandists while Signior Dildo, attributed to Rochester, was scurrilous but with a subliminal political message. Marvell was drawing attention to the vice, extravagance, greed and political corruption at Charles II's court, but rather than attacking the King directly he attacked the King's relatives, his ministers, his mistresses and his friends. Marvell attacked Anne Hyde precisely because she was an easy and vulnerable target, victim of rumours and scandal about her
pregnancy and subsequent marriage, and particularly because she was the daughter of the hated Edward Hyde, Charles II’s Lord Chancellor whose downfall in the autumn of 1667 coincided with the writing of *Last Instructions to a Painter* in September 1667. It was not published until after the Duke of York was in exile with his second wife, but among the accusations of Clarendon’s arrogance, appetite, love of grandeur was the oft-repeated claim that he was the architect of the plot to ascend the throne through his daughter and grandchildren since he had arranged for Charles to marry a barren wife. The satiric *The Downfall of the Chancellor* sums up most of the allegations against him:

"Pride, lust, ambition, and the people’s hate,
The Kingdom’s broker, ruin of the State,
Dunkirk’s sad loss, divider of the fleet,
Tangier’s compounder for a barren sheet,
This shrub of gentry, marri’d to the Crown
(His daughter to the heir), is tumbl’d down ..."

(Lines 1-6) 87

Attacks on both father and daughter were legion and in Marvell’s *Third Advice to a Painter* he accuses her of ensuring her husband’s succession to the throne by having any possible rivals eliminated:

*Then Culp’per, Gloucester, ere the Princess, di’d:*

*Nothing can live that interrupts an Hyde.*

(Lines 245-6).
Princess Mary of Orange was older than James but Henry, Duke of Gloucester was the youngest brother; it is a ludicrous suggestion, since both had died in late 1660 of smallpox and, according to Pepys, in the case of Gloucester "by the great negligence of the Doctors", not Anne Hyde's treachery.88

**Acts of Patronage**

Anne Hyde inherited the hatred that her father inspired, but she also seems to have inherited his intellectual tastes. Both of them read widely and Clarendon thought books were an important part of life. His taste in pictures seems to have been almost exclusively for historical portraiture, since he had begun to collect books and papers during his exile in France. It was there he had seen that his vocation was as an historian; in his will he left ".. to my sunn Cornbury all my library of bookes and papers which are in my house at Worcester House which I desyre he will keepe togither (sic) (for which I have builte a particular roome in Clarendon house)"89 He also commissioned some portraits while in exile, for example of Anne Hyde herself from Hanneman, and it is possible that at the same time he acquired some Dutch and Flemish subject pictures that formed part of the later magnificent gallery he had prior to his "fall" in 1667.90

He commissioned directly from Sir Peter Lely; not only the pendant portraits already mentioned (figs.10 and 11) but a portrait of Heneage Finch, later first Earl of Nottingham: "I have been three times at Mr Lilly's to sit for my picture by my Lord Chancellor's command" Finch wrote in August 1666. Since Robin Gibson's assessment is that many of the portraits in Clarendon's collection suggest a mid-1660s dating, he can
argue that most of the pre-Civil War portraits are copies, of which the originals are still in the relevant family collections, thus refuting the accusation that Clarendon plundered Royalists. Lely and his studio were frequently employed to copy existing portraits rather than to paint "ad vivum".91

Edward Hyde wrote of his relationship with his favourite child Anne that "It was very obvious that he liked her company and conversation very well, and was believed to communicate all his counsels, and all he knew and thought, without reserve to her".92 They both patronised Lely and in contrast to the collections formed by the Earl of Arundel and Charles I for example, Clarendon’s collection seems to have been inspired not by connoisseurship but iconography, ".. the desire of a historically-minded patron to preserve the likenesses of the men and women who had played a large part either on the wide stage of public affairs or in the intimate theatre of his own life".93 As if to emphasise this, John Evelyn records in his Diary that he “gave his Lordship a Cataloge (sic)” of people that he, Evelyn, thought should still be added to the collection: "... I dined with my Lord Cornbury at Clarendon house, now bravely furnish’d; especialy with Pictures of most of our Antient & Modern Witts, Poets, Philosophers famous & learned English-men, which Collection of my L: Chancelors, I much commended ...".94

Anne Hyde commissioned the famous portraits that eventually came to be known as the “Windsor Beauties” from Sir Peter Lely; they were considered to be a “set” or “series” of 11, now 10, portraits when Pepys saw them in 1668 which he thought “good, but not like”.95 It is thought that Anne’s commission was probably inspired by her career
at court in The Hague when she would have seen Amalia von Solm’s collection, and which was in a long tradition of series of portraits of beautiful women. The notoriously unreliable Count of Grammont reported that Anne Hyde was “... desirous of having the portraits of the handsomest persons at court, Lely painted them ...”\textsuperscript{97}. However, given Anne’s intellectual frame of mind and the tremendous influence of her “historically-minded” father on her thinking, it can be argued that her commission was, like his, a desire to preserve the likenesses of women who were centre-stage at both the court of Catherine of Braganza and the Yorks; that is it was inspired by iconography, and not because she was a connoisseur of painting, or particularly of beauty or “beauties”.

Certainly, Charles II’s court offered young women scope for the deployment of their talents if Sir Charles Sedley’s question to a new courtier whether she intended to be “a Beauty, a Miss [mistress], a Wit, or a Politician” is to be believed. In her Sociable Letters Anne Hyde’s friend the Duchess of Newcastle was of the opinion that “a Beauty” would be the obvious choice, since she thought the most significant form of religion at the Restoration Court was female beauty\textsuperscript{98}.

Anne Hyde was a cultivated woman, and royal women were expected to be patrons. She came into contact with Lely, as Heneage Finch did, because her father had commissioned him to paint her portrait for his collection, so what better introduction? Mary of Modena’s official artist was Benedetto Gennari, best known for his portraits, but rather than painting portraits, he was sought out as a fellow Italian and Catholic to paint religious pictures. He painted a number, such as a Penitent Magdalen for her bedroom\textsuperscript{99}.  
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She had a great love of art, particularly music, and when she became queen she sent to Rome for the best singers. John Evelyn on 29 December 1686 went to listen to the
“musiq of the Italians at the new Chapel now first open’d at Whitehall for the Popish services... [and to see]... a world of figures painted by Verrio”\textsuperscript{100}. Mary of Modena also patronised Edmund Waller who wrote a courtly compliment when she asked him to write in her copy of Tasso, and Dryden dedicated works such as \textit{The State of Innocence} to her and wrote her flattering lines.

Anne Hyde stood out at court, not because she was beautiful or because she was Duchess of York, but because she had poise, style and intelligence and her household was better organized and more “select” than that of Charles II and Catherine of Braganza; she was indeed a unique “phoenix”, who encouraged others who had merit. The poet Katherine Philips (1632-64), “the matchless Orinda”, was a well-connected middle-class woman who relied on others to present her writing to a court audience. She married a Parliamentarian, but had Stuart sympathies and a desire for notice at court, to which end she cultivated Sir Charles Cotterell, by the Restoration, the king’s Master of Ceremonies who encouraged her to send her poetry to court and to seek patronage from Anne Hyde. The Renaissance “worship” of the aristocratic woman allowed Philips to address other women as sources of cultural authority and political stability; in particular, early on she addressed her women friends, like the affluent Anne Owen who was above Katherine Philips in social station and who was “Lucasia” to Philips’s “Orinda”. Increasingly female members of the royal family took the place of these friends as her ideal audience. She wrote to Cotterell, whom she called “Poliarchus”, that \textit{“The Bounds of my utmost...”}}
Ambition aspire no higher, than to be able to give [the Duchess of York] one Moment's Entertainment". Anne Hyde asked to see copies of Philips's verses but Philips worried about her “self presentation”, so she asked her Muse to be less melancholy and more cheerful than was usual. Her Poems. By the Incomparable Mrs. K.P. (1664) has in the contents list “To her Royal Highness the Duchess of York, on her commanding me to send her some things that I had written.” Katherine Philips wanted her work, but not herself as author, to be famous. As an example of her considering the Duchess of York to be an ordinary human being with ordinary feelings, she thought of “Humbly dedicat[ing]” her translation of Corneille’s La Morte de Pompée in 1662 to Anne Hyde. It was acted at Charles II’s court with a cast which included James, Duke of Monmouth, and closed with a Masque danced before “Caesar and Cleopatra” (i.e. Charles and Catherine of Braganza”). But if she dedicated this to Anne Hyde, Philips was concerned that the Duchess of York would be very offended since so many copies of the translation had circulated before she had thought of the recipient of the dedication. Cotterell agreed, and she sent it to Charles II instead, who was obviously more able to cope with this slight.

Decline and Death

Anne Hyde may or may not have been offended by Katherine Philips, since La Morte de Pompée was dedicated to the King and she was never put to the test. What did test her was her husband’s penchant for lunging from one affair to another: Pepys had heard that “… he hath come out of his wife’s bed and gone to others laid in bed for him”. Anne Hyde had complained about Elizabeth Butler, Lady Chesterfield who had
attracted the attention of the Duke of York in 1662, but she does appear to have taken his serial infidelities in her stride, although according to Grammont, she sought consolation in food since the Duke was "... incessantly in the hurry of new fancies, exhausted himself by his inconstancy, and was gradually wasting away". She "gratified her good appetite, grew so fat and plump". She certainly had ample reason to be jealous, although not all the mistresses were beautiful like Elizabeth Butler or "this whore Denham" as Pepys, the assiduous scandal collector, called her, whose beauty, or at least her face, Anne Hyde commissioned Lely to capture. Objects of her husband's pursuit included Susan, Lady Bellasyse who had little beauty according to Bishop Burnet, and John Churchill's sister, Arabella who was "a tall creature, pale-faced, and nothing but skin and bone".

Catherine Sedley (1657-1717) is said to have wondered what her appeal to James, Duke of York was since she had no beauty, "and it cannot be for my wit, [since] he has not enough to know that I have any". Shortly after his second marriage he had reverted to type and Mary of Modena was to suffer his infidelities as the first Duchess had done. Sedley was a Maid of Honour to Mary of Modena between April 1678 to c.1681, and she bore the Duke of York at least three children during this time.

Arabella Churchill (1648-1730) was one of Anne Hyde's Maids of Honour and became the Duke of York's mistress; she was not simply one of his many casual liaisons. The year she had the first of their four children in 1668 also marks the rapid decline of the Duchess of York; she became so overweight that her health was undermined. She lost her figure and her looks, and she had also lost three children between 1666 and 1669 and her public appearances were curtailed: she "breaks out so ill of her face visibly -
and of her leg again as people talke – that she was yesterday [May 4 1668] blooded and kept her bed”¹⁰⁹.

Mary of Modena did not tolerate her husband’s infidelities. When he was King he elevated Catherine Sedley to Countess of Dorchester in January 1686. Barillon the French Ambassador wrote to Louis XIV “... she [Mary of Modena] is Italian and very proud ... She has openly declared she will not suffer the public scandal it is intended to establish, that she will not see the new Countess, and that if the King does not separate from her, she will retire to a convent, in any country that may be”¹¹⁰. Catherine Sedley, Countess of Dorchester departed for Ireland. Indeed in all respects Anne Hyde’s character, background and career was the antithesis of that of Mary of Modena, although they were both catapulted into the same milieu of voluptuous spectacle and corrupt idleness at the English Court of Charles II.

After the birth of her last daughter, Anne Hyde died, apparently of breast cancer, at St James’s palace on March 31 1671, and on Wednesday April 5 was “... interr’d in a large Vault on the South Side of King Henry VII’s Chapel; her Body being accompanied from the Painted Chamber in the Palace at Westminster (whither it was privately brought from St James’s) by Highness Prince Rupert, who appear’d as chief Mourner …¹¹¹”; neither the Duke of York her husband, nor the King was present, and so that Charles II’s birthday celebrations would not be disrupted, mourning was curtailed by the King’s order. James showed little sorrow at the death of this intelligent, strong-minded woman who had exercised considerable influence over him. The Venetian Ambassador in
London, Girolamo Alberti reported to the Doge that: "The Duchess of York was not buried when negotiations were begun for a fresh marriage."

Two years later in November 1673 the Duke of York went to meet another "phoenix", Mary of Modena:

"... the Duke has gone and many Popish Lords with him to meet the new Duchesse at Dover, Crow Bishop of Oxford went to marry them, they come to Whitehall by water, & so there will be no show in the city."

This is from the Verney Collection of Letters from the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They give much court and town news and the majority are from Sir Ralph Verney between 1640 and 1688, including an account of the last moments, in 1671, of the life of Anne Hyde. On 20 November 1673 Sir Ralph was to remark:

"... after Mary of Modena has been a few months in England, that the new Duchess is better looking than he ever thought she would be, and Anne Hyde, the mother of two English Queens, is quite forgotten."
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CHAPTER 2

A “Picture of Fair Venus”: Mary of Modena as a “Beauty”

A Lely “Beauty”: Innocence and Virtue

"The pencil of Lely has rendered every one familiar with the languishing dark eyes, classic features, and graceful form, of the Italian consort of James II; that painter was never weary of multiplying portraits of a princess who completely realized his "beau ideal" of female loveliness, and who so well became the rich and picturesque costume which his exquisite taste had rendered the prevailing mode of the court of the second Charles".¹⁴

Agnes Strickland’s early Victorian biography of Mary of Modena opens with a report of a visual representation of her. The biography presents the royal heroine in the idiom of the day, as in effect the female counterpart of the male heroes who, for “sages” like Thomas Carlyle, embodied the highest human ideals and the motive force of history. But since she attributes women’s importance in history, and Mary of Modena’s importance in particular, to womanly virtue, she does not challenge the principle of the heroic male of conventional history. Strickland, writing one hundred and seventy years after Lely and his studio produced the first of a number of portraits of Mary of Modena in c.1674, describes the portrait of her as being “in the character of Innocence, without a single ornament to enhance her natural charms”¹¹⁵ (fig.17). In this portrait of her seated
in a landscape she rests her right hand on the stuffed lamb which features in the portrait of Charles II’s mistress Louise de Kéroualle painted earlier in c.1671 (fig.18).

What is considered beautiful in a woman varies between historical periods and between cultures, and Strickland’s opening paragraph raises the question what was Lely’s beau ideal? Both the portrait of Louise de Kéroualle and that of Mary of Modena are in the style of Lely’s popular, frequently repeated “pastoral femininity” design which dates from the early 1670s, the sitter in the disguise of a shepherdess. However the portrait of Louise de Kéroualle, which was probably the first time Lely had used this pose, is a striking example of his mature style. Her face is described by T.F. Dibdin in both its expression and colouring as “perfect”, and the background is “among the happiest specimens of the master”. But the version featuring Mary of Modena was painted about the time when the increasing pressure of work compelled Lely to use studio assistants and while her head appears to be by Lely “the rest of the design is by an inferior hand”117; R.B. Beckett agrees that this is a studio painting118, and Oliver Millar argues that Lely could not possible cope with the demand for numerous copies of portraits “especially of the royal family and of the spectacular ladies, ... This demand could only be met by putting the assistants on to painting everything but the head, after the design had been laid out for them”119. This is probably a portrait by several hands.

In accordance with convention Louise de Kéroualle is painted in a shift and nightgown. This is repeated in the portrait of Mary of Modena and displays the superior status which “undress in the presence of others” indicated120. However, Mary of Modena
was already Duchess of York in 1674 and incongruously she wears an ermine trimmed deep red robe over her gold nightgown; Kéroualle was elevated to a Duchess only in 1673 which dates her portrait as earlier than that of Mary of Modena and certainly before 1673. Strickland’s comment that Mary of Modena was portrayed “without a single ornament” is rather qualified by her robe, the meaning of which the contemporary viewer would have understood. Their hairstyles are similar with widely-spread curls pulled flat across the top of the head, but Mary of Modena’s was the fashion of 1673-74 where a long curl falls over the left shoulder. Ernest Law’s catalogue of the Royal Collection at Hampton Court published in 1881 argues that the portrait’s overall style, while attributed to Lely, appears to be more like that of Wissing. There is a very similar portrait in the collection at Glamis Castle (fig.19) inscribed Mary of Modena after William Wissing. The design resembles the Hampton Court portrait, now at Holyrood House, although the ermine trimmed robe is enhanced by Wissing’s signature jewelled edging, and the stuffed lamb is replaced by a crown on a plinth on which she rests her right hand which suggests a dating of between 1685-1687 when Wissing briefly took up Lely’s mantle at the court of James II before his death in 1687. Although this is a rather more stilted version of the Hampton Court/Holyrood House portrait, the sitter’s features are distinctively “Lelyesque” with heavy “languishing dark eyes” and full pouting mouth. This is probably a copy by William Wissing (1656-87) after Lely; Wissing was the most important of his pupils who took over much of Lely’s practice after his death in 1680. He came to London from Holland in 1676 and continued under the patronage of James II, painting Mary of Modena in a style close to that of Lely.
According to Agnes Strickland Lely "was never weary of multiplying portraits" of Mary of Modena; the expanding print trade in the 1670s certainly made copies of images by popular portraitists widely available and was less expensive than acquiring a studio copy. Miniaturists too copied portraits: "a head and shoulders" miniature by Richard Gibson in the Welbeck Collection, of Mary of Modena, in a brown bodice and white chemisette on a blue/grey background is based on the "stuffed lamb" portrait. Gibson was the successor of Samuel Cooper as King’s Limner to Charles II, although for only one year. He was increasingly employed as a copyist "in little" of Lely’s large-scale portraits (fig.20). Richard W. Goulding, in the Welbeck Abbey Catalogue (1916), identified it incorrectly as Lady Elizabeth Percy, Countess of Ogle, afterwards Duchess of Somerset. In Vertue’s Catalogue (1743), no.116, it was correctly identified as "Mary Duchess of York – Qu: Mary," and in McKay’s Inventory, (1880), no.20 as "Mary of Modena ... B. Lens". Goulding, however argues that he had established the sitter’s identity as Lady Elizabeth Percy, Countess of Ogle on the basis of the Lely portrait of the Countess of Ogle, no.543 in the Welbeck Collection of pictures. The correct identity was re-established in the Royal Academy Exhibition catalogue, 1960-61, The Age of Charles II: "Goulding’s identification ... has been rectified by Mr David Piper, who points out that it is derived from Lely’s portrait of Mary of Modena".¹²²

Images both of notorious court women such as Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, and of the long suffering Queen Catherine of Braganza, were disseminated to a wider public, particularly through the expansion of mezzotint printmaking, in the 1670s. The skill was imported by immigrants from the Netherlands, and by the French
Huguenots who used mezzotint "to such good effect that there was a real mania for prints in the medium in the period 1681-5 and an explosion in publishing". Gerard Valck who came to England with Abraham Blooteling, his brother-in-law, in 1673 published portraits of the King's mistresses the Duchess of Cleveland, the Duchess of Portsmouth, Mary Davis and Nell Gwyn as well as the only mezzotint after Lely's "innocence" portrait of Mary of Modena (fig.21). It is possible that this was made about the same time as the mezzotint, "probably Valck's finest ...", published in 1678 that was based on the portrait type of the Duchess of Portsmouth feeding the lamb.123

Regal emblems appear in the "lamb" and "the crown" portraits of Mary of Modena, including a castle against a dramatic sky; this is probably Windsor Castle. On 21 August 1674 Monmouth, fresh from the siege of Maastricht, and the Duke of York had together been playing elaborate war games below Windsor Castle, and "Great Guns" were fired, grenades thrown, mines set off and "prisoners taken" to the delight of a "thousand spectators", but surprisingly, without accident according to John Evelyn124. Mary of Modena attended this spectacle while she was at Windsor for some weeks in August 1674, which accords with the approximate dating of the portrait.

Ironically this portrait was identified in The Stranger's Guide to Hampton Court Palace and Gardens published in 1876 as No.196 "Nell Gwynne by Lely"125, actress-mistress of Charles II. Agnes Strickland, however, saw it as Mary of Modena by Lely, but Ernest Laws records that "since it came here, about fifty years ago, from Buckingham Palace, it [has] been misnamed "Nell Gwynne".126 His argument was that it was not
“pretty” enough to be Nell Gwyn, and of course it is unlikely that she would be painted with an ermine robe and a background of Windsor Castle, but the confusion arose no doubt because of the numerous versions made of the original Kéroualle portrait. Strickland’s perception of the portrait differs from Law’s: “We recognise her, in her youthful matron dignity, among “the ‘light-o’-love’ beauties”, in the Hampton Court Gallery, but distinguished from them by the vestal-like expression of her face”. William Hazlitt had seen these beauties at Windsor in 1823 designating them “... a set of kept-mistresses, painted and tawdry, showing off their theatrical or meretricious airs and graces”. They are variously and thinly-disguised as Minerva, Diana or St. Catherine for example and in this Lely emulates Titian and the tradition of the Venetian courtesan.127

Louise de Kéroualle’s portrait as a shepherdess still hangs at Althorp, and was not part of the “Windsor Beauties” series. However, she was armed with a crook in her “disguise” as a shepherdess, Mary of Modena had only the lamb, “the Stuart emblem of innocence”.128 The lamb usually appeared in portraits of new brides, and was the personification of gentleness, patience and humility and the attribute of St. Agnes, possibly because of the similarity between the name Agnes and the Latin “agnus”/lamb, although it is a false derivation as Agnes comes from the Greek meaning chaste. Mary of Modena’s chastity is emphasised by the lamb and reinforced by an unlikely pillar in the background which is absent from Louise de Kéroualle’s portrait. This was a religious symbol of spiritual strength and steadfastness, and an attribute of the allegorical figure of constancy, as befitted Mary of Modena’s newly-married status and her reported piety.129
Strickland refers to the "vestal-like" expression on Mary of Modena's face; this could also be read as a reference to an "impassive" facial expression. One of the most powerful signs of character that could be conveyed by the body was an impassive demeanour, associated with tranquillitas, an emotional state that was a valued personal ideal in humanist circles across Europe. Renaissance humanists followed the Stoic philosophy that rational control produced constancy; the control of the passions was an ideal in wide circulation and theoretically available to both men and women. In the Book of the Courtier, Castiglione had praised "a quiet manner as an enviable mark of the grave and dignified man ruled by reason rather than appetite"; a portrait, as representation of the body, could also display this ideal. Strickland elides the beautiful and the good: for her, "vestal-like" virtue is beauty. Female beauty and virtue had been linked in Renaissance thought and art; the classical equation of the beautiful and the good was formulated by the Florentine humanist Marsilio Ficino, particularly the Neoplatonic notion that physical beauty signified an inner beauty of spirit. Opposed to the heroic male virtù, appropriate female qualities were considered to be chastity, constancy, humility, piety, charity, modesty and, particularly, obedience in a male dominated society. Women were still being defined as "the softer sex" in the 1690s; in the Ladies Dictionary outward beauty was identified with inward beauty of spirit.130

**The "beau ideal"**

Restoration portraits are clearly not straightforward portraits of individuals since they lack the psychological dimension, the revelation of the inner self, expected from modern portraiture. If Lely's portraits of Louise de Kéroualle and Mary of Modena
represent the sitter's individual nature they reflect a different conception of identity for they are seen in the light of their social status, and in this sense they are individual variants of the society's paradigm of the "ideal" woman. They are presumably recognizable "likenesses" in contemporary "undress" which displays their status — Mary of Modena, at the time she was painted, was wife of the Duke of York, Louise de Kéroualle was a king's mistress but not yet a Duchess. Their identities are amplified by a presentation of their "character" in the form of emblems — the lamb, the pillar and so on. One might well conclude that Lely's beau ideal was a woman with "languishing dark eyes", a pouting mouth, widely spread curls, in an alluring and informal three-quarter-length pose, the "undress" garments richly textured, the colour warm and the portrait completed by a lamb or other attribute. Undoubtedly because of demand, Lely's portraits suffered from his diminished participation, and became more stereotyped in form. Lely was concerned to create an idealised beauty or fashionable "type" because the women of fashion wanted to be represented as much alike as possible. 131 Strickland clearly thought she could define Lely's beau ideal. But if Mary of Modena "completely realized his beau ideal" of female loveliness" which was applied both to a woman of "vestal-like expression" and to Restoration courtesans, what is loveliness? What is beauty, if as Roland Barthes asserts: "Beauty (unlike ugliness) cannot really be explained ... it does not describe itself"? 132

Barthes' point is firstly that the attempt to define the attribution of beauty leads to the impasse of a tautology and, secondly, that beauty cannot assert itself except in the form of a citation. In S/Z he breaks down the text of Balzac's novella Sarrasine into
fragments (lexias) and identifies the cultural codes which provide the information on which texts rely: Balzac for example describes Count Lantray as "dark as a Spaniard, dull as a banker" by drawing on cultural stereotypes. The only way something can be said about Marianina's beauty is to use the simile she resembles the Sultan's daughter, while the singer "La Zambinella" displays "the ideal beauty". Sarrasine, who is an artist of genius, sees "La Zambinella" as "more than a woman, this was a masterpiece" and consequently he equates beauty with art: "Sarrasine devoured Pygmalion's statue, come down from its pedestal". What we call beauty then is "referred to an infinity of codes: lovely as Venus? But Venus lovely as what? As herself? As Marianina?" Strickland cites the "vestal-like expression" of Mary of Modena to infer that her outward beauty concealed an inward spiritual beauty. To recognise beauty is to defer endlessly the question of its origin, of its model, and what Barthes questions is where is the original for our notion of beauty? Sarrasine finally and obsessively draws "La Zambinella" from memory and confirms that ideal beauty exists only in the imagination, reinforced, in Balzac's story, by "La Zambinella" who, it transpires, is a "castrato" disguised as a woman. In another tale by Balzac, The Unknown Masterpiece, the artist Frenhofer's ambition is to complete a painting of "a flawless woman", but he knows that she exists only in his imagination: - "But where is she in the flesh?" ... "that matchless Venus of the ancients, so often sought and never found except in scattered elements, some fragmentary beauties here, some there! Oh! I would give all I possess if just once, for a single moment, I could gaze upon that complete, that divine nature, if I could meet that ideal heavenly beauty ...".
That the ideal woman was not a creature, but "a creation"\textsuperscript{136} was the gospel that Giovanni Bellori (1615-1696) preached. The work of art surpasses nature's individual, specific creation in its perfect figures and flawless shapes, although it is based on the essence of nature.\textsuperscript{137} Lely painted Mary of Modena "without ornament to enhance her natural charms", but what, for Bellori, is characteristic of the ideal absolute perfection is not the perfection of Lely's execution of the portrait, but what is represented, the figure the artist represents — so that perfection is the beauty of the depicted shape of Mary of Modena. This beauty does not follow from a reliance on prior models, but is superior to nature by selection from natural beauties, although we may ask, what is to guide an artist in his selection of these beauties and what enables him to "purify" nature? The search for the ideal throughout the Renaissance had been manifested in the studies for the proportions to be used in a representation of the human body — for example Leonardo's image of the Vitruvian man, as well as for the design of buildings and plans for the ideal city. Alberti had suggested deriving from nature a canon of beautiful proportions, presented as an average of many measurements, the statistical average of which was perfection, and based on classical mythology. Alberti reported in his treatise On Painting the story of Zeuxis told by both Cicero and Pliny the Elder: no single woman was beautiful enough for Zeuxis's panel painting of Venus (or Helen) to be placed in the temple of Lucina at Croton, so he chose the five most beautiful women to draw from them whatever feature of feminine beauty was most praiseworthy in each for his image of the perfect woman. Bellori repeated this story, and his main point that perfect beauty does not exist in nature but only in the realm of ideas, lead him to the ridiculous notion that the Trojan war was not fought over the real Helen, (because a living Helen must have
had imperfections), but over a statue of her. Because it was made by art it was perfect: the Trojan War, therefore according to Bellori was waged for the statue's beauty. Jean Baudrillard takes this up in his essay "The Illusion of War" writing that it was the simulacrum of Helen that was at the heart of the Trojan War:

"Helen was in any case merely a simulacrum, since the universal form of beauty is as unreal as gold, the universal form of all commodities. Every universal form is a simulacrum, since it is the simultaneous equivalent of all the others – something it is impossible for any real being to be."\(^{138}\)

Helen, wife of the King of Sparta, Menelaus was abducted by Paris to be his bride in Troy and was like Pandora and Eve, a beauty who brought about tragedy: Pandora lured men into the evils of matrimony, Eve tempted and brought about the Fall\(^{139}\). Helen appeared as a woman in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but in Euripides' play *Helen* she is a work of art: "Hera gave the royal son of Priam for his bride – not me, but a living image compounded of the ether in my likeness. Paris believes that he possesses me: what he holds is nothing but airy delusion".\(^{140}\)

These three mythical women have had their identities created for them; their identities are perceived through the eyes of others and not their own. It is the condition of beauty, of being an object of desire, that woman as being, and woman as artefact become interchangeable. Both the definition of woman and the definition of art are the same: fascination and beauty. The nature of the court portrait itself is a "propaganda"
instrument in effect, and, by extension the portraits of beautiful women testify to the commissioner of a portrait as having power, good taste and an eye for beauty. In the Renaissance women had become patrons too and Mary of Modena’s great great great great aunt Isabella d’Este (1474-1539) had commissioned her portrait to be painted by such artists of the period as Leonardo da Vinci (1500), Francesco Raibolini Francia, (who painted her portrait in 1511 without seeing her, basing it on an early portrait), and Titian, whose Isabella d’Este (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) painted between 1534 and 1536 was based on Francia’s 1511 portrait. A portrait in the Royal Collection, Hampton Court called Isabella d’Este(?) is thought to represent her because of the “fantasy knots”, her personal device, in the pattern of her dress. It is attributed to Giulio Romano and has been dated 1524-5, shortly after he settled in Mantua. The sitter looks far younger than the fifty years old she would have been, but Isabella d’Este did not like to sit for her portraits and she was concerned to be represented in a flattering manner. Because traditional attributes of nobility and status, such as arms or chivalric decorations were denied women, she was also shown in the most fashionable clothes. Giangiorgio Trissino created a “word-picture” of her in his Ritratti (Portraits) (1524) of the finest Italian ladies, describing her arriving for Mass at Milan Cathedral in 1507, holding an open prayer book and wearing a gold-embroidered black velvet dress. Trissino, in keeping with Neoplatonic ideas, considered her attire as “liberality” because she shared her riches with everyone, for physical beauty was the outward manifestation of virtue. 141

There is a European tradition of collections or series of portraits of famous women and beauties. For example Galeazzo Maria Sforza commissioned portraits of the
beautiful and eligible women in the Duchy of Milan in 1473, and it is possible he planned a beauties’ gallery. The Duke of Mantua had a “Gallery of Beauties”\textsuperscript{142}; introduced to Vincenzo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua (ruled 1587-1612), Rubens worked on a portrait series of beautiful women alongside Frans Pourbus, his fellow court painter at Mantua. At the end of 1603 the Duke requested that Rubens should go to France to paint more women for his gallery of beauties, which Rubens refused. Instead he stopped at Genoa where his main activity was painting portraits which he though unworthy of his talent. However, he was the first to establish the type of full-length aristocratic portrait such as the \textit{Marchesa Brigida Spinola-Doria} (c.1606) emulated by Van Dyck, and from which derived the tradition of the idealized portrait. Philip, Lord Wharton’s gallery of beautiful women, once at Upper Winchendon, had many of the portraits painted by Van Dyck.\textsuperscript{143}

A series of three-quarter-length portraits of his beautiful female relations and friends by Van Dyck formed a striking group in the collection of Algernon Percy, 10\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Northumberland at Northumberland House. These are said by Oliver Millar to be \textit{the direct inspiration} for Lely’s three-quarter-length “Windsor Beauties” commissioned by Anne Hyde, different though they are in mood and atmosphere.\textsuperscript{144} One of the portraits in Northumberland’s collection was of Lady Dorothy Sidney, Countess of Sunderland (1617-1684) (fig.22) whose beauty prompted Van Dyck to paint her at least four times, and inspired the “Cavalier poet” Edmund Waller (1606-1687) to write some twenty poems celebrating her as Sacharissa.
The Poetry of Praise: Edmund Waller

Edmund Waller was a courtier and a politician, and the unchanging component of all his poetry, from the conventional love poems of his early years to the elaborate state panegyric of his middle and old age, is praise. He praised the beauty of Sacharissa in "On my Lady Dorothy Sidney's Picture", a young man's lyric on a portrait by Van Dyck, in the same tone he used to celebrate Mary of Modena's beauty forty years later when he wrote in her copy of Tasso. Sacharissa, Waller's "Venus" was "The matchless Sidney, that immortal frame/Of perfect beauty on two pillars placed;/Not his high fancy could one pattern, graced/With such extremes of excellence, compose;/Wonders so distant in one face disclose!" Van Dyck's sitters, no less than the poems of the period about the sitter, reflect Neoplatonic ideals that considered earthly beauty to be the image of a higher, heavenly reality rather than of impermanent, earthly vanity. Waller refers to Dorothy Sidney's great uncle Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia ("which the artist took/From the fair picture of that noble book") and decides that in the debate about the supremacy of painting or poetry, Sacharissa's portrait, "this glorious piece [which] transcends what he could think", wins the contest. Sidney's Arcadia had divided beauty into two portraits, that of Philoclea and Pamela, but Van Dyck captured all the properties of ideal beauty in one portrait of Lady Dorothy Sidney. In his verse "These Verses Were Writ in the Tasso of her Royal Highness" however Waller sees that Tasso, (and like Balzac's fictional Frenhofer, as well as Bellori and Alberti), understands that perfection cannot be found in one human being alone. Waller makes one exception: Mary of Modena herself in whose copy of Tasso he writes the following:

Tasso knew how the fairer sex to grace,
But in no one durst all perfection place.

In her alone that owns this book is seen

Clorinda’s spirit, and her lofty mien,

Sophronia’s piety, Erminia’s truth,

Armida’s charms, her beauty, and her youth. 146

Waller is unable to define the attributes of spirit, piety, truth or beauty, except in the form of citations: he says something about Mary of Modena’s beauty only by using the simile that she resembles Armida. So in a paraphrase of Barthes: “lovely as Armida? But Armida lovely as what? As herself? As Mary of Modena?” As Warren Chemaik argues in his discussion of Waller’s verse, Waller prefers “the explicitness of simile to the sudden thrust and chooses metaphors where the terms dovetail easily”. 147

The four female figures that Waller cites of course all appear in Torquato Tasso’s great epic poem Gerusalemme liberate (Jerusalem Delivered) (1575) about the storming of Jerusalem by the Crusaders in 1099, but which also encompasses the tales of Erminia and Tancred, Clorinda and Tancred, Sophronia and Olindo and Rinaldo and Armida. Armida is the seductive Saracen sorceress who loves the Christian knight Rinaldo, and their tragedy is of the conflicting demands of love and duty. Her task is to use her magic power and seductive beauty to ensnare Rinaldo, Godfrey of Bouillon’s most eminent commander. Metaphor was important to Waller because it illuminated the hidden resemblances of things and he modelled his characteristic style on the heroic poetry of the Elizabethan age, particularly Edward Fairfax’s translation of Tasso. 148
Tasso was a “Caravaggio of poetry” who scorned court life but who was an avid seeker after advancement at court. Mary of Modena’s ancestors, discussed by her biographer Agnes Strickland, feature in Tasso’s epic, since he spent the most stable years of his life in Ferrara from 1565 when he became attendant to the Cardinal Luigi d’Este of the ruling Ferrarese family. He then was attendant to Mary of Modena’s great grandfather Alfonso II d’Este, the last Estean duke of Ferrara (r.1559-97) who became Tasso’s patron, and who Tasso, in his madness, believed was intent on poisoning him and whom Tasso alternately fled from and returned to, begging forgiveness.

Tasso was a lover of the old romances, and his message in *Gerusalemme liberate* is submission to authority; the wise ruler is a prudent ruler who is an image of Providence and who literally “sees” ahead. Waller’s debt is to the Renaissance epic romance of Tasso, to Ariosto and to Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* parts of which are close to the Italianate tradition. Waller’s twenty or so Sacharissa poems are similar to his addresses to great ladies in which he uses “the language of love and gallantry to praise the Queen and other ladies in high position, but he is always conscious of court decorum.” His poem *To Vandyck* opens with praise for the artist’s ability to create beauty where “nature’s self so often errs?”; Waller continues:

*She for this many thousand years
Seems to have practised with much care,
To frame the race of women fair;
Yet never could a perfect birth
Produce before to grace the earth,*
Which waxed old ere it could see
Her that amazed thy art and thee.\textsuperscript{152}

So Waller, although praising Van Dyck's brilliance in painting, comparing him with Prometheus and his theft of fire, is really saying that the production of the acme of Van Dyckian achievement rests on the choice of model: perfection is Lady Dorothy Sidney. Indeed her visual image is portrayed as a rather plump "goddess" with the standard ringlet-framed face, pearl necklace and earrings in a three-quarter-length portrait, her orange/red drapery with sleeve and floating grey scarf billowing and animated. This is a popular composition of Van Dyck's dating from the 1630s and would appear to be the paradigm for the image which Lely adapted for the very early portrait of Mary of Modena painted between 1673 and Lely's death in 1680, dated c.1674 by Beckett\textsuperscript{153} (fig.23). This portrait is also three-quarter-length, standing to the right but facing towards and looking to the front. Although Lely was using much studio assistance at this time, it is probable that the head is by his hand. Unlike her "vestal-innocence" portrait she wears her hair in Van Dyckian ringlets framing her face; this is a radical change in hair-style from her "vestal-innocence" portrait and, although only speculation, perhaps points to this portrait as the earlier of the two. Certainly her hairstyle in other portraits conforms to the later fashion worn by Louise de Kéroualle. Mary of Modena too wears the standard Van Dyck and Lely pearl necklace and earrings. Instead of pointing to the tree in the urn as Lady Dorothy Sidney does, her right hand plucks a blossom from the orange tree and her left hand holds a flower as she leans on the table
before her – perhaps this is an image of transient beauty, although the fruit had traditional associations with love and constancy.

This portrait of her, probably painted at the outset of her marriage, places her firmly in the visual dynasty of court beauties beginning with Dorothy Sidney. Lely had interpreted Van Dyck’s composition early in his career using this identical pose in 1651 for Catherine Windham (fig.24) in the Ketton-Cremer collection at Felbrigg Hall, Norfolk, and for the portrait of an Unknown Lady at Euston Hall, Suffolk. A variant on this pose was used by Lely for the portrait of Elizabeth Percy, Countess of Essex (fig.25) wife of Arthur Capel (Egremont Collection, Petworth, Sussex) in 1650 which Henri Gascar quoted, in reverse, nearly thirty years later in a portrait of her niece Elizabeth Percy, later Duchess of Somerset in c.1678. The image of Mary of Modena painted by Lely and his studio shortly after her arrival from Italy is not a direct representation of her “reality” nor what the artist(s) saw. She is an embodiment of a set of ideals and values, both aesthetic and social, shared by patrons and artists.

It proved to be a popular painting. It was produced as a mezzotint by A. Blooteling (fig.23a), and this print was then copied in reverse of the Blooteling by H.H. Quiter, which was made probably in 1678 when he visited London briefly for the only time. It was also engraved by P. Stephani as a half length in an oval frame on a pedestal, and published by Visscher in Amsterdam. It was not only Lely and the engravers who multiplied Mary of Modena’s portraits. Benedetto Gennari copied the head and shoulders for a bust portrait (fig.26). This would probably date the original to
c.1674, which agrees with Beckett's estimate. Gennari painted his copy in c.1676-1677. It was sent to Modena and is described in his list of paintings made in London under number 25 as "Un quadro mezza figura ritratto dell Signora Duchessa di Yorck che poi fu portato a Modena".  

If we can see a precedent for Lely's portrait of Mary of Modena as far back as Van Dyck's portrait of Lady Dorothy Sidney painted in 1640, then we can also see a precedent for Waller's poem To the Duchess: When He Presented this Book to Her Royal Highness (see Appendix B) in his own poems to Sacharissa, of forty years earlier. Although Sacharissa was the archetypal mistress of the Petrarchan tradition in whom all the virtues reside, and who encompasses more than human beauty, Waller exceeds even his own hyperbole in this poem to the Duchess. However he surely does not expect his reader to believe a word of the compliment. While he uses imagery of idealism, we know that the truth is relative – after "the matchless Sidney" who could believe that Mary of Modena's "brighter eyes" could inspire "A nobler flame, and raise our genius higher"? She also has a "matchless beauty" which "gives our fancy wing". Mary of Modena's earthly beauty limits Waller to the material before him even though he treats it as the platonic form. As the preceding discussion has shown, nature was filtered through the ideal, and the concept of beauty, harmony and divine proportion were seen not only as the manifestation of the perfection of an idea, but of the infinite goodness of God. Perfection could be achieved through the idea, through the artist's imagination, because there was no absolutely perfect woman, nor anybody able to judge her beauty. However the dedication inscribed in the copy of the 1668 edition of Waller's poems owned by
Mary of Modena sheds light on his panegyric; he wanted her patronage: "This Booke, never Dedicated to any before, humbly desires the Patronage of hir R. Highness".\(^{156}\)

**The Judgement of Paris: George Granville, Lord Lansdowne**

Waller's verse was a model for his successors to imitate. Warren Chernaik firstly characterises George Granville, Earl of Lansdowne as the "most persistent of the epigoni", and secondly quotes Samuel Johnson's words that Lansdowne "seems to have had no ambition above the imitation of Waller, of whom he has copied the faults, and very little more".\(^{157}\)

Waller however encouraged Granville when he wrote a poem *To the Author, on his foregoing Verses to the KING. By Mr Edmund Waller* in which he praises Granville as "An early Plant, which such a Blossom bears,/And shows a Genius, so beyond his years ..."\(^{158}\).

This blossoming Plant engaged with the minor genre of flattering poems to ladies at the early age of twelve years. Mary of Modena visited Cambridge in 1674 with her husband; Granville, a student there, wrote and recited a poem to celebrate her marriage, although it seems to be an extended compliment to what Strickland called her "languishing dark eyes", and Granville called "those auspicious Lights, Your Eyes". They are "radiant Eyes, whose irresistible Flame/Strikes Envy dumb, and keeps Sedition tame:/They can to gazing Multitudes give Law,/Convert the Factious, and the Rebel awe:/They conquer for the DUKE,/wher-e'er You tread, Millions of Proselytes, behind
are led; ...”159. After the initial furore caused by her marriage in 1673, she became more popular than James, Duke of York and the student Granville was prescient when concluding his recitation:

Securely here, He on that Face relies,

Lays by his Arms, and conquers with Your Eyes,

And all the glorious Actions of his Life,

Thinks well rewarded, blest with such a WIFE.160

For Granville it was her eyes that were James’s secret weapon against the bitter hostility the marriage had provoked in England; although others were less effusive, they were still favourably impressed: “She hath very good eyes, very good features and a very good complexion”, wrote Conway, “but she wants the air which should set off all this and having been bred in a monastery knows not how to set one foot in front of another with any gracefulness”161. Still only fifteen, these social accomplishments were to be achieved with maturity.

Her beauty impressed Henry Mordaunt, Second Earl of Peterborough, the Duke of York’s Groom of the Stole, and friend of the Stuarts; as Ambassador Extraordinary he had been ordered to Italy by James to marry her by proxy before Parliament reassembled in October 1673.

Peterborough records in his memoirs, (Succinct Genealogies), that he had seen a portrait of Mary of Modena that had almost turned his head: “It bore the appearance of a young
Creature about Fourteen years of Age; but such a light of Beauty, such Characters of Ingenuity and Goodness as it surprised the Earl, and fixt (sic) upon his phancy (sic) that he had found his Mistress, and the Fortune of England’. This recently painted portrait appears to have been seen by him in the Conti Palace where it had been sent from Italy. It was owned by the Prince and late Princess de Conti; Anne-Marie, the Princess de Conti was a Martinozzi and the sister to Laura, Duchess of Modena, Mary of Modena’s mother. 

The prose portrait that Peterborough painted of Mary of Modena after he had met her in the flesh rises to greater heights of hyperbole: “... she was tall and admirably shaped, her Complexion was of the last degree of fairness, her Hair black as Jet, so were her Eyebrows and her Eyes; but the latter so full of light and sweetness so they did dazzle and charm too ...” It seems this effusion was not improved upon to impress the Duke of York as it appears in Peterborough’s memoirs which were written twelve years later in 1685. We know where the prose portrait is, in the Succint Genealogies (1685) of Peterborough, (and published under the pseudonym of Halstead) but who was the artist who painted the portrait that was sent from Italy to her Aunt, Anne-Marie de Conti, is yet to be discovered.

Mary of Modena was already famous for her charm, beauty and accomplishments; Peterborough wrote enthusiastically to Charles II of his future sister-in-law that he would find her possessed of “beauty in her person and in her minde, to be faire tall, well-shap’d and very healthfull”. The marriage negotiations were not concluded at once, primarily
because Mary of Modena herself had decided to take the veil. She had a long association with the Nuns of the Visitation, whose convent adjoined the palace at Modena and which had largely been rebuilt by her mother, Laura Duchess of Modena in about 1668.\textsuperscript{165} When her mother settled in Rome in 1685 she enlarged a convent of Ursuline nuns, now the Accademia Santa Cecilia in the Via Vittoria. She and her mother are still to be seen in roundel portraits in the refectory; they are \textit{grisaille} on a gold ground and Mary of Modena wears a pea pearl necklace and pendant pearl earrings, a lace tucker and a brocade stay-bodice decorated with a large brooch. She has long sausage curls falling over her shoulders, while the Duchess Laura has a classical hairstyle reminiscent of a Roman empress.\textsuperscript{166} Only after the intervention of Pope Clement X and Louis XIV was the proxy wedding celebrated on 30 September 1673 in the Palazzo Ducale. Dom Andrea Roncagli officiated and Peterborough stood proxy. It was late evening some two months later on 21 November 1673 (OS), after lavish entertainment by Louis XIV in Paris that she finally landed in England.

So Peterborough’s mission was successful in spite of adversaries to the match, ostensibly because of her Catholicism and James, Duke of York’s conversion to the faith. The French ambassador to London, Colbert de Croissy wrote of the gossip to Louis XIV on 17 August 1673 that “... Mylord Arlington assured me two days ago, he had heard it reported the Princess of Modena is very ugly, - “fort laide” - and red-haired ...”.\textsuperscript{167} However, apparently even a Protestant chaplain to the Duke of York was able to compose an impromptu Latin ode to the “fair young flower” while riding his horse, after being “seized with a fit of poetic inspiration”. While it appears that what some saw as her great
beauty and extreme youth undoubtedly made a favourable impression on many, for others they were offset by the problems of her Catholicism; Gilbert Burnet summarises the suspicion with which she was viewed, although he was writing with hindsight and from an anti-Catholic stance in History of His Own Time. 168

Peterborough and George Granville were particularly entranced by the beauty of her eyes. Granville’s poem To the Earl of Peterborough on His Happy Accomplishment of the Marriage between His Royal Highness and the Princess Mary D’Este of Modena. Written Several Years After in Imitation of the Style of Mr Waller, invokes the Judgement of Paris:

*Th’ impartial Judge surveys with vast Delight*

*All that the Sun surrounds of Fair and Bright,*

*Then, strictly just, he with adoring Eyes,*

*To radiant Este, gives the Royal Prize.*

*Of Antique Stock her high Descent she brings,*

*Born to renew the Race of Britain’s Kings;*

*Who could deserve, like her, in who we see*

*United, all that Paris found in three.* 169

Granville, in the role of Paris, awards the golden apple to Mary of Modena who combines the beauty of Venus with the power of Juno and the wisdom of Minerva. The precedent for this written image is the visual representation of Elizabeth I in the HE (Hans Eworth?) portrait Elizabeth I and the Three Goddesses (fig.27), an elaborate
composition showing Elizabeth in the role of Paris judging the goddesses but, by her own beauty and accomplishments which combine their attributes, she has put them to shame. Granville thus not only compliments Peterborough but the Duke of York, because as Edgar Wind has argued, it was "a fixed formula of Renaissance euphuism" to compliment a prince by comparing his judgement to that of Paris.  

Mary of Modena herself lacked complete control of her images and representation. This is evident in the negative representations of her that were both performed and published in her lifetime, particularly after she became queen, but even when she was allegorized in celebratory mode, such as in Granville's poem, her representation depends largely on the conceptualization of her female qualities. In his poem The Progress of Beauty written after her exile, Granville again imitates Waller, and, like him, places her in a long line of female beauties which stretches from Helen of Troy, taking in Venus, Cleopatra, Waller's Sacharissa to Mary of Modena herself, and beyond to Kneller's "Hampton Court Beauties":

Thy Beauty, Sidney, like Achilles' Sword,
Resistless, stands upon as sure Record; ...
Behold from Italy an awful Ray
Of heav'nyly Light illuminates the Day,
...
Queen of our Hearts, and Charmer of our Sight,
A Monarch's Pride, his Glory and Delight,
Princess ador'd and lov'd! ...
... "Phoebus" enjoy'd the Goddess of the Sea,

"Alcides" had "Omphale", "James" has thee.

...

Who wou'd not give their Crowns to be so blest?

Was "Hellen" half so fair, so form'd for Joy,

Well chose the "Trojan", and well burnt was Troy,

... 171

A Lely “Beauty”: grazia and leggiadria

Granville cannot resist citing Helen of Troy and awarding the golden apple to James' Helen, Mary of Modena. A tree with the promise of golden fruit appears in another of Lely's portraits of her, executed in a design which was chosen by a number of Lely's clients in the mid to late 1670s with slight variations, and which was to set the pattern for the formal portraiture of Wissing and Kneller particularly. This portrait, still in the Royal Collection (and now at St. James's Palace in need of cleaning), is full length, posed standing on a step in an orange coloured dress, with blue-green drapery. The elbow of her left arm rests on a pedestal and her hand holds up the drapery on her shoulder. Her right hand rests on a large urn embossed with a gryphon or gargoyle, which contains the orange tree, with curtains and a statue in the background (fig.28). The elongated proportions, the formal arrangement of the figure in front of an elaborate backdrop, the simplified design of the draperies and deep tones with dark underpainting are, according to Oliver Millar, typical of Lely's late style. 172 This large portrait follows
a type developed by Van Dyck while in England, particularly in his portrait of Lady Mary Villiers (fig. 29). An almost identical portrait to that of Mary of Modena is of Frances Stuart, Duchess of Richmond that incorporates both the same urn and orange tree on which she rests her hand, and the Greek statue in the background. There are variants of this design, and perhaps the earliest version is Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland with her right hand to her bosom, no statue and a different carved vase painted c.1675. Jane Bickerton, Countess of Norfolk (1677-8) (fig. 30), Lady Cornwallis (c.1675) and Jane, Countess of Marlborough follow the Cleveland model, although the Countess of Marlborough sports a pearl necklace.

Millar says the identity of this portrait type of Mary of Modena “is not entirely certain”, but points out the ducal coronet worked into the sculpture of the vase. This has been verified, (with the aid of a torch because of its poor condition), by the former Surveyor of The Queen’s Pictures, Christopher Lloyd and myself. It was probably painted after the Cleveland version, as Mary of Modena has rather heavy hooded almond eyes and very strong eyebrows, characteristic of the Cleveland “look”. Ernest Law’s entry in A Historical Catalogue of the Pictures in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court (1881) attributes it to Kneller, a mistake easily made as Kneller took up this pattern. He suggests that the date 1677 for Mary of Modena’s portrait is accurate in that it was probably painted about the time of her stepdaughter Princess Mary’s marriage to the Prince of Orange on 4 November 1677, because not only does Mary of Modena wear an orange dress, but “the orange tree being apparently introduced in compliment to that alliance”.173
Mary of Modena was only four years older than Princess Mary and they were close friends. She wrote to her brother Francesco II, Duke of Modena “I am much grieved to lose her, because I hold her in much affection, and she is really a Princess of merit.” The two wept copiously at the Princess of Orange’s leaving to go into a strange land with a husband twelve years older and four inches shorter, whom she hardly knew.\textsuperscript{174}

The orange tree which bears “golden fruit” standing in its pot to Mary of Modena’s right is also a feature of a portrait by Van Dyck of Queen Henrietta Maria with Jeffrey Hudson and an Ape, (1633) (fig.31); the opulent architectural setting, the step on which she stands, and the tall, relatively narrow canvas are also comparable features. Van Dyck used this formula to flatter his exalted sitters very successfully, as, contrary to her appearance Henrietta Maria was diminutive; the top of her head reached only to her husband Charles I’s shoulder, and he was a mere five feet four inches tall. In Mary of Modena’s case it was unnecessary to make her appear taller and more elegant than she was: she was in fact tall and elegant. This appears to be simply another case of a hard-pressed, overworked Lely “borrowing” well-tried formulae from his predecessor.

The “borrowing” of the orange tree from Van Dyck’s portrait where it was “an unmistakable Venus reference – the golden apple given to Venus by Paris”\textsuperscript{175}, is probably a reference to beauty in the Lely portrait. The orange was regarded as a thing of beauty, especially in the cold English climate, and the blossom was also a symbol of fertility and
fruitfulness. Mary of Modena's first child Catherine was born in January 1675 and died of convulsions in October the same year. However, her daughter Isabella born in August 1676 was still alive when the portrait was painted in 1677, and her first son Charles, Duke of Cambridge was born in November of that year, although he died a month later of smallpox; these were child bearing years and the reference is possibly to healthy children. Oranges were also thought to be the Golden Apples of the Hesperides which were part of the Twelve Labours of Hercules in which he triumphs over evil at great odds. So it appears that Lely was referring to both the beauty and the virtue of Mary of Modena when he painted this derivative portrait: in place of the sorrows and difficulties attendant on her private life, Lely shows her in her public role as an ideally beautiful and virtuous young woman in a graceful pose.

For Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo the essence of beauty resided in the "figura serpentinata": certainly this portrait of Mary of Modena has an upward flame-like shape; in his Treatise on the Art of Painting (1584) he had discussed movement in relation to Neoplatonic thought. The full articulation of grazia had been achieved outside the realm of philosophy, particularly through Baldesar Castiglione's discussion of Renaissance standards of manners, behaviour and elegance in his Book of the Courtier (1527). He distinguishes between beauty and grace: "Surely you realize how much more graceful a woman is who, if indeed she wishes to do so, paints herself so sparingly and so little that whoever looks at her is unsure whether she is made up or not". He developed the idea of "modesty", particularly in the sense of an avoidance of ostentation or affectation, and "behaviour" included appearance, posture and gestures. In all these
respects both male and female alike should cultivate grazia – in this sense Castiglione’s concern is with the aesthetics, as well as the ethics, of behaviour.

The most important and complete treatise of the beauty and grace of the ideal woman is Agnolo Firenzuola’s Dialogue on the Beauties of Women (1548). Grace we learn is “nothing other than the observation of a tacit law given to you women, by which, in moving, bearing and using both the whole body and the individual limbs everything should be done with grace, with modesty, with nobility”. The essence of leggiadria resides in movement that is controlled and measured with only subtle twists to the body: grace delights more than beauty. Mary of Modena’s portrait is characterized by deportment that is erect, composed, and gently curving, most obviously her left arm holding her heavy, billowing drapery to her left shoulder. The sense of movement and animation is heightened by the elevated step on which she stands, enhancing the theatricality of the composition. Elizabeth Cropper argues that no painting is more closely related to the ideal of female beauty recorded by Firenzuola than Parmigianino’s Madonna of the Long Neck (fig. 32) particularly the elongated proportions and her long slender neck. This picture brought Parmigianino a reputation for grazia and leggiadria, supposedly able to excite a man’s soul to love God. Diana Dethloff has noted Lely’s debt to Parmigianino; certainly the delicate long, gently tapering fingers of the Madonna’s right hand are copied by Lely and rest in Mary of Modena’s portrait on the carved urn in which flourishes that symbol of beauty, the orange tree.
Apart from this Parmigianino-inspired portrait of Mary of Modena, Lely’s surviving portraits of her are all of the popular three-quarter-length type. There is a less elegant full-length mezzotint of her, resting her right hand on the pedestal of a huge ornately carved urn filled with flowers (fig.33). There is no sense of graceful movement however, and on the contrary, she appears to be weighed down with her heavy jewelled and fringed drapery and large pearl necklace.

This was published by Alexander Browne after Lely, but there is no surviving oil portrait of Mary of Modena in this particular pose. As the British Museum Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits entry records “Altered from Mrs Jane Middleton”\(^{180}\), it is quite possible that Browne copied the body from the portrait plate of Mrs Jane Middleton and took the head of Mary of Modena from another, perhaps the portrait of her with the putti and spaniel recorded in the Bathurst Collection. The inscription indicates this was made before she became queen consort, and therefore before 1685.

There is a second plate with an altered inscription line, made after her coronation (fig.34). Although not reserved solely for royalty, during the period of the sixteenth century the association of the full-length format with the image of the sovereign and their consort had been established, together with the classical column and the velvet curtain as part of the repertoire associated with superior status, magnificence and power, that we find cluttering the background of this mezzotint. It was a repertoire that was to be emulated for the next three centuries. This full-length mezzotint was an ideal print for promoting Mary of Modena’s elevation to Queen Consort.
A third plate by an anonymous hand which has been reduced to a three-quarter length, with the addition of a fallow deer which she fondles with her left hand, was also produced after her coronation in 1685 (fig. 35).\textsuperscript{181} It introduces an intimate more feminine note to what was a mezzotint showing the burden of superior status. So that we do not misinterpret the images of Mary of Modena we need to take into account the different genres and their functions. The portrait, the miniature, the print, the satire, the medal, the panegyric, the flattering poem, each had its own convention, its own formulae, and an audience familiar with these conventions which shaped their expectations and their interpretations.

As for the function of the printed images described above, they were not, generally speaking, produced to provide a recognisable likeness of Mary of Modena’s features – if they are compared with her oil portraits they are only superficially “like” her; rather, the aim was to celebrate her status as a wife of a Duke and then of a King, and as mother of a future monarch; in other words to persuade a wide audience of her importance, her superiority and worthiness, particularly before and after the coronation.

So what of Agnes Strickland’s description of Mary of Modena’s “vestal-like expression”, what of the portraits? Were they not also to celebrate her beauty, and consequently to persuade of her virtue? There was tremendous hostility to the marriage, to her Roman Catholicism, and indeed to her very “foreignness”; these questions, and their bearing on the representations of her, are among the subjects of discussion in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

Beauty, Deception and the Distorted Image

"The Duchess of York has wonderful success, she is loved with extraordinary affection by her husband, praised by the Court and respected by that evil party of Parliamentarians although they hate the marriage ... I think we shall soon be moving hence, because I see the Parliament is furious and determined to meet in January. The Duke is not afraid. Nevertheless it would not be well that we should be found here. Other matters are going well, but might go better". 182

So wrote Mary of Modena’s uncle Prince Rinaldo d’Este to his nephew and her brother, Francesco II, Duke of Modena on 1 December 1673. He refers to the favourable impression that her beauty and youth had made on the English people, including the Court and Parliament, but the subtext of this letter is that the Italians had outstayed their welcome; the Regent, Duchess Laura of Modena her mother, and Prince Rinaldo eventually stayed more than a month instead of the intended week, having arrived on 21 November and departed in the first week of January. 183 The critics of the Duke of York were convinced that he was pursuing a pro-Catholic agenda, and his marriage to an Italian Catholic reinforced this conviction. Mary of Modena’s religion was indeed the central problem for her reputation, and while she made a favourable impression on all those who encountered her, the public image of her was the result of pre-existing prejudices driven by xenophobia; Henry Ball wrote on 31 July 1673 that: “The town is
now full of the news of the Duke of York's marriage with the young Duchess [sic] of Modena ... sister to the present Duke ... and great niece to the late Cardinal Mazarin". 184

MPs frequently insisted on their fear of France and its commercial, territorial and religious ambitions in the 1670s, and warned of the dangers of emulation "... our jealousies of popery, or an arbitrary government, are not from a few inconsiderable papists here, but from the ill example of France". 185 In the 1660s the fiction that Charles II was a strong king, albeit with unwise counsellors, was maintained. However, he allowed Parliament to sit for the first time in over two years in February 1673 to request supply for the Third Dutch war, and to declare his intention of standing by the Declaration of Indulgence. His opponents saw the Declaration as part of a wider plan to favour both France abroad and Catholicism at home, and consequently a wave of unmitigated personal abuse was directed at him and at the Stuart dynasty. The Declaration was opposed by both houses and Charles withdrew it in March, and after public pressure assented to the Test Act.

The exaggerated fear of "Popery" had been bred in the nation by four generations of Protestantism. Consequently, James who had gone "awhoring after foreign gods" provoked an unprecedented, and wholly unwarranted, hostile reaction, so that his conversion to Catholicism was seen to confer on the religion an overwhelming influence at Court and in the country. This was in spite of the fact that Catholics constituted approximately 1.2 per cent of the population of England and Wales, and who were, in any
event, treated as social outcasts. In the summer of 1672 there was public acknowledgement of James, Duke of York's conversion to Catholicism. At Easter 1671 he had stopped receiving Anglican communion, although he still accompanied Charles to chapel. It was only in 1676 he stopped attending Anglican services. He had been appointed Lord High Admiral in 1660 and resigned his command on the passing of the Test Act in 1673. In 1673 there was the success of a Dutch propaganda campaign. The propaganda was a persuasive message in *England's Appeal from the Private Cabal at Whitehall to the Great Council of the Nation. The Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled*, ascribed to the vehemently anti-Catholic Peter Du Moulin, which had appeared in February 1673 and was distributed at the beginning of March; it furthered the suspicion that Charles was secretly conspiring with the French to promote Catholicism in England. According to K.H.D. Haley it was this pamphlet "*which did more than anything else to identify the French alliance in foreign affairs with the danger of Popery at home ...*". Du Moulin came from a family which had a century of uncompromising Protestantism behind it, and who, although born in France, had become a naturalized Englishman. The poet, Andrew Marvell, a member of the House of Commons, has been suggested as the author of the pamphlet *Relation of the most material matters handled in Parliament, relating to religion, property, and the liberty of the subject*, which also appeared in 1673, with a commentary stressing the danger of Popery and the French alliance. Marvell, the only MP to be allocated a code name, "Mr Thomas", was in touch with Du Moulin and seems to have been writing pamphlets for him. He was the author of the *Growth of Popery*, and as an MP, hostile to France; his skill as a political pamphleteer would have been a valuable acquisition for Du Moulin's group.¹⁸⁶
It was common knowledge that Louis XIV supported the Modena marriage, and it was rumoured that he would pay Mary of Modena’s dowry. In addition “the common people ... and even those of quality” believed, in 1673, that she was “the Pope’s eldest daughter”. A memorandum presented to Parliament described Mary of Modena in October 1673 as: “an Italian Papist, descended of a father and mother who are the bastard issue of a Pope and a Cardinal”; the “Cardinal” is probably a libel on her great uncle the late Cardinal Mazarin. The problem for the xenophobic British was that “a prince in Italy, to the thinking of the ordinary people, is too near the holy see of Rome, and a marriage proposed and concluded by the French cannot be good ...”.

The most important factor in the furore over the Modena marriage was the “hate and malice against the French”, it was not a religious problem so much as a political and patriotic problem. Charles II pointed out to the Commons in his reply to their address of 29 October 1673 against the marriage of James to Mary of Modena that there had been no opposition in the previous session to the proposal for James to marry the Austrian Archduchess Claudia Felicitas of Innsbruck (1653-76) whose name had been put forward by Spain and who was not only a famous beauty but a Catholic; this fact points to the core of the problem which was that Mary of Modena was a danger not merely because she was a Catholic, but also that she was a protégée of Louis XIV. It has been argued that in fact the news of the Modena match was opportune, and useful to Charles II because it probably diverted attention away from his French mistress, Louise de Kéroualle whom he had created Duchess of Portsmouth in August 1673. It was
believed that Portsmouth used her position to obtain significant power, and the anti-French Protestants enlarged her image to discredit Charles so that she became "the symbol for everything French and evil". There are parallels between the casting of Portsmouth as the "French whore" and the rumour and suspicion surrounding the Modena marriage. While Mary of Modena's beauty and poise made a superficially favourable impression, her image was not of her own making. Her personal qualities simply had very little to do with her image and far more to do with the current perception of the French, and she too was cast in the role of the "other".

**The Distorted Image**

Portraits, whether visual or textual "paintings", are always distorted to some extent, in that the mirror held up to flawed human beings is frequently flawed itself. The scurrilous satirical attacks on Portsmouth typically refer to the "whore" whose "pocky bum/so powerful is of late ... It rules both Church and State". Both the Duchess of Portsmouth and Mary of Modena were subject to scurrilous lampoons because they were foreigners and "outsiders": "Madame Carwell" was the vulgar Anglicanization of Louise de Kéroualle just as "Madam East" was the vulgar form of Maria d'Este. Charles II was described in a satire of 1674-5 as resigning "his crown to angel Carwell's trust". These textual portraits encouraged semi-informed opinion and ignorant rumours about the extent of Portsmouth's influence, but even in this satire Portsmouth is referred to as an "angel" rather than as a woman concerned with the masculine activity of politics.
In Andrew Marvell's poem *Upon his Majesty being made Free of the City* written in 1674 Mary of Modena is attacked, through reference to her husband James, Duke of York, as the “other”.

*And how could he [Charles II] swear*

*That he would forbear*

*To colour the goods of an alien,*

*Who still doth advance*

*The government of France*

*With a wife and religion Italian?*\(^{193}\)

Marvell, writing as a satirist and possibly Du Moulin’s mouthpiece, pretends to deliver the unvarnished truth while colouring and distorting reality for his own anti-French political and aesthetic purpose. Mary of Modena is cast in the image of the twin evils of Catholicism and foreigner helping to advance French interests. On the contrary Edmund Waller and George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, as we saw in the previous chapter, were writers of commendatory verse. Granville for instance softened the focus and produced an image of beauty associated with mythic precedents, particularly Helen of Troy in *The Progress of Beauty*.

Mary of Modena’s beauty was thought by many to be a disguise, a front for the threat she presented to the Protestant succession. Bishop Gilbert Burnet had a personal animus against James, Duke of York, and when James became King, Burnet equated him
with those "execrable monsters" Tiberius, Caligula, Nero and Domitian.\textsuperscript{194} Burnet was the founder of the Protestant Whig interpretation of history in the late seventeenth century; his inaccurate knowledge of events in England during his exile in Holland is evident in his \textit{History of His Own Time}. In this he offers a retrospective view of what he considered to be her malign presence:

\begin{quote}
She was then very young, about sixteen, but of a full growth, a very graceful person, with a good measure of beauty, and so much wit and cunning, that during all this reign she behaved herself in so obliging a manner, and seemed so innocent and good, that she gained upon all who came near her, and possessed them with such impressions of her, that it was long before her behaviour, when she came to be queen, could make them change their sentiments of her. With such art and dexterity did she manage herself upon all occasions, that she was enough to deceive even the eldest and most judicious persons. She avoided the appearance of a zealot or a meddler in business; all her diversion was innocent cheerfulness, with a little mixture of satirical wit that would now and then break out; but it was taken well, and imputed to the levity of youth not enough practised in the world; and upon these accounts she was universally esteemed and beloved as long as she was duchess."\textsuperscript{195}
\end{quote}

The smug Bishop lays emphasis on the point that she was "esteemed" while she was Duchess of York, but once she was queen this changed. He accords her personality a sinister interpretation crediting her with far more subtlety than, as a sixteen year old, she possessed. Presumably she "avoided the appearance of a zealot" because she was not
bigoted, and her religious opinions hardened only after the trials following the Popish Plot when members of her staff were implicated, including her chaplain and confessor since 1676, Claude de la Colombière (1642-82, beatified 1929 and canonized in 1992), a French Jesuit who was briefly imprisoned, and her unfortunate secretary Edward Coleman who was executed on 3 December 1678. Her “satirical wit” can be accounted for by the squalid, adulterous exploits of James her husband with his mistress and her Maid of Honour, Catharine Sedley; this attracted her occasional displays of anger and thus offered her critics ammunition with which to censure her. So Burnet presented her in his History of His Own Time as a woman who practised deception for twelve years but, once she became queen, appeared in her true persona as an arrogant woman who behaved in a “queenly” manner. If, as Burnet asserted, she deceived everyone, it raises the question what part her early portraits were intended to play in the creation of her image; for Burnet it was obviously to reinforce her disguise as a youthful, innocent, good and faithful wife and duchess.

Although Julia Maciari Alexander argues in Painted Ladies that Mary of Modena did not have a “tight-knit relationship with one painter” while she was Duchess of York, six portrait poses of her emanated from the studio of Sir Peter Lely, as well as the variant on the “innocence”/lamb portrait by Lely’s pupil Willem Wissing; numerous copies of these circulated with some being engraved as discussed in the previous chapter. Certainly they were all standardized and lacked originality.
Deceptive Fidelity?

The portrait of Mary of Modena seated in a landscape wearing a reddish brown gown, white chemise and blue robe painted by Lely in c.1674 shortly after her marriage (fig.36) is a standard pose for a youthful woman and is also a variant on the “innocence”/lamb theme, the lamb having been replaced in this by a fashionable King Charles spaniel on which she rests her right hand. This portrait still hangs at Althorp, Northamptonshire, the country house of Robert Spencer, 2nd Earl of Sunderland who, in 1674 was appointed Privy Councillor and Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Charles II, and Secretary of State from 1679 to 1680. It is recorded as being in the Spencer collection by 1802. Sunderland was a notable patron of the arts and remodelled Althorp between 1666 and 1668. He patronised Lely and his studio and had the largest collection of Lely and studio portraits in England hanging in the new gallery he had created there.

He was close to the Stuarts, but Mary of Modena found this scheming, Machiavellian character an untrustworthy individual. He was an exclusionist, supporting the bill to exclude her husband James from the throne. However, after Sunderland’s disgrace in 1681, he was reconciled with Charles II in 1682 and readmitted to the Council and appointed Secretary of State (North) in 1683 until he fled to Rotterdam in 1688. He converted to Catholicism, publicly renouncing the Protestant religion and took mass in 1688, but after the revolution returned to England, declared himself a Protestant and took the oath of loyalty to William III. He had managed to ingratiate himself with Mary of Modena by his support for her when, on 20 January 1686, James created his mistress.
Catharine Sedley, Baroness Darlington and Countess of Dorchester with a pension for life; John Evelyn described the occasion of the elevation of James's "concubine" which Mary of Modena "tooke (sic) very grievously". Sunderland's Protestant wife, Lady Anne Digby, was a Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Catherine of Braganza, while the Protestant Catharine Sedley was Maid of Honour to Mary of Modena from about April 1678 to 1681 at the same time she was mistress to the Duke of York. Lely's studio produced a portrait of the notoriously witty but plain Sedley in c.1675 (fig.37) which, until 1947 was thought to be of Nell Gwyn by Lely. Three-quarter length and seated in a landscape and looking to her right, this is a favourite pose of Lely and his studio; many sitters were painted in this way, and all with rather similar faces. This portrait for example is identical to the portrait of the Countess of Nottingham (fig.38), but it differs from that of Mary of Modena painted about a year earlier than Sedley's in hairstyle, since it lacks the long curl over her right shoulder, and there is no King Charles Spaniel since she was not associated with Charles II.

A subordinate figure such as a dog, a dwarf or a servant was frequently included in portraits from the sixteenth century onwards to indicate the natural authority and elevated status of the sitter; in portraits of women the lapdog was also a symbol of marital fidelity. From antiquity a dog has been a symbol of faithfulness, and to the elder Pliny a dog in his work Natural History (8:142), together with the horse, was among the earliest domesticated animals most faithful to man. In allegory the dog is the attribute of fidelity personified, and when it is included in portraits such as this of Mary of Modena, (although usually at a woman's feet or in her lap), alludes to her marital fidelity. For
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example, Agnolo Bronzino's superb *Portrait of a Lady* (c.1530-1533) (possibly Francesca Salviati) (fig.39), once attributed to Jacopo Pontormo, is represented in her stunning red dress with two symbols referring to the sitters adhesion to her society's notion of virtue: her lap dog as symbol of conjugal fidelity and her rosary a symbol of piety. The main source of Renaissance illustration was *Cefalo*, a popular Italian play of the fifteenth century by Niccolo da Correggio (1450-1508) who embellished Ovid's version in *Matamorphoses*, (7:795-866). Cephalus rejects the goddess Aurora who retaliates by making him doubt the fidelity of his wife Procris. He tests her by seduction and she flees and joins the huntress Diana; Cephalus and Procris are reconciled through the mediation of an old shepherd. Procris returns and brings Cephalus gifts, a spear and one of Diana's hunting dogs. Ovid's story ends with Cephalus killing Procris accidentally with the spear, but in *Cefalo* Diana brings Procris back to life for a happy ending.

It is no coincidence that many dogs appearing in portraits pertain to the hunt, such as the greyhound, the mastiff and the spaniel. The dog, Mary of Modena caresses is a King Charles spaniel and it is perhaps also no coincidence that the attribute of Margaret of Cortona (1247-1297) is a dog, generally a small spaniel. She, like Mary of Modena was an Italian, but the peasant mistress of a nobleman who was murdered after visiting her. The dog owned by her lover returned to Margaret to lead her to its master's body. The incident brought about her conversion; she repented her former life and was admitted to the Order of Franciscan Tertiaries. Mary of Modena, who had also renounced her former life, but as daughter of an ancient ruling family in another country and educated
by Jesuits, had intended to dedicate her life to God and become a nun of the Order of the Visitation. Dogs seen in portraits are usually portraits of particularly favoured or special animals who had a standard of living above the royal servants, while the ownership of such dogs as a greyhound or spaniel for example from the time of Canute had been confined by law only to people above a certain social level. The dog which features in the portrait of Mary of Modena (fig.36) is probably a pet, since a similar one with a white stripe down its forehead and muzzle appears in another Lely portrait of her, which will be discussed later (see fig.47).

A spaniel also features in Henri Gascar’s mezzotint after his lost portrait of Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth, of c.1675 (fig.40), and produced slightly later than the portrait of Mary of Modena. The dog was included in Gascar’s portrait presumably as a reference to her status as mistress to Charles II and to her former position as Maid of Honour to his sister Henrietta Anne, Duchesse d’Orléans, who was frequently portrayed holding one. The inclusion of a spaniel in this portrait of Mary of Modena is hardly surprising given that she was the new bride of a dog-lover, and the sister-in-law of another who had given his name to the breed. There is possibly no obvious allusive meaning in the inclusion of the King Charles spaniel. A spaniel appears in many portraits of women associated with Charles II, but to a seventeenth-century audience it would surely be understood to be an allusion to her fidelity, as a new wife, as well as her status. Lely’s portrait poses had become standardized through pressure of work. Portrait painters were not usually intellectuals or scholars, but rather were in the business of representing their sitters in the most visually compelling way that was both
appropriate and fashionable; this portrait is no exception. While the prevailing view in modern art history is that the function of art is to express ideas rather than to make an attractive picture, it is also obvious that there was a common fund of pictorial traditions on which the artist could draw, and this is precisely what Lely has done in this portrait. 200

English and continental artists of the seventeenth century frequently represented women as “types” embodying appropriate feminine virtue, and used the heraldic convention of placing a wife to the left of her husband. In “genre” paintings women were depicted in passive poses, and in both “genre” painting and portraits the artist would surround a woman with the same, very limited number of objects that were replete with significance, and symbolized wifely, or domestic virtue, particularly a parrot, a cradle, a dog, a bird in a cage or a musical instrument. A favourite “genre” subject was a suitor competing, supposedly jealously, with a lap dog as the object of an aloof beauty’s affection; Teasing the Pet (fig. 41) by Frans van Mieris the Elder painted in 1660, is a typical example. The conceit of the envious suitor who vies with a lap dog can be found in love poems and songs of the period:

Fortunate little dog, your prosperous lot is envied:

Fortunate little dog, that so often enjoyed Celestynè’s lap,

And, to my regret, was caressed by her so softly. 201

Lely painted tiny lap dogs in portraits as early as c.1659; in the portrait of Sir Thomas and Lady Fanshawe (fig. 42), Sir Thomas appears to have won the competition as
Lady Fanshawe holds flowers in her lap. The dog, however is on her right side the conventional place for her husband who stands at her left. Titian had included a lap dog in the *Venus of Urbino* (fig.43) (1538), and although this one is curled up comfortably on the bed, nevertheless Lely was simply one in a line of artists who painted women with dogs. The artist is an historically located personality, and the beliefs about woman’s role in Dutch society guarantees access to the meaning of the symbols in the paintings. Both Lely and Wissing would have known the work of Jacob Cats, the author of many Dutch emblems, and author of *Spiegel van den ouden en nieuwen tijdzt* (*Mirror of Ancient and Modern Times*) (1632): according to Cats “A lady is as her dog”; a particularly significant observation if we compare the alert face of the spaniel in Bronzino’s stunning portrait, with the owner’s sophistication and composure.

Is Mary of Modena “as her dog”? She appears tranquil, contained and gentle, her dog subdued under her hand. In Dutch symbolism, if a dog was included in the picture, she could also be understood as faithful, submissive and easily trained; or at least this was what was required of the ideal wife, even if few lived up to the exacting standards of male society. J. Douglas Stewart in *Pin-ups or Virtues? The Concept of the Beauties in Late Stuart Portraiture* gestures in the direction of the ideal wife in seventeenth-century society when he points out that from the sixteenth century “the idea of the love of a dog for its master was used by northern artists as an emblem of charity”, and of course not only was charity linked to the love of one’s neighbour, but was also linked to the love of God; a dog would be a most appropriate attribute for the pious and loving Mary of Modena.
The Althorp portrait was not only painted in a frequently used pose, but the portrait of Mary of Modena itself was popular since both Peter Cross and Nicholas Dixon based miniatures on it. Nicholas Dixon’s miniature painted c.1680 (fig.44) was once thought to represent Nell Gwyn. This is a mistake easily made, as Dixon’s distinctive style (technically akin to Samuel Cooper) when painting women offers the similar heavy almond eyes and languorous air employed by Lely, and is a style in which the individuality of the sitter is subordinated to fashionable “beauty”, which in this instance is quite ugly. The hairstyle with its flat top, bunched curls, and long coil over the shoulder, and the angle of the head are very close to the Althorp portrait, but the features are of any “Nell Gwyn type” court lady. There are two versions extant of the miniature now attributed to Peter Cross; one now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, is signed with the initials PC1677 (fig.45). It was once in the possession of N. Pfungst of Cleveland Square, London. A version came up for sale at Sotheby’s on 30 June 1980 in which she is wearing a white chemise and blue cloak; it is in a silver gilt frame, and is also inscribed on the reverse with a monogram. There is a note in the Heinz Archive, National Portrait Gallery from 2 May 1913 that records the miniaturist of these versions by PC1677 as Paolo Carandini who “was a miniature painter of Modena who came to England in the suite of Mary of Modena and died here quite young”. Daphne Foskett disputes this; miniatures which had been signed “PC” previously had always been attributed to either Paolo Carandini or Penelope Cleyn, but that there was no evidence that Carandini had accompanied Mary of Modena to England: “a contemporary writer speaks of him as dead in 1673”. The discovery that an initial on miniatures thought to be “L”, referring to Laurence Cross was in fact a “P”, and a whole series of miniatures
with the "interlaced monogram which looks like "LC", but which we must now read as "PC", run from 1678 until 1716" is discussed by Graham Reynolds in English Portrait Miniatures.206 Peter Cross seems to have taken over the most important miniature work from Richard Gibson when Gibson left London in 1677; it is possibly through the household of Mary of Modena and the Duke of York that Cross achieved royal patronage. Coincidentally the miniature of Mary of Modena now in the Fitzwilliam was painted in 1677 and is the same year that Gibson left London. Although Nicholas Dixon was officially the king's limner from August 1673, John Murdoch argues that "the fact that Cross was actually picking up most of the business probably reflects the fact that Dixon was putting his energies into subject limnings rather than portraits".207

Copies "in little" of larger paintings were common, as were full-size copies of originals. A three-quarter length full-size (49 x 40 ins) copy (fig.46) of the Althorp portrait (50 x 40 ins) by Lely of Mary of Modena, was given to Oxford University by Nathaniel, Lord Crew, Bishop of Durham in 1720, two years after her death. Crew had been Rector of Lincoln College Oxford and Bishop of Oxford, and he solemnized the marriage of James Duke of York and Mary of Modena at Dover in 1673. He was an Ecclesiastical Commissioner, Dean of the Chapel Royal from 1686-1688 and was sympathetic towards James, actively promoting the Declaration of Indulgence (1687). As his chaplain he had baptised Mary of Modena's first baby, a daughter, Catherine Laura in 1675 who died aged 10 months of convulsions. This portrait is listed in the Illustrated Catalogue of a Loan Collection of Portraits of English Historical Personages who Died Between 1625 and 1714, (Oxford, 1905), although the fact that Mary of Modena actually
died in 1718 appears to have eluded the curators. In this catalogue entry, number 288, it is attributed to Sir Peter Lely on the strength of the similarity to the Althorp portrait. Mrs Reginald Poole lists it in *Catalogue of Portraits in the Possession of the University, Colleges, City and County of Oxford* as by John Riley. This is corroborated by Bishop Crew’s will in the Oxford University Archives, dated June 24, 1720. A clause refers to the portrait of Mary of Modena and three other portraits as follows: “*I do hereby give unto the said Chancellor Masters and Scholars of the University of Oxford aforesaid the Pictures of King Charles the Second, and of Queen Catherine his Consort, and of King James the Second, and of Queen Mary his Consort, all drawn by Mr Riley, and now being in the drawing-room at Steane [Northamptonshire] aforesaid, to be placed in such places in the said University, as the said Chancellor Masters and Scholars shall think fit.*”

Riley had been a pupil of the Dutchman Gerard Soest whose portraits dispense with superficial elegance and flattery, although in this portrait the style is very close to the late Lely, but this may be because Riley (and Kneller) employed Lely’s valued “posture painter” John Baptist Gaspars, a native of Antwerp who came to England in the 1640s and worked for Lely for many years. Riley’s copy has been dismissed by C.H. Collins Baker as “poor in quality” evidently because he was incapable of painting “heavy languor”, so that “Riley’s intense, almost melancholy, seriousness sits uneasily in Lely’s convention”. Although not particularly strong on composition, on the contrary, Riley was renowned for his sensitive and observant painting of portrait heads, and this one is no exception. Mary of Modena appears more delicate, gentle and rather
melancholy compared with her representation in the Althorp portrait, and he captures the rather wistful side of her character with great sensitivity. The Painter-Stainers company had asked Riley and John Baptist Gaspars on 25 November 1681 to paint a portrait of the Duchess of York, so the portrait willed by Crew to Oxford University probably dates from late November 1681:

In November the Court returned thanks to Captain Gosfright and Mr Stamper for their pains in getting the King's picture; and Mr Saville, Captain Gosfright and others were ordered to go to Mr Wrigley and Mr Baptiste and desire them to do the Duchess of York's picture, “and bring it with what expedition they can”.209

At this time, 1681 she certainly had reason to be “melancholy”; she and the Duke of York had had 3 children, but on March 2nd 1681 Princess Isabella their only surviving child had died in London at the age of four and a half years while they were in exile in Scotland.

Charles II had ordered James to leave both the court and the country on 28 February 1679 because of the fear and hatred with which he was generally regarded, and between 1679 and 1682 they lived intermittently in Brussels and Edinburgh. They returned to England on 6 June 1682 to be met by a warm welcome despite having been charged in a pamphlet by an Irish informer Edward Fitzharris with plotting the death of Charles II. The Modenese ambassador in London, Felice Montecuccoli was accused of offering Fitzharris £10,000 on behalf of Mary of Modena’s mother, the deeply unpopular
Duchess Laura to assassinate Charles. Mary of Modena's cousin, Hortense Mancini, Duchess Mazarin, then resident in London, would poison him since Fitzharris said he refused the bribe; a large army of Frenchmen were to help place James on the throne. Fitzharris was tried and convicted of high treason, although Lord Shaftesbury, who was allegedly behind the absurd plot, was acquitted and survived.

Since she was in Scotland in 1681 this portrait is presumably not ad vivum, and was simply copied by Riley and Gaspars, omitting the jewelled clasps on her right sleeve and adding a pea pearl necklace, but the colours of her garments are identical in brown, blue and white. She sits against the sombre background, her right hand resting on her spaniel, that in Riley's copy appears smaller and darker.

"Something of Cleveland's Face"

The position of the spaniel is reversed to her left hand side in a similar portrait painted by Lely when she was sixteen years old (fig.47). In the Althorp portrait she is coy and contained but in this composition of Lely's, known through a number of studio repetitions, she is both composed and represented as a confident descendant of the great and ancient family d'Este. The architectural associations link her to power and status; the sculpted relief to the right of her head is a type uncommon in Lely's portraits and shows two "putti" supporting a swag of bound laurel branches helped by a winged "amorino" above them. To the seventeenth-century's hierarchical mind this was a clear allusion to her high rank. The small-leaved "Laurus nobilis" which made up a victor's crown is symbolic of triumph, and may also be an allusion to her family; her mother's name was
Laura, and laurel can denote immortality and eternity from the perspective of an ancient lineage.

At the time the original portrait was painted, c.1674, Lely did occasionally include similar panels in his work, for example, in the portrait of the fourth child of Charles II and Barbara Villiers, *Lady Charlotte Fitzroy* (fig. 48). This was painted c.1672 to advertise her status as a prospective bride. It is a delightful portrait of a little girl of eight years old with golden curls, and in the background is a frieze of "putti" garlanding a goat, a symbol of carnal love. One “putto” holds a flagon of wine, so that it appears to be an allegory of Bacchus with reference to love, revelry and beauty. Beauty, above all, is the clear link between “putti” who constantly attend Venus the goddess of love and beauty, and which are usually included in portraits of young women, for example Mary, Princess of Orange (fig. 49), 1677, another Lely portrait with a frieze similar to that in the portrait of Mary of Modena.

Mary of Modena’s dress is variously described as brown, orange or light violet, but in all cases she wears a blue mantle. In the *Catalogue of the Bathurst Collection*, compiled by Earl Bathurst in 1908 attention is drawn by him to the problem of identifying sitters when a pose is repeated frequently by an artist. The Bathurst portrait was identified by Lionel Cust in May 1906 as Mary of Modena, but an identical portrait mentioned by Bathurst as at Berkeley Castle at that time was called the Duchess of Portsmouth. 210 Certainly, there was a portrait in the Duke of Newcastle’s collection at Clumber, Worksop, Nottingham which was sold at Christie's on 4 June 1937, as the
Duchess of Portsmouth, and again at Sotheby's on 16 December 1981, as the Duchess of Portsmouth, but which is undoubtedly a portrait of Mary of Modena (fig.50), although this "Clumber" portrait has a slightly fuller face than the Bathurst portrait. Another copy, with a black rather than a red background curtain recorded as being in the United States since at least 1925, was given to the Richmond Art Museum in 1957 as a portrait of Lady Twisden, but appeared in the exhibition *Power and Beauty*, 12-22 June 2001 at Historical Portraits, London as *Mary of Modena, Duchess of York*, c.1674.

It was a popular pose and this was a popular portrait. There is a beautiful drawing of this portrait carefully following the guidelines of 2 inch squares that is in the Sutherland Collection at the Ashmolean Oxford (fig.51), although the location of some of the copies is now unknown. The Bathurst portrait recorded at Cirencester Park by R.B. Beckett in 1951 does not feature in the Courtauld Photographic Survey of Cirencester Park taken 27 years later in 1978. Elizabeth Butler, Countess of Chesterfield appears in this pose in an engraving (fig.52) (Macdonnell Collection), possibly executed after her death in July 1665. In 1662 the court was rife with speculation about her association with James, Duke of York. She was removed from court to Bretby, the Chesterfield country estate, and it was rumoured that her jealous husband Philip Stanhope, 2nd Earl of Chesterfield had poisoned her. The engraving by T. Wright bears scant resemblance to Lady Chesterfield's features in the portrait of her in a saffron robe painted by Lely c.1660 (fig.53) but the tilt of the head inclining to her right and the round face are similar. It appears as an illustration to Mrs Jameson's *The Beauties of the Court of Charles II*.
(1833), and seems to be an amalgamation of the head of her portrait and the body of the Mary of Modena “Bathurst” pose.

The “Bathurst” portrait was reproduced as a mezzotint, the reverse of the painting after Lely by an unknown artist, and distributed by Richard Tompson a print seller and publisher who died in 1693. The print bears the legend Her Royall Highness the Duchess of York, P. Lilly pinxit, R Tompson excudit, (fig.54). There is a mezzotint in a similar pose sold by “Alexander Browne” after a possibly “lost” portrait by Lely. While this parallels the “Bathurst” portrait and fig.54 she holds a wreath in her right hand (fig.54a). The pose of fig.54 is similar to that in the reverse direction print of the actress Jane Long by Lely in the British Museum (fig.55). She reclines supported by her right elbow with her left hand on a small dog; the “putti” are replaced in the print of Jane Long by trees, hills, a lake and building.\

Lely used this pose for his royal and his aristocratic patrons and as we can see, there are several versions extant. The only version of the “Bathurst” portrait to omit the dog is not by Lely, but by his friend the miniaturist Richard Gibson. It is one of a pair of miniatures (6¾ x 5¾) (fig.56); the other is of her husband James as Duke of York in full armour and the sash of the Order of the Garter. He holds a baton, his plumed helmet is on red drapery and he stands three-quarter length before a column. It is based on a portrait by Lely now at Kenwood House. The pair are intended to be displayed together; she is in the conventional heraldic position on her husband’s left and looks to her right while he faces to his left.
The “Bathurst” portrait pose, because it exists in so many copies, is possibly the first portrait that Lely painted of Mary of Modena after her marriage. Not only was the entire portrait copied of which there are several versions extant, but there are copies existing in bust-length versions only, at least four of which are presented in a painted oval. When Lely’s collection of pictures and the contents of his studio were sold to pay off his debts at his death, drawings and pictures by his “own hand” were sold too. According to the list, among them was not only a half-length of the Duchess of York, but also a copy of “The Present Dutchess of York” half length, and “a head” of the “Dutchess of York” too, which, as they were all still in his studio c. 1680, may have included one of the “Bathurst” pose in a “sculpted” oval. They all appear to be by his studio: one is in a sculpted oval (fig.57) (28½ x 23½) and is quite close in features to the full-size Bathurst portrait, and was painted, as most of the copies were, around 1680.

Between February and 20 October 1680 James and Mary of Modena were in England; this may have been a “promotion of her image” exercise while they were in temporary respite from their exile in Scotland. This portrait is almost certainly not by the hand of Lely. Mary of Modena wears a brown dress and a green scarf in this portrait; possibly the green scarf is one of Lely’s “props”, that is, “pieces of material used for Drapery Painting”. This was exhibited at the Worcestershire Exhibition in 1882 and came up for sale at Christie’s on 27 January 1956 (lot 123). In the Christie’s sale catalogue no provenance is given, but the 1882 Exhibition Catalogue lists the lender as Mr Isaac Averill of Broadway who was also on the local Evesham committee, one of the committees responsible for organizing the exhibition.
A portrait, almost identical but far smaller (11¼ x 9½ ins), in which she wears an orange dress and green robe, is owned by the Duke of Buccleuch (fig. 58), and is by a different hand. It is now in the Boughton Collection, and was recorded in the Catalogue of the Pictures in Montague House, no. 146 in 1954. Yet another hand, originally identified as Willem Wissing, painted the copy once in the Ehrich Galleries, New York, although it was called the "Duchess of Portsmouth". Because they both had dark hair confusion frequently arises in the identification of the two sitters, but this identification is obviously incorrect; the portrait bears no resemblance to Portsmouth's features at all. Rather than by Wissing it is almost certainly by Mary Beale, known as a copyist and connected with Lely's studio; her style was rather flat and derivative which is reflected in the rather poor copy (fig. 59). A far more competent copy was in the collection of Viscount Hinchingbrooke and now in Shire Hall, Warwick (fig. 60). It was put up for sale in 1957 as a portrait by the French painter Nicolas de Largillierre who spent three periods in London. It is quite possible that it is by Largillierre since he was in London for a second time in 1675. He became associated with Lely, who was then Principal Painter to Charles II, and he assisted Antonio Verrio at Windsor Castle. Like Mary of Modena, Largillierre was a Catholic, and he returned to Paris in 1679 because of the anti-Catholic persecution, a consequence of the Popish Plot. He left England in spite of the record in the Privy Council Register of 21 May 1679 that "'Nicholas Lauzellier' and other assistants of Antonio Verrio at Windsor Castle are exempt from the persecution against Catholics".216
There is also a very ugly, coarse copy at Bath, listed as School of Lely painted c.1680 (fig.61). It was given as a gift to the fashionable spa town of Bath by Charles Edward Thomas in 1909. It was an appropriate gesture because when Mary of Modena became Queen Consort she had bathed in the waters of the Cross Bath in September 1687. On 10 June 1688 she provided James II with an heir, who in securing the Catholic succession also sealed the Stuarts' fate of exile in France. The Bath waters were credited with amazing efficacy, and anxious to demonstrate his response to this moment of Catholic triumph, John Drummond, Earl (later Duke) of Melfort, Secretary of State for Scotland, (recent political convert to Rome and an exile with the Stuarts), commissioned an ornate Baroque marble monument, complete with Este eagles, in the Cross Bath to commemorate the conception of the Prince of Wales (see Chapter 7).217

Testament to the confusion about the identity of sitters caused by the repetition of poses is the copy of the bust "Bathurst" portrait that came up for sale at Sothebys in November 1993, and again in July 1995.218 This was mis-identified on each occasion as Charles II's mistress Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland wearing the brown and blue robes and in a painted oval (fig.62). While it is identifiable as Mary of Modena by the School of Lely, there is nothing of the delicate sensitive painting of the features which distinguishes the Boughton (fig.58) or the possible Largillierre (fig.60) copies. Two portraits identified for some time as Mary of Modena are most certainly not of her. A half-length "Studio of Lcly" in a painted cartouche, the sitter wearing a red dress, came up for sale at Christies in July 1986, but is possibly of Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland (fig.63). Another oval with a half-length figure at Haddo House, is attributed
to Lely; it was exhibited at the *Stuart Exhibition: New Gallery* in 1889 as being by Lely of Mary of Modena, but is certainly not her (fig.64). The hair style of dark brown curls, and the costume are similar to the other “Bathurst” type bust portraits, but the sitter’s features do not agree with other identified portraits and it is possible that this could be a portrait of Mary of Modena’s Maid of Honour from 1678 to 1681 Catharine Sedley, later Countess of Dorchester. A smaller coloured pastel drawing of Mary of Modena purchased at Colnaghi’s, London in 1923 is now in the National Gallery of Ireland in Dublin. It is a copy of a Lely portrait by T. Trumpton (or Thrumton) signed *Trumpton Fecit/Lely Pinxt* (fig.65). Trumpton was not a miniaturist or a pastellist but his style derives from Lely, and it is most likely that he was a painter in oils who contributed to the production of the large numbers of copies of portraits attributed to Lely. Little is known about him, although he was working in London in 1667 and certainly this study was completed after 1675.

One of the most noticeable aspects of these early portraits of Mary of Modena painted by Lely and his studio soon after her marriage in 1673 is, rather than portraying a “likeness”, she is represented as a court “beauty”, and thus she becomes interchangeable with the “sleepy-eyed”, erotic court women, particularly in the School of Lely copies of the “Bathurst” portrait where “something of Cleveland’s face” intrudes in all of them. She can be identified as “Mary of Modena”, but she is also identifiable as a court “beauty”, a beauty whose tone was set not by herself but by the royal mistresses.
The King's mistresses, notably Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, frequently and obsessively painted by Lely, and Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth were particularly defined by sexual intrigue at Court. Personal satire, which undermined Charles II, his brother James, Duke of York and other intimates, functioned as an effective political weapon, and bore a weighty ideological significance. As already discussed, the French Duchess of Portsmouth was used to discredit Charles by the anti-French faction, so that she was the symbol for all things French and therefore evil. John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester is usually credited with the production of Signior Dildo, a bawdy poem that is more than a libel and illustrates the very powerful undercurrents at Whitehall, both political and religious, and which particularly reflects the crisis brought on by the Modena marriage. The edition of State Papers published in 1775 by Macpherson still argues the view that Mary of Modena's beauty was her redeeming feature, especially with the common people:

As for the people, their prejudices were gradually removed by her behaviour. The uneasiness conceived on account of her religion was soon forgot; she was universally esteemed and by many beloved. Her beauty rendered her the favourite of the populace.²²⁰

Martin Haile, writing more than a hundred years after Macpherson's State Papers also thought that the popular mind was probably quite open:
Until disturbed and led astray by the fanatics of political or religious factions, the public mind generally makes right judgement of the persons presented to its view. So it was with Mary Beatrice. Not her beauty alone, but the candour, grace and goodness which accompanied it captivated the people ...

“Disturbed and Led Astray”: Rochester and the Satirical Portrait

In the case of Mary of Modena, the new Duchess of York, it was the educated “public mind” and the Court that were “disturbed and led astray” by the anti-Yorkist satire Signior Dildo, usually attributed to Rochester. Rochester belonged to a culture that withheld from the press ideologically sensitive, oppositional, political texts. Instead they were distributed to circles of readers with common interests, in manuscript form which were in turn copied into a reader’s personal miscellany before being sent to the next member of the circle. Proliferation was rapid, as many readers belonged to more than one circle, and in Rochester’s case this meant Whitehall, Windsor and Newmarket, although this form of “publication” was in any event largely restricted to the professions and frequenters of the London coffee-houses other than the members of the governing classes.

Rochester is frequently cited as the ultimate dissolute Restoration rake, but this traditional image is difficult to reconcile with the distaste and cynicism with which he recounts the drunken revelries and court scandals in his poetry. If he was indeed motivated by malice he could have circulated Signior Dildo by leaving it around the court or posting it up on doors which would have lead to a demand for copies. Copies could

109
then be leaked to the two most important reader circles connected with Rochester, the Inns of Court and Oxford University: "Rochester’s connection with Oxford and residence at Adderbury and Woodstock is the most likely reason for the number of transcripts found in the miscellanies of dons of the time". 223

Certainly there are many variants, and clearly Rochester cannot be responsible for all the forms that exist; typically accretive it is very loosely structured, easily admitting additions by other hands. The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester (1999) offers a Version A with Additions and also a Version B224. (See Appendix C). Although it has been suggested that the poem originated as a sort of party-game, in the court milieu of the 1670s obscene fiction was faction driven, which in turn requires collectivity, so the company would rhyme on gossip-worthy names. The hostility against the Duke of York’s entourage can also be seen as a consequence of the rift between him and the Duke of Buckingham in whose faction Rochester, if indeed he was in anybody’s save his own, would be. All forms of authority were loathed by Rochester, particularly politicians and priests, although on his death bed he displayed signs of religious mania, persuading his wife to leave the Catholic church and take the Anglican sacraments with him.

John Dryden and the Earl of Mulgrave in An Essay Upon Satire (1679) thought effective satire combined imagination and wit with abuse. Signior Dildo is distinguished by the general nature of its reflections on the disreputable Court, but rather than "stylish" it is merely censorious and develops into a scurrilous slur not only on Charles II’s
mistresses, but also on a selection of aristocratic women that emphasises the anti-York bias. The poem "to the Tune of Pegg's gone to Sea with a soldier(sic)" begins:

You Ladies all of merry England
Who have been to kiss the Dutchess's Hand;
Pray, did you lately observe in the Show
A Noble Italian, call'd Signior Dildo?

This Signior was one of her Highness's Train,
And helpt to conduct her over the Main;
But now she cries out, to the Duke I will go,
I have no more need of Signior Dildo.

These two stanzas are from the Version B (edited by Harold Love, 1999). Love tentatively suggests that Version B could possibly represent a rewriting of the 1690s, rather than a version from the 1670s, but that previous editors have used the 1690s version as their copy-text. The "Duchess" in the first stanza refers to Mary of Modena. The arrival of an Italian Catholic Princess in England, as the bride of the Duke of York, is the motivation to launch an attack on her for bringing unspeakable vices as a Catholic wife of the Catholic heir presumptive to the throne. Its appearance shortly after her arrival at the end of 1673 marks the beginning of the underground propaganda campaign against James's succession (in which Charles Sackville Earl of Dorset, Fleetwood Shepherd and Rochester were all implicated), although it seems, in this
instance, to be intended as an attack on York's personal qualities rather than on his Catholic faith, even if it does have a subliminal political message.

There was a trade in dildoes imported from Italy and France during the Restoration; representing "Signior Dildo" as a member of Mary of Modena's Italian entourage was an attack on the loose-living court, since the imported phallus is noble, healthy, cheap, discreet, modest and, most importantly, preserves marital fidelity. The last three attributes were unlikely to be found in the person of Mary of Modena's new husband. Their joint household had a high profile as a Catholic stronghold, and the women who are the objects of ridicule in this man's world of satire are mostly Catholics. The most obvious are Rochester's cousin Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, and Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth, referred to in line 33 as "dainty fine Dutchesses", who both had long-standing associations with Charles II which enabled them to demand substantial funds to buy "dainty" finery. It is probable that Cleveland as well as "Lady Betty" in stanza 6 were included because they were notorious at the Restoration court as whores with reputations for assertiveness, lust for life and extramarital affairs, and, in the case of the versatile Lady Elizabeth Felton, with the supposed author of the poem, Rochester himself.

The anti-Duke of York bias is emphasised by reference to four women closely associated with him: Mary of Modena his new wife, her mother Laura, Duchess of Modena and two countesses. Her mother is referred to in Stanza 11; "she looks high" is a jibe at a highly intelligent woman possessed of a strong character who ruled as Regent
of Modena from 1662 until 1673 and who was an unpopular guest at the English court. That she was allowed to sit in an armchair when dining with Queen Catherine, and that the ladies of the court had to stand when she dined with her daughter, caused them to indulge in objectionable and insolent behaviour. The Duchess of Modena’s crimes seem to have been her self-confidence, born of being regent, an ability to raise money without applying to Parliament, and her French associations, since her marriage to Alfonso IV of Modena (fig.66) was by proxy under the auspices of the French king; “the Secrets” referred to were probably of the French “spy” variety rather than any sexual transgression.

One of the Duke of York’s well-known mistresses was Anne Hamilton, Countess of Southesk in Stanza 5, a promiscuous friend of the Duchess of Cleveland; Southesk had a notorious affair with the Earl of Chesterfield before moving on to the Duke of York. Her husband unexpectedly returned from a bear and bull-baiting spectacle to find her entertaining the Duke. The other was Mary Bagot, the widowed Countess of Falmouth, Stanza 7, who had hopes of succeeding Anne Hyde as Duchess of York. Strikingly beautiful she was painted by Sir Peter Lely for Anne Hyde’s commission for the portraits of the most beautiful court women, the “Windsor Beauties”; she managed to acquire something of a reputation before secretly marrying Rochester’s friend Charles Sackville, 6th Earl of Dorset.228

Although it is a satire, Signior Dildo is not strictly an anti-papist satire; however most of the women referred to were Catholics, and Henry Jermyn, the elderly “Saint
*Albans, with Wrinkles and Smiles in his Face*, Stanza 15, was an ardent Francophile who, it was rumoured, as ambassador extraordinary to France in the 1660s had either married or had an affair with James, Duke of York's mother the exiled Catholic Queen Henrietta Maria. So as a satire it reflects the formidable hostility against Catholics which existed at the time. It played on these fears and, in effect it fanned the propaganda campaign against the Modena marriage, the succession of the Duke of York and any children he and Mary of Modena might have. This epic is attributed to Rochester and he certainly could have had some input; he accused himself of being Charles II's pimp, and he was frequently called on to drag the King out of his depressions and raise his spirits. Rochester claimed he could not stand “still life”, and he could be relied on to shatter the peace. This satire with female Catholics the objects of ridicule managed to do just that, and insofar as Mary of Modena’s image was a construct of anti-Catholic and anti-French propaganda, it was indissolubly linked with the unpopularity of her husband.

Van Dyck idealised his sitters, and in turn Lely’s portraits idealised the sitters of the later generation, but the impulse in written portraits towards the last quarter of the seventeenth century was towards the satiric; this mode had gained ascendancy over the heroic verse of such poets as Edmund Waller and his imitator Lansdowne. A comparison of Waller’s heroic poem *Instructions to a Painter* with the satiric poem *Advice to a Painter to Draw the Duke by* (1673) illuminates the techniques of heroic and satiric modes in topical poetry, as they both deal with the figure of the Duke of York and both enlist the painter’s aid in drawing portraits. Waller’s poem is designed to invoke
admiration for York’s exploits and, to a certain extent, idealize them, and he manages to identify “the valiant Duke” with the heroic tradition:

_Let thy bold pencil hope and courage spread_

_Through the whole navy, by that hero led;_

_Make all appear, where such a Prince is by,_

_Resolved to conquer, or resolved to die._

(lines 15-18)²³⁰

Waller’s celebration of the inconclusive sea victory over the Dutch off Lowestoft in 1665 graphically describes the picture that was to be painted of the battle under the Duke of York. He was already unpopular, and the naval administration incompetent, so that Waller was felt to have overstated the case. A spate of satirical verse (generalized oppositional reflections) and lampoons (verses on particular people) can be seen to develop from 1665 onwards, and the most distinguished can be said to be the poems offering “Advice to a Painter” that Waller launched with his complimentary _Instructions to a Painter_. Andrew Marvell particularly was in the forefront of responses to Waller with several other “Advice” poems, and his parody _Second Advice to a Painter_ was the first substantial attack, and the subsequent “Advices” exposing the fiasco of the Dutch war in the summer of 1665 and summer of 1666; in them he blamed the Duke of York and supporting cast of servile MPs and court ladies. These satires lend support to the suspicion that Marvell was writing pamphlets for Du Moulin’s anti-Catholic propaganda war.
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If Signior Dildo was both scurrilous and had a subliminal political message, 

Advice to a Painter (1673) carried a forthright statement of the threat of popery. It followed the conventions of the genre, “the Painter” providing anti-Catholic sketches of York’s papist co-conspirators, the envoy to Modena the Earl of Peterborough, Arundell of Wardour, and the Talbot brothers (Peter and Richard)\(^2\), and exposes the human weaknesses of Mary of Modena’s husband, York himself, particularly his conversion to Catholicism and his lechery:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Next, Painter, draw his Mordaunt by his side,} \\
\text{Conveying his religion, and his bride:} \\
\text{He who long since abjur'd the royal line} \\
\text{Does now in Popery with his master join.} \\
\text{Then draw the Princess with her golden locks,} \\
\text{Hast'ning to be envenom'd with the pox,} \\
\text{And in her youthful veins receive the wound} \\
\text{That sent Nan Hyde before her under ground;} \\
\text{That wound wherewith the tainted Churchill fades,} \\
\text{Preserv'd in stone for a new set of Maids.} \\
\text{Poor Princess, born under a sullen star,} \\
\text{To find this welcome when you've come so far!}
\end{align*}
\]

(lines 37-48)
The Earl of Peterborough (Mordaunt) is blamed for secretly carrying James away from the Anglican faith through negotiating the Modena marriage and bringing Mary of Modena, freighted with "foreigness" and "Catholicism" to England. The Duke of York’s lack of mastery of his lecherous ways and his furtive affairs with unattractive court women is implied by the reference to his first Duchess Anne Hyde who died of breast cancer. Although his affairs with numerous court whores, some of them Anne Hyde’s Maids of Honour such as Arabella Churchill, have made her death from the "pox" not such an unlikely occurrence. The implication that the "tainted" Arabella Churchill was "fading" refers to her fading from the Duke of York’s favour, after producing four children for him in eight years, to marry a Colonel Godfrey.

The satire was probably written late in 1673, and has been variously attributed to Andrew Marvell, Henry Savile (brother of George Savile, Lord Halifax), and John Ayloffe, but it was not published until the height of the Popish Plot crisis in 1679. The poem clearly endorses the value of satire shown in Signior Dildo and there is strong evidence of a campaign of propaganda against James in the lines on Mary of Modena’s futile journey from Italy to become Queen:

Better some jealous neighbour of your own
Had call’d you to some sound though petty throne,
Where ‘twixt a wholesome husband and a page
You might have linger’d out a lazy age,
Than in false hopes of being once a queen
"An improved and chastened likeness": Lely's Portraits of Cousins, Mary of Modena and Hortense Mancini

The late seventeenth century had two types of dissent from an official presentation of an image of royalty, or what Peter Burke has termed the "reverse of the medal"; one is the dissent expressed by individuals who are, or consider themselves, loyal subjects, while the second kind is the work of declared enemies. We can see that, in effect Signior Dildo falls into the first category and the work of Marvell, Du Moulin and the Dutch propaganda before and after the so-called "Glorious Revolution" falls squarely into the second. Engravings were a favourite medium, as were poems, prose texts, playing cards and plays. The art of satire was widespread: Louis XIV, (from whom Mary of Modena and James II were to receive hospitality in exile for the rest of their lives), was in the direct line of fire in France from pamphleteers who particularly linked his lack of moral scruples to doctrine of "reason of state" and the ideas of Machiavelli that he had supposedly learned from the Sicilian Cardinal Mazarin. Mazarin was Mary of Modena's great uncle, and like her charged with being an intruder from Italy; although in the case of Mazarin also with usurping power.

Mary of Modena's ambitious paternal grandfather Francesco I had been committed to the restoration of the grand reputation of the House of Este, lost when Cesare his grandfather surrendered the duchy of Ferrara to the Pope in 1598. He had
wanted an alliance with a ruling house in Europe. In 1638 a possible match between his son Alfonso and a daughter of Charles I had been dismissed as a “caprice”, and it was left to Alfonso’s daughter Mary of Modena to marry into a European ruling house. Francesco had proposed one of his daughters as Louis XIV’s bride but his plan to marry into the monarchy failed and he settled instead for the marriage of his son Alfonso to a “Mazarinette” instead. Mary of Modena’s mother was Laura Martinozzi, one of the nieces of Cardinal Mazarin who had a title bestowed on her through this marriage of convenience, in exchange for which Mazarin could bestow considerable material advantage on her prospective father-in-law. Francesco I needed this French alliance to counter attacks from Spain on his territories, and in exchange for a title for the Mazarin niece he was named commander-in-chief of the French forces in Italy. She was married under Mazarin’s auspices, at the Chapel Royal of Compiègne on 27 May, 1655 by proxy to his son Prince Alfonso d’Este, who in the year of Mary of Modena’s birth, 1658 was to become Duke Alfonso IV. Hostility to Mary of Modena’s own marriage with the Duke of York was because it could be seen as also a marriage with the Duchess Laura who was an adopted daughter of France.

At the time of Laura Martinozzi’s marriage Hortense Mancini was nine years old, and Mazarin’s favourite niece and heir. Charles II asked twice for her hand, in 1659 and again in 1660, before his restoration, but he was refused on the grounds that Mazarin thought that the enormous wealth he would leave Hortense Mancini would be squandered by the profligate exile and, in any event he doubted Charles would ever regain the throne of England. Perversely the Cardinal married her, aged fifteen to Armand-Charles de La
Porte de La Meilleraye from a family whose rise to wealth and power from obscurity mirrored Mazarin's own rise. Hortense Mancini and her husband became Duchesse and Duc Mazarin. 235

Hortense Mancini led an undignified and bizarre life, and, trailing lovers of both sexes in her wake, escaped from her husband, who it transpired was schizophrenic and psychotic, to Italy disguised in men's clothing. Indifferent to fashion in both dress and behaviour, she polished her reputation through publishing her own unreliable memoirs and transformed herself into a fantasy object whom everyone wanted to meet because of her "notorious identity". 236 The ambitious "arrant knave", Ralph 1st Duke of Montagu (d.1709) had brought Louise de Kéroualle to England and during his years in the Embassy in Paris he heard of the famous Mancini, and finally met her at Chambéry in Savoy. 237 Montagu took a house for her in Covent Garden Piazza and she arrived in 1675 on horseback disguised as a man, a cavalier with boots, spurs and muddy overcoat.

With her arrival came rumour and wild speculation about her interest in the king. Coffee house talk in London observed that the Duchesse Mazarin had come to England because the scheming Montagu had encouraged her, as he and the Duke of Buckingham were anxious to displace Louise de Kéroualle and rid Whitehall of her influence and Charles II's reliance on her. Hortense Mancini insisted that she was in England only to visit her cousin Mary of Modena whom she had met at Chambéry when the Modena bridal party had stopped there in the second week of their passage from Italy to England. Although her visit was greeted with dismay by the Yorks, in a gesture of hospitality that
reinforced Hortense Mancini’s claim, Mary of Modena’s husband, who thought Mancini the most beautiful woman in the world, purchased a house next door to his own home, the Palace of St. James, filled it with his finest furniture and put it at her disposal for as long as she wished.238

Hortense Mancini’s reign as the King’s mistress was brief, 1676 to 1677, and Ralph Montagu’s plans to dislodge Louise de Kéroualle came to nothing. Hortense Mancini continued to be mistress of her salon at “The Little Palace”, and the claim was still made that she was the most beautiful woman in England. Agnes Strickland writing in the nineteenth century draws attention to what she considered to be the “strong personal resemblance” between the Italian cousins, although because of Hortense Mancini’s disreputable and bizarre behaviour, in comparing their portraits she thought those of Mary of Modena “bear an improved and chastened likeness to those of Hortense Mancini ...”.239

It appears that Strickland is making her comparison on imponderables such as birth, since she emphasizes Mary of Modena’s descent from “families in which nobility of person was an hereditary gift”. Hortense Mancini was “humbly born”, but Mary of Modena was fortunate in that the princely house of Este was able to lift her features a notch or two above those of her cousin.240 It is not clear which particular portraits were being compared, or whether this was simply a generalized observation on Strickland’s part after having seen a number.
There are two very similar portraits of Mary of Modena (fig. 67) and Hortense Mancini (fig. 68) which can be usefully compared; both are based on the full-length seated portrait of Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland, (once identified as a portrait of Nell Gwyn), now at Goodwood (fig. 69). This was probably painted in the early 1670s by Sir Peter Lely since Cleveland’s hair, clustered in curls at the sides of her head, was a style popular about 1673. The fine mezzotint, published by Alexander Browne after 1680 identified the artist as “P. Lely Eques” (fig. 70). The portraits of all three sitters are so similar that to change the names of the sitters around would not change the “identities” of the portraits.

Portraits of this period failed to represent emotions such as sadness, happiness, fear or anger; instead they favoured bland vacancy that became a style of representation which signals the group identity of “beauty” over the individual person. This conformism in the sitter was acceptable because it was so common; what Richard Brilliant terms “the masks of convention”. The mask allows the sitter to impersonate someone, even herself, in a favourable guise.241 The basic requirement for a portrait was that the sitter was recognizable to its original and intended audience, with the artist attempting to approximate the “look” of the person portrayed, although in these three particular portraits the bodies belong to “anybody” while the heads are slightly different. All portraits of the time had something of a Barbara Villiers “look”, but later all portraits of doubtful identify were called “Nell Gwyn” for many years. In looking at the confusing profusion of seventeenth-century portraits, many of which replicate each other, it is worth remembering Thomas Carlyle’s nineteenth century observation:

122
In short, any representations made by a faithful human creature of that face and figure which he saw with his eyes, and which I can never see with mine, is now valuable to me, and much better than none at all. 242

The head of the portrait of Mary of Modena is very close to the “Bathurst” (fig.47) portrait by Lely, which may have served as the model for fig.67 that was painted about five years afterwards; fig.67 is inscribed “Duchess of York/1679 and still hangs at Kedleston Hall. This portrait is one of those referred to in Philip, Lord Wharton’s brief Latin autobiography (1685) in which he describes his acquaintance with Charles II and James, Duke of York, later James II, writing:

My one further ambition was to have portraits of them and their Queens (as I have had of Charles I and his Queen) and with those they have presented me painted in full length and from the life by the best painters [ie Lely and Van Dyck] in England and perhaps all Europe. 243

Wharton’s large collection of portraits of family members, contemporaries and royalty by Van Dyck and Lely were sold by Wharton’s profligate son in about 1725 to Sir Robert Walpole, although the full-length portraits by Lely were possibly not among them and may have been sold by Wharton to Sir William Stanhope direct. The portraits of James Butler, 1st Duke of Ormond, Henry Jermyn, Earl of St. Albans, Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington and James Duke of York all in Garter Robes, and Mary of Modena when Duchess of York, were sold in the sale of Sir William Stanhope’s pictures at his
Albermarle Street house on 28 April 1733 to Sir Nathaniel Curzon who was decorating a house in Brook Street. These five portraits were moved to Kedleston Hall in about 1740; the portrait of Mary of Modena has definitely hung there since 1769. Henry Bennet, James II as Duke of York and Mary of Modena still hang there together in the State Bedchamber, although her portrait was not originally associated with the Garter portrait of her husband as the very different poses, his formal, hers informal, make quite clear.

The portrait of Hortense Mancini that hangs at Boughton House, Kettering now was painted earlier than that of Mary of Modena in c.1675, and is ascribed only to the "Circle of Sir Peter Lely". Because of the ornate fringing and the rich gold fleur-de-lys embroidered on her dress, uncharacteristic of Lely himself, the portrait could possibly be by Lely's pupil Willem Wissing; the embroidery, drapery and ornament may derive from Wissing's period of study in France, and can be compared to the rich, intricately embroidered gowns Louise de Keroualle was famous for introducing to the English court, and which French portrait artists such as Mignard and Henri Gascar portrayed her wearing. It also recalls the work of the French portrait painter Nicholas de Largillierre who had developed his talents as a portrait painter in Lely's studio, having come to London in 1675, about the same time as Mancini herself. Montagu, after his years in France, had commissioned a new London house in Bloomsbury, built "after the French pavilion way" sometime before 1675 which was decorated by Antonio Verrio. This portrait of Mancini in her French-inspired embroidered gown, (which appears not to be recorded by Susan Shifrin in her thesis on portraits of Hortense Mancini "A Copy of My Countenance", (1998)) originally hung in Montagu's bedroom at Montagu House,
Bloomsbury. Mancini was a close companion of Ralph Montagu’s later years, and papers still at Boughton record his generosity to her, formerly the richest woman in Europe; he had lent her three hundred pounds, and at her death (of dropsy in July 1699) he paid £100 for her body to be returned to France, rather than have her creditors seize it as ransom. It is because Ralph’s son, John 2nd Duke of Montagu, (who had a great interest in “the plate jewels & Pictures .. and the furniture of houses”), managed to resolve his father’s outstanding debts at his death (9 March 1708-9) without selling off the “family silver” that the portrait of Hortense Mancini, Duchesse Mazarin now hangs at Boughton.

Although they are so similar, the three portraits of Mary of Modena, Mancini and Cleveland differ in detail. Hortense Mancini’s portrait differs from that of the Duchess of Cleveland and Mary of Modena, not only in dress but overall background design. They all have scalloped-edged sleeves and pea pearl necklaces, but where Mancini’s is heavily embroidered, Cleveland’s gown, in both portrait and print, is plain satin with jewelled edging, and Mary of Modena wears a plain grey satin scalloped-sleeved gown over a white chemise, with a blue robe; Mancini’s is green. The design in the portrait of Mary of Modena is a simplified rendering of the pattern evolved for the ornate full-length of the Cleveland portrait and print. It has been suggested that the Cleveland design underlines her standing as a figure of the “court”, as she is seated “... in front of Francesco Fanelli’s “Diana Fountain” which once stood in the Privy Garden at Hampton Court.”. Certainly this is correct in so far as Cleveland was a prominent member of the court and frequently resided at Hampton Court, in spite of Catherine of
Braganza's objections, and would also accord with the fact that Mary of Modena was the king's sister-in-law. The fountain does not appear in the design of the Mancini portrait, (the background is a heavy, draped curtain), lending weight to the proposition that Hortense Mancini was not a particularly welcome member of the court.

Lely had used the mis-named "Diana Fountain" as a background feature in portraits of Charles II's youngest sister Henriette Anne, Duchess of Orléans. The fountain appears in Henriette Anne's portrait undoubtedly because her mother Henrietta Maria's main palace was Somerset House where alterations to the gardens from 1627 to 1638 included two fountains by Hubert le Sueur, one of Mercury and the other of Arethusa in 1636. They are not by the Florentine Francesco Fanelli; although he made some bronzes for Charles I and Henrietta Maria, his main patron was the Duke of Newcastle. Le Sueur's Arethusa Fountain was the most elaborate to be commissioned by the Caroline Court, and in the 1659 Commonwealth Inventory the "lady" on the top of it was "called Arethusa", one of Diana's nymphs; Virgil thought of her as a Sicilian nymph and the inspiration for pastoral poetry. Cromwell had the fountain re-erected at Hampton Court, but now most of the bronze components are in Bushy Park, outside Hampton Court, where it is usually and erroneously referred to as the "Diana Fountain" (fig.71).

Le Sueur's figure does not have the crescent moon in her hair, while Arethusa was turned into a fountain by Diana, according to Ovid, to escape the advances of Alpheus. The fountain in the portrait of Mary of Modena has the head of Arethusa and the marble shell basin, but not the "syren" or mermaid squeezing water from her breasts as in the Cleveland portrait. It has been suggested by David Howarth that Le Sueur copied
Giambologna’s conceit from the fountain of Neptune in the Piazza Nettuno, Bologna.\textsuperscript{249} However, the figure of Arethusa herself could be a direct acknowledgment of Mary of Modena’s origins, as it appears to be derived from one of the Mantuan Statues, the \textit{Venus with a Dolphin}, the dolphin being one of Arethusa’s attributes; the “syrens” in the Arethusa Fountain originally were “\textit{seated astride dolphins}”.\textsuperscript{250}

In the three portraits the sitters all hold flowers to their bosoms with their right hands and cup flowers resting on their laps with their left. The reference can be read as the sitter in the guise of Flora, a classical goddess, like Diana, familiar to a seventeenth-century audience. It is a pertinent reference for the three sitters, Mancini a “Roman dame”, Cleveland “the king’s whore” and Mary of Modena an Italian, that Flora was a Roman goddess whose festival, the Floralia on 1st May, was celebrated with much licentiousness by, among others, Roman courtesans. The symbol of the flowers is twofold, embodying the promise of fecundity with the transient and perishable “flower” of youth and beauty. Flora was the mother of Spring, and in Botticelli’s famous \textit{Primavera} (1477) in the Uffizi, Florence, Flora exhales flowers while Zephyr pursues her to marry her and create her mistress of the flowers. She served as an allegory in \textit{Flora} (1515) (Uffizi, Florence), Titian’s portrait of a virtuous woman, and as a goddess, Flora was frequently used as a popular vehicle for female portraiture, the sitters sometimes having garlanded hair, but invariably holding a posy of flowers, as in the portraits of Cleveland, Mancini and Mary of Modena.\textsuperscript{251}
Mary of Modena's "posy" is in fact a basket of flowers, which offers a different "reading" that alludes to her Roman Catholicism. Some of Van Dyck's sitters of the later 1630s who were Catholic converts were partial to esoteric symbolism. His portrait of Dorothy Savage, Viscountess Andover and Her Sister Elizabeth, Lady Thimbelby (c.1637) (fig. 72) represents two sisters, Elizabeth on the left and Dorothy on the right, who were the daughters of Thomas, Viscount Savage. It was probably commissioned and painted to mark Dorothy's marriage in 1637 to Charles Howard, Viscount Andover, which explains the winged "putto" with a basket of roses, attribute of Saint Dorothea of Cappadocia, patron saint of brides and newly-weds, and an allusion to the sitter's name.

The portrait of Mary of Modena has been signed and dated 1679, (although the inscription was applied at a later date), and therefore she was not in any sense a "newly wed", but Viscountess Andover was a convert to Catholicism at the time of her marriage which caused considerable controversy. Dorothea of Cappadocia was a Christian saint and virgin martyr of Caesarea, condemned to death by Fabricius the Roman Governor in c.303 for refusing to recant her belief. The Golden Legend records that she was accosted on her way to be executed by the scribe Theophilus who requested that she send him roses from the garden of her heavenly bridegroom. A child appeared to Theophilus after her death and presented him with a basket of roses which encouraged his conversion. Viscountess Andover married and embraced the Roman Catholic church against all opposition, and Mary of Modena embraced England and a foreign Prince, against her own inclination for the good and glory of the Catholic church. Her resistance to marriage with James, Duke of York and her decision to become a nun was overcome only after she
received a Latin brief written by Pope Clement X addressed *Dilectae in Christo filiae Nobili Puellae Mariae Principessae Estensi. Clemens P.P.X.* that in a rambling, friendly and avuncular way makes his wishes quite clear:

> ... You can therefore easily understand, dear daughter in Christ, the anxiety which filled Us when We were informed of your repugnance for marriage ... We therefore, fulfilling the duties of Our charge, earnestly exhort you by these presents to place before your eyes the great profit which may accrue to the Catholic faith in the above-named Kingdom through your marriage, and that inflamed with zeal for the good which may result, you may open yourself a vaster field of merit than that of the virginal cloister ...

*Given at Rome XIX September MDCLXXIII the fourth year of Our Pontificate.*

(see Appendix D)

She submitted of course and her marriage raised the unwelcome spectre of a Catholic dynasty in England. Her husband’s conversion to Roman Catholicism meant that Charles II could easily be influenced by “Popish counsels”. James was unconvinced of the errors and iniquities of Popery, and so his brother Charles II ordered him and his wife not only to leave the court but the country. On 3 March 1679, after the Popish Plot and what Mary of Modena called “*the most melancholy Carnival I have seen in my life*”, they set sail for Holland and Brussels and the start of a period of exile that lasted, intermittently for nearly three years. She wrote home in June: “*i have no hops yett of going to my dear England again*”. In fact she went home to England in October,
although in November she went with the Duke of York to Scotland. They were recalled in January 1680 but by October 1680 they were to be in Scotland, holding court in Edinburgh until their return on 6 June 1682.  

In 1679, six years into her marriage, and before her exile to Scotland, we can see that in the portraits painted by Lely and his circle, and in the textual portraits, friendly and critical, an image of Mary of Modena is emerging which reflects the chosen view of her by others. We have no documentary evidence at all that she played any active part in the way she was represented in her early portraits, although we can reasonably assume that she may well have done, and would have been aware of the prevailing conventions. As a “sitter” her face, praised for its beauty, is only a small aspect of her “portraits”; her most distinctive features are her poses, her gowns, her bunched ringlets, her “otherness” and her religion, but not her face. These artists of both the visual and the textual portrait avoided particular details in favour of a more general observation on women and beauty, and so bequeathed to posterity a distorted image.
CHAPTER 4

"A drop of poison or a popish knife ..."256: Mary of Modena

as an "outsider" patron and subject

Mary of Modena’s public image was something that she was not able to control herself; her personal qualities were not the issue as the previous chapter argues. She was praised for her beauty, grace and kindness, but she had representations thrust upon her that were the result of pre-existing prejudices which were mostly negative – that is that she was an Italian, that she had links with France through her family, particularly as she was "great niece to the late Cardinal Mazarin"257, and her Catholic religion which provoked the observation that "a prince in Italy, to the thinking of the ordinary people is too near the holy see of Rome"258. This chapter looks at Mary of Modena both as a patron of, and as a subject for representation by, artists and writers who were themselves "outsiders". This raises the question did those who had first-hand experience of "otherness" represent her in a more sympathetic light, or was this factor simply not an issue.

Contempt of strangers and the strength of English patriotism feature in contemporary visitors’ accounts of English attitudes towards them. Particular characteristics were ascribed to different countries to accentuate their differences from the English259. This xenophobia extended even to the neighbouring Scots, one of whom protested:

131
All nations on earth are regarded by them [the English] with an equal degree of contempt or hatred, which they are not at all solicitous to conceal; and upon the slightest provocation, or even without it, they will express their antipathy in such terms as these, "a chattering French baboon", "an Italian ape", "a beastly Dutchman", and "a German hog"...  

Stereotypes are not always illusions, although many are baseless and pernicious; foreigners and Catholics were the "outsiders", the "bêtes-noires" in seventeenth-century England, and women were beneath consideration. The writer Aphra Behn, who is discussed in the next chapter, was both Catholic and female and an apologist for the Stuarts, since the generous message of many of her texts was that the Stuarts were a force for good. This was not the view of John Evelyn who observed that more than a thousand spectators were treated to an elaborate mockery of Roman Catholicism on 5 November 1673, two weeks before Mary of Modena landed in England: "This night the youths of the City burnt the Pope in Effigie after they had made procession with it in great triumph...", he attributed the apprentices actions to their displeasure at the Duke of York "...for altering his Religion, & now marrying an Italian Lady etc ...", Mary of Modena was damned as an "outsider" three times over since she was an Italian, a "Lady" and a Catholic.
Constructing the "outsider"

In early modern Europe Christian identities were constructed in opposition to Islam, Judaism and heathenism and therefore religious difference became an index of, and metaphor for, racial and cultural difference. This generated the stereotypes of "outsiders", and not only those of ethnic difference, but those in Europe such as the French, the Italians and the Spanish. English satirical prints had increased in number in the seventeenth century and, for example, had expressed detestation of the Dutch as a treacherous, contemptible, fat, clumsy people addicted to cheese, brandy and herrings who live in a land encumbered with frogs. English attitudes to France changed in the seventeenth century. Spain's growth of power had established Anglo-French cooperation under the Tudors and, in the 1590s, a triple alliance with Holland against Spain. The French Kings had not adopted the Inquisition, despite being Catholic, and Protestants had a degree of toleration in the Edict of Nantes.

However from the time of Charles I's marriage to Henrietta Maria, the court of the Stuarts became increasingly associated with Catholicism. The marriage to Henrietta Maria, sister to the French King was at first seen as a deliverance from a Spanish match, although she soon began to lose her initial popularity amid fears of the growth of Catholicism at Court. The diplomatic realities of European royal marriages had the inevitable consequence that all British Queen consorts were foreigners and she was one of four Catholic consorts who headed the list of immigrants to England who hardened English attitudes during the seventeenth century. Anna of Denmark, wife to James I and mother to Charles I had been instructed in Catholicism by Father Abercromby and been
converted to the faith, but there is some doubt as to "whether she died a Catholic"\(^{263}\). Mary of Modena and the Portuguese wife of Charles II, Catherine of Braganza were both devout Catholics. Charles II’s two pre-eminent mistresses, the Duchess of Cleveland and the Duchess of Portsmouth were Catholics and his wife had many Catholic servants and had the Portuguese ambassador as her chamberlain for a time. On 12 February 1674 a Grand Committee of the House of Lords discussed "Papists" in the Queen’s "Family". Not only did they resolve that "the word Portugal be altered into foreigners", but that no Jesuits were in future to be admitted to take up vacancies for priests in the household of Catherine of Braganza.\(^{264}\)

From the Tudors onwards, anti-Catholicism was a dominant theme in English political life. Mary Tudor’s reign had demonstrated that Protestants were persecuted by Catholic regimes; the Gunpowder Plot was just one of the spectacular plots against the English, the Irish Massacres of 1641 were on the list of wicked deeds attributed to Papists, while the most damaging of all stories was that James, Duke of York and the Jesuits had started the Great Fire of London in 1666 and others afterwards that were propagated in a series of "Fire Libels" from 1667 onwards\(^{265}\). Anti-Catholicism became embedded in Protestantism since it could be turned against Methodists, Unitarians, republican sympathisers and all “others" who were not “one of us”. By 1674 hostility to growing French power led to Charles II abandoning support of France in the Third Anglo-Dutch War, and in 1677 there was a partial reconciliation with Holland. The Popish Plot whipped up anti-French hysteria and the so-called “Glorious Revolution" of 1688 was seen as a Protestant deliverance from French influence. Within a hundred
years the English perceived France to have supplanted Spain as the leading Catholic power in Europe. The extent of the change in perception is manifest in the dispatch to the Doge and Senate from Girolamo Alberti the Venetian Secretary in England who recorded a remark made to him by the Spanish ambassador that:

"... the duke of York was too partial to France, and that was the reason, not the marriage to a Catholic, why he suffers so much persecution at the moment ... the truth is that the position of France is not growing worse as she is already detested in England ... the duke suffers for the sake of France, his enemies having multiplied because he took his wife at their hands ...".

The people who ultimately suffered were the Catholic victims of political, rather than religious, persecution.

Strangely enough it was through the distortions in the translation by a French Huguenot, Innocent Gentillet, of Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince* which confirmed the suspicions of the Elizabethans about all things Italian. Originally published in Italy in 1532, publication of *The Prince* was long banned in England; its notoriety ensured that copies in French and Italian found their way across the Channel, and those who had not read it knew its reputation through Gentillet's *Anti-Machiavel* of 1576. Finally translated into English and published in London in 1602 it set the scene for Italy being synonymous with the destruction of virtue since Gentillet described *The Prince* as a "deadly poison sent out of Italy". The "wicked, impious and detestable" doctrine of "that most filthy
Atheist" had left no "kind of wickedness to build a tyranny, accomplished of all abominable (sic) vices"."267.

Michel Foucault made the point in Power/Knowledge that each society has its own general politics of truth: truth for Foucault was discourse, a language game which acts as censor. "Truth" was a useful fiction that is in discourse by virtue of power, and power uses the term "truth" to exercise control, define normality and boundaries in order to exclude, or exploit, others268. The character-type of the Machiavel, Machiavelli’s disciple, an unprincipled and power-hungry Italian villain hero appeared frequently in English stage literature of the period; for example Christopher Marlowe’s characters Barabas and Ithamore in The Jew of Malta (1589), and Shakespeare’s Richard III269, reinforcing and popularizing the thundering tones of the Calvinist preacher in Gentillet that Italy and the Italians could be equated with "perfidy ... so detestable to God and to the whole world"270. Italian taste echoed in sculpture and architecture throughout Europe, as it did in painting, and there were few poets who would not have seen desirable models in Petrarch and Ariosto. Yet all original “messages” of literary and artistic ideas acquire a different emphasis as they are passed along and become distorted or drowned in different regions; this Italian “character” imported from Italy did not transform England’s indigenous culture, but it left a notorious and “popular” impression of the Italian.

Not only did Anna of Denmark, Henrietta Maria, Catherine of Braganza and Mary of Modena provoke animosity against themselves because they were not English and were Catholics, there was hostility towards the foreign trains they brought with them who
were given English offices and places, honours and land. Attitudes to all foreign immigrants were guarded; Protestant immigrants were admitted and 40-50,000 French Huguenots came over in the 1680s, but this influx tested both England’s economy and the tolerance of English artisans severely. Many more Italians than the Earl of Peterborough had been told to allow came over with Mary of Modena. She had a large staff and the list of Italians included ladies-in-waiting Contessa Vittoria Davia Montecuccoli, Contessa Lucretia Pretonari Vezzani, Contessa Torriesi and Contessa Eleonora Molza, one of her six women of the bedchamber Pellegrina Turini, her chaplain Dr Jacques Ronchi, her confessor Father Antonio Guidici, a valet, a page, a maître d’hôtel and two cooks.

Part I

Mary of Modena and Music

A more extreme reception was accorded the professional immigrant with a particular skill, than to an ordinary foreign tourist or member of a royal household, since the professional merit, particularly of artists and musicians, was a threat to English livelihoods. In the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century Italian “prima donnas” and “castrati” were the butt of the print makers and satirists since Italian opera was by then the rage of fashionable London. Charles II had brought in Italian musicians in 1664 soon after the Restoration and they continued their role at court until the “revolution” in 1688. The periods of their service are difficult to determine, but Giovanni Sebenico, the principal organist and an able singer joined the King’s Italian
musicians in 1666 and became their master in 1668, and Matteo Battaglia of Bologna the master in 1669. Giovanni Battista Draghi became a thoroughly English subject known as Mr Baptist; a keyboard player, he was in London soon after 1662 joining Vincenzo and Bartolomeo Albrici who were musicians at court. He became master of the King’s Italian musicians by 1673, supervising, along with Sebenico, the music in Catherine of Braganza’s chapel thought to be the best place to hear Italian music in London. John Evelyn records in his diary that on 19 November 1674 he heard the “stupendious (sic) Violin Signor Nicholao (with other rare Musitians) whom certainly never mortal man Exceeded on that Instrument ...” and on 2 December “… Signor Francisco on the Harpsichord, esteem’d on(e) of the most excellent masters in Europe on that Instrument: then came Nicholao with his Violin & struck all mute …”.

Mary of Modena came to court in November 1673 and her arrival appears to have stimulated more musical activities since she was a knowledgeable music lover; Mr Baptist (Giovanni Battista Draghi, who had studied in Venice, Italy’s major opera centre), became her favourite composer. John Evelyn had seen on 5 January 1674 a few weeks after her arrival “… an Italian Opera in musique, the first that had ben (sic) in England of this kind …”275. There had been several attempts to establish an Italian opera company and Charles II had granted Guilio Gentileschi permission to establish an Italian opera house in 1660 and bring in the necessary musicians276. The opera that Evelyn saw probably involved a new group of Italian musicians brought to London for Mary of Modena’s private chapel277. Evelyn’s diary entry has been much disputed since some scholars think that he saw an opera sung in Italian by members of the “King’s Italian
Musick” while others such as E.S. de Beer contend that Evelyn actually saw the French opera *Ariane*. It is conventional to assume that the Restoration court always followed where the French had led, but as a member of one of the greatest dynasties of Italian patrons, the Este, Mary of Modena’s presence in England was certain to have an effect on the type of music performed.

**Her Image in the Text**

**Ariane**

Late seventeenth-century French and Italian operas were occasional, their premières frequently planned to coincide with celebrations of political events like coronations, victories and royal weddings. The French opera that de Beer thinks Evelyn attended, *Ariane, on Le Mariage de Bacchus*, was occasioned by the marriage of Mary of Modena with James, Duke of York in the face of the objections of the Earl of Shaftesbury and others who feared another incursion of Catholicism into the Stuart royal family. It is doubtful that this was “Evelyn’s” opera since it was sung in French, with a libretto by Pierre Perrin. It was performed on 30 March 1674 at the Theatre Royal Drury Lane to a score (which doesn’t survive) of a revision by the Spanish Luis Grabu, Master of the King’s Music, of the original by Robert Cambert. Cambert was a French exile attached to the English court and in late January or early February 1674 his *Ballet et musique pour le divertissement du roy de la Grande-Bretagne* was performed at court also in celebration of James and Mary of Modena’s marriage. The text for this was supplied by a minor French novelist from Provence, Sébastien Brémond who, it appears, was also responsible for the new, rewritten allegorical prologue for *Ariane* that made the opera’s
story topical. *Ariane* was originally a simple *comédie en musique* about the wooing of Ariane by Bacchus and the ensuing wedding and coronation celebrations. It was originally commissioned by Mary of Modena’s uncle Cardinal Mazarin in 1659 for the negotiations of the marriage of Louis XIV and the Infanta of Spain, Maria Theresa, although never performed formally. It could be that this was an acknowledgement by Charles II of Mary of Modena’s French connections while the subject of the opera was eminently suitable for celebrating this marriage; the five-act opera had a larger cast, more complex plot including an opposing "war" contingent of Mars, Bellone and their entourage, *corps de ballet* and spectacular machine effects.

It is the new prologue that sets the opera firmly in 1674, celebrating Mary of Modena’s marriage, since it is set on the banks of the Thames and enacted by four nymphs, three of whom arrive on a large mother-of-pearl shell, who represent the rivers Tiber, Seine and Thames. In an engraving from the libretto (London, 1674), the design for the prologue (fig.73) London and the River Thames can be seen with 3 nymphs representing the Thames, Tiber and Seine with the shell in the background. It comments on events surrounding Mary of Modena’s marriage including her journey from Italy, via Paris to England, designated the isle of love. Near the end of the prologue the fourth nymph, representing the River Po (Italy for Mary of Modena), enters and celebrates the recent marriage of the Yorks:

"Suffer this happy Day, that I
May through thy Chrystal Waves draw nigh,"
And my Princess divine,
To thy great Heroe joine.
I Through the fierce Billows have past,
Of two Seas deep and vast,
By Rocks and Mountains ran,
To Mortal-men unknown:
Leaving my fertil Plains, and Shoars, to bring
A Royal Sister to thy Greatest King.

Thamesis, in her song of welcome, acknowledges the initial lack of enthusiasm for the Duke of York’s marriage, although the people honour and love the new Duchess:

And thou maist see his People now,
To thy Princess, both love and honor (sic) shew:
This Bliss, thou ow’st to her alone, whose Charm,
In ‘spight of Fate, all resistance disarm:
And makes Envy it self t’adore
Her now, whom it oppos’d before\(^2\).\(^8\)

This was a prologue written in praise of, and in celebration of, England, (including France’s praise of England’s naval power), and it acknowledges dissent about the marriage. Christina Bashford argues that this must have been written by someone who was resident in England, probably a Frenchman eager to toe the royalist line: the
novelist Brémond having captured the attention of the King and the Duke of York with his novel of 1673 *Le Cécile ou conversations galantes* seems to be the chief contender.\(^{282}\) The opera was seen as overtly royalist and because of anti-Catholic and anti-monarchist sentiment it was, not surprisingly, poorly received and the opera, along with its mother-of-pearl shell bearing the nymphs, sank without trace to the extent that only the libretto, but no music survives from 1674.

The libretti, both in English and French, were produced by the royal printer Thomas Newcombe; contemporary English sources, including Newcombe, say nothing of Robert Cambert as composer of the lost music although he was in London when *Ariane* was staged, and all attribute the music to Luis Grabu. But Cambert was a recent immigrant whereas the French-trained Spaniard Grabu had been in England since 1665, firstly as “composer-in-ordinary” for the King’s private music and in 1666 as the Master of the King’s Music. His preferments, including control of the select band of 12 violins as Master of the King’s violins, was greatly resented by English musicians, particularly John Banister\(^{283}\) who was ousted by Grabu from the King’s Violins. Grabu aroused the hostility of the ambitious composer Pelham Humfrey who, Pepys thought, had become more French than the French and consequently thought himself superior to everyone, particularly to Grabu. Humfrey complained to Pepys that: “... *Grebus (sic) the Frenchman, the King’s Master of the Musique, how he understands nothing nor can play on any instrument and so cannot compose*”.\(^{284}\) Grabu’s standing at court was not improved with his involvement with *Ariane*, since English musicians attacked both his character and his professional competence. After the production of *Ariane* in 1674 he
was replaced as Master by Nicholas Staggins, an overtly political, rather than an artistic, decision. On 31 March 1679 Grabu and his family were issued with passports, and, because they were also Catholics they returned to France during the years following the Popish Plot. Grabu’s reputation for incompetence was undeserved and he was a victim of sustained character assassination because of his nationality and religion. Charles II survived the turbulent years between 1678 and 1682 starting with the witch hunt of the Rye House assassination plot and the attempt in the Exclusion Crisis to block his brother James’s succession, because James and his wife Mary of Modena were Catholics. Consequently, Charles wanted something “at least like an Opera in England” in celebration to commemorate the occasion.

**Albion and Albanius**

Actor manager Thomas Betterton was dispatched by Charles II to Paris in 1683, to “fetch ye designe” for a full-scale opera in the French style, but after various vicissitudes returned with Grabu instead. The result was the first full-length, all sung English opera *Albion and Albanius*. In the prologue, Dryden takes the stance of the poet who resorts to opera because it is the only thing that a “weak” audience will accept, and since it was finally performed in front of the recently crowned James and Mary of Modena he says the show was invented by “the Wise Italians”, was developed by the French but accepted last by the English. Much to the annoyance of English musicians, Grabu wrote the music for this *tragédie en musique* which was performed at Dorset Garden Theatre, on 3 June 1685 only after the untimely death of Charles II on 6 February 1685 in the midst of final rehearsals.285
Albion and Albanius is an allegory, with Albion representing Charles II and Albanius the Duke of York; it makes a political statement in that the prominent role of Mary of Modena’s husband as Albanius was a public affirmation of the Catholic succession. Grabu wrote in the preface to the full score published in 1687 that the opera’s plot “was too thin a Veil for the Moral not to shine through the Fable”286. The libretto was written by John Dryden who converted to Roman Catholicism after the accession of James in 1685; his conversion coincided with the public performance of his robustly political Albion and Albanius287. Thus through his conversion to Roman Catholicism at the end of 1685 he too became an “outsider” and lost his posts as Poet Laureate and Historiographer Royal with the arrival of the Protestant William III.

Dryden’s conversion was probably not to curry favour with his royal patrons with one eye on preferment; Charles II owed him £1,075 when he died, James was unlikely to make good the arrears, and his Laureateship was already confirmed. It seems that James’s accession increased Dryden’s contact with prominent Catholics, including James Corker; Corker was a Benedictine, one of the order which had taken charge of Mary of Modena’s chapel in St. James’s Palace, and it was he who received Dryden into the Roman Catholic Church. In the preface to Albion and Albanius Dryden wrote that “Tis my part to Invent, and the Musicians to Humour that Invention”. He strenuously defends Grabu against his critics arguing that with “his Genius” and “his Skill” ... “he seems to have enter-d into my thoughts, and to have been the Poet as well as the Composer”. This
says Dryden is not flattery but a just assessment of his "extraordinary Tal lent". He is keen to draw attention to:

"... some English Musicians, and their Scholars, (who are sure to judge after them,) the imputation of being a French-man, is enough to make a Party, who maliciously endeavour to decry him. ... When any of our Country-men excel him, I shall be glad, for the sake of old England, to be shown my error: in the meantime, let Vertue be commended, though in the Person of a Stranger."\(^{288}\)

However, their opera failed because of Charles II's death; this meant that the original purpose of the opera's commission was lost. This, together with Charles's illegitimate son the Duke of Monmouth's Rebellion that closed all the theatres, led to failure, rather than Grabu's incompetence as a composer and his failure to "humour" Dryden's invention as alleged by his detractors. Dryden's subtle allusions to contemporary events are hardly "invention". Zelota and Pluto are the perpetrators of the Popish Plot and most of the action in Act 2 and Act 3 centres on the attempts to undermine Albion/Charles's reign and the reasons for Albanius/James being sent into exile with his wife.\(^{289}\) Zelota tells Pluto that:

\begin{verbatim}
Y'have all forgot
To forge a Plot
In seeming Care of Albion's Life;
Inspire the Crowd
\end{verbatim}
With Clamours loud

’T’involve his Brother and his Wife.

(II, i, 84-9)

This quite obvious allusion to the Popish Plot to undermine the Catholic succession of James and Mary of Modena occurs in the second act. Given Dryden’s allegiances and their practical political manifestations he was astute in giving James a role just before the death of the king. His appearance makes a political point, since James was both Duke of York and of Albany and represented the unwavering dogma of Stuart royalism in a way that the easy going Charles had not. Dryden was inflexible in his loyalty to James and Mary of Modena; the act of this performance was in itself a political event synonymous with the masque of the earlier seventeenth century, and the subsequent publication of the folio edition, with Grabu’s dedication to James in 1687, just as much an affirmation of loyalty. The publication of the 1691 edition was even more so, and could be considered a Jacobite gesture of defiance given that James and Mary of Modena had fled into exile in France and the Protestant William of Orange was esconced on the throne.

Psyche

Seventeenth-century dramatists were accustomed to inventing emblematic characters and symbolic actions based on people and events that seemed to have inspired their plots. Dryden was the master at weaving political allusion into drama, and in Psyche Thomas Shadwell is no less adept. While it can be seen as simplistic to find that
any drama written in this period can be interpreted allegorically, the semi-opera *Psyche*, with a libretto by Shadwell and music by Matthew Locke and Giovanni Battista Draghi, has as its story one which parallels the controversial aspects of the York/Modena marriage of October 1673. It was probably commissioned by Thomas Betterton in October 1673, yet another work planned to celebrate the marriage of James, Duke of York and Mary of Modena since Shadwell’s preface makes clear that much of the libretto was written sixteen months before its first performance at the Dorset Garden Theatre, London on 27 February 1675, that is in October 1673 shortly before Mary of Modena’s arrival in England. Shadwell based his libretto on the “tragédie-ballet” *Psyche* (1671) by Lully with words by Molière, Corneille and Quinault. He altered the story to reflect the circumstances surrounding the marriage, in which a princess (Mary of Modena) who is more beautiful than Venus (Catherine of Braganza) is married to a dreadful Monster (James Duke of York and England), but who turns out to be the god of love.

Shadwell slyly alludes to the beautiful Mary of Modena’s preference to enter the Visitation Convent rather than to become a royal wife, with the attendant difficulties and resentment this engendered. So Princess Psyche, as the most beautiful woman in the world, in the first act is in a rustic retreat from the strife at court, being entertained by Pan. Her peace is disrupted by Envy and Ambition and then by the courting of two princes Nicander and Polynices, rivals for her hand. Curtis Price argues that the fact

“... they later become symbiotic champions of her liaison with Cupid is an added twist by Shadwell and “may refer to the proxy marriage at Modena in September
1673, when Henry Mordaunt, second Earl of Peterborough, stood as substitute for the Duke of York. Seconding him as emissary for Louis XIV was Philippe de Courcillon, Marquis of Dangeau. Having been on opposite sides in the Second Dutch War, the two men now shared the honour of escorting Mary to London.

Nicander and Polynices perform a similar duty for Psyche in the first scene of Act 5. 

This is an ingenious reading, and since Shadwell’s libretto was an overtly political message that Shaftesbury’s fears were unfounded and that the marriage of Mary of Modena to James, Duke of York who was not the Catholic “monster” he claimed, it is a well-founded one.

Shadwell’s Christian piety was always in doubt, and it is certain that he was not a devout Christian. He was the subject of a pamphlet war in which he was accused of being both an atheist and a papist, and during January and February 1681 he was reported to be “a Papist, married by a Popish Priest; And that all his Writings and Railings against the Church of England, was to promote the Church of Rome’s”. While Shadwell’s response was reported to be “Come, Dam Religion, Let’s Drink aboet”, it is obvious that he sees Mary of Modena as something of a sacrificial victim when in Act 2 the oracle announces that Psyche is to be sacrificed in the Temple of Apollo:

You must conduct her to that fatal place ...

On Venus Rock upon the Sea,

She must by you deserted be;
A poys'rous Serpent there she'll find
By Heav'n he Psyche's Husband is design'd.

(II, i)

The “poys'nous serpent” is James, Duke of York, and England the “Rock upon
the Sea”, a rather apt description for Mary of Modena’s initial reaction when she was told
of her fate; according to Peterborough’s memoirs she told him that “if he had interests in
his Masters, he would oblige her, by endeavouring yet to divert any further persecution of
a Maid, who had an invincible aversion for marriage”292. This was carefully labelled the
English Opera, although it was a venture which included Italian and French musicians.
On balance the work has French elements but the emphasis on other elements, Italian and
English, indicates a shift in taste to the more elaborate entertainment of the Italians.

Music Patronage

By 1677, four years after Mary of Modena’s arrival, Italian taste was well
established in London since Roger North comments:

During the first years of Charles II all music affected by the beau-mond run into
the French way; and the rather, because at that time the master of the Court
Music is France, whose name was Babtista, (an Italian frenchyfyed) had
influenced the French style by infusing a great portion of the Italian harmony into
it; whereby the Ayre was exceedingly improved293.
The Italian virtuoso violinist Nicola Matteis arrived in the early 1670's, (possibly 1670, at about the same time as Mary of Modena) and until 1685 with Charles II's death, Italian music, rather than French, was most favourably received. After his death French musicians lost out altogether when Mary of Modena became Queen Consort and the leading arbiter of music at court. An unpopular choice of bride and the subject of vicious rumour with her arrival in 1673 (fig. 74)\textsuperscript{294}, by the time of the coronation in 1685 her dignity in the face of adversity had earned her the respect of many people, although she had always been celebrated for the more superficial qualities of her youth and beauty.

She left her mark on English music in a number of ways, principally as an inspiration for composers. Apart from the music composed to celebrate her marriage to James, Duke of York, Cambert's \textit{Ballet de musique ..., Ariane, ou le mariage de Bacchus} and \textit{Psyche}, Henry Purcell wrote an anthem "My heart is inditing" for the coronation of James II but it actually belonged to Mary of Modena's part of the coronation ceremony as James's Queen Consort who "At his right hand shall stand the Queen". With the death of Charles II, it has been argued by Martin Adams, Purcell was freed from the King's "Francophilia" and began to develop "stylistic conflations", moving towards "the methods of Italian composers"; the symphony to Mary of Modena's coronation anthem "My heart is inditing" Adams sees as "something of a landmark" in this development\textsuperscript{295}. Francis Sandford's detailed illustrated account of the coronation, published in 1687, offers information about the performance of "My heart is inditing" (fig. 75). For instance that the singers in the gallery on the left belonged to the Chapel Royal, and were supported by a small organ provided for the purpose by Purcell in his
capacity of Keeper of the Organs. The artist of fig. 75 has indulged in some artistic licence because it shows the performance of an anthem during the crowning of James, although Sandford records that no anthem was sung at that point. Mary of Modena is shown seated on the left in the illustration with the Duchess of Norfolk standing to her right in the panoramic view of fig. 75 while fig. 76 shows Mary of Modena with the Duchess in greater detail; both of these illustrations are from Sandford's The History of the Coronation ... of James II ... And of his Royal Consort Queen Mary (1687).

Mary of Modena was the recipient, in early 1688, of another anthem “Blessed are they that fear the Lord”, by Purcell. Although this time, it was in celebration of her pregnancy after a long series of miscarriages, since it was for “the Thanksgiving appointed to be in London & 12 miles round Jan 15 1687 [old style] & on the 29th following over England for Queen’s being with Child”. The announcement in January 1688 that Mary of Modena was pregnant caused a crisis that had been rumbling for years between James and the Protestants, since it raised the spectre of a Catholic heir to the throne; her son James Francis Edward born on 10 June precipitated the “revolution” at the end of the year which sent James II, Mary of Modena and their son into exile in France.

The traditional view, articulated by Charles Burney, is that under an openly Catholic king and his wife, there was a decline in royal music:
King James II was too gloomy and bigoted a prince to have leisure or inclination or cultivating or encouraging the liberal arts; nor, indeed, does he seem to have revolved any other idea in his mind, than the romantic and impracticable plan of converting his three kingdoms to the Catholic faith.

There is no sign that the royal patronage of music declined; this is surely mere Whig prejudice, since patronage certainly did decline after the “Glorious Revolution”, when in 1689 the court was no longer the important musical centre it had been.

The drastic deterioration in the quantity and quality of church music has been ascribed to William III’s character and his lack of interest in music in general. Under the Catholic James and Mary of Modena the Anglican Chapel Royal certainly did not enjoy its previous status, and the setting up of the new Roman Catholic Chapel Royal at Whitehall staffed by foreign singers caused resentment in English professional circles. Roger North, Mary of Modena’s Solicitor, and from October 1685 her Attorney General, who was responsible for having her “picture to be graved by Mr White, all which were imprinted on all the Queen’s patents ...” discusses in his essays on music a Saxon musician called Captain Prencourt with whom he was associated, who was probably a Jesuit. He had a brief career in the new Catholic Chapel Royal since he was both an organist and played the harpsichord. From 1688 with the arrival of William III and Mary, the “Popish Chapel” was finished, the musicians left to themselves and Captain Prencourt had to make his living through teaching and composing.
The new Chapel Royal was opened publicly on Christmas Day 1686 and the vacancy for a Catholic court composer was filled by the Italian Innocenzo Fede, the maestro di capella of S. Giacomo degli Spagnouli, Rome. John Evelyn was an early visitor who admitted that the Italian music was superb, recording in his diary for 5 January 1687: "I was to heare the Musique of the Italians in the new Chapel, now first of all opned at White-hall publiquely for the Popeish Service: ... [It was] a world of mysterious Ceremony the Musique play[jing & singing: & so I came away: not believing I should ever have lived to see such things in the K. of Englands palace ..."³⁰³. Evelyn did not allow his prejudice against the importation of Italians and Catholicism through the influence of Mary of Modena to stop him going again, since on 30 January 1687 he heard "... the famous Cifecio (Eunuch) sing, in the new popish chapell this afternoone, which was indeede very rare, & with greate skill: He came over from Rome, esteemed one of the best voices in Italy, much crowding, little devotion"³⁰⁴. Evelyn is here referring to the castrato Giovanni Francesco Grossi (1653-1697) known as Siface. He came to London when Mary of Modena became Queen Consort; she had written to her younger brother Francesco II, by then Duke of Modena, to request the loan of his musicians. She also obtained musicians from Rome for the Catholic Chapel Royal; in fact records show that under James II and Mary of Modena a full musical establishment was started which eclipsed the original Chapel Royal.

There was an attempt to improve court administration, and although there was an effort to pay off the enormous accumulated arrears left by Charles II, musicians' traditional difficulty in getting paid continued. Nevertheless the new monarchs were
interested in court music and the secular musicians at court were members of a single
“Private Music” consisting of the Master of the Music, thirty three rank-and-file members
and an instrument keeper. Henry Purcell was described as harpsichordist rather than
composer, but there is a surviving copy of Purcell’s bill for a variety of outstanding
payments in this period which includes numerous rehearsals of court odes; the many
rehearsals indicate that a high quality of performance was expected and appreciated by
James II and Mary of Modena. It is possible that Purcell, who had a Catholic father-in-
law, was himself either a Catholic or had Catholic sympathies. However he did set some
anti-Catholic verses as catches, such as “Now England’s great council’s assembled” (Z
261) which condemns Jesuit plots, and “True Englishmen drink a good health to the
mitre” (Z 284) which supports the Seven Anglican Bishops imprisoned in 1688 by James
II. While we know nothing for sure about his religion or his political opinions, we can
reasonably conclude that like musicians, poets and artists down the centuries he would be
unwilling to offend the hand that fed him or promised to feed him, and that he may have
been equivocating.

Calisto

Shortly after her arrival in England, Mary of Modena was credited with helping to
plan the general shape of the 1675 “Maske at Whitehall”, Calisto: or, The Chaste Nimph
which had begun to occupy the attention of the court from late summer of 1674 about 8
months after her arrival. Calisto was set to music by Nicholas Staggins who had
replaced Grabu as Master of the King’s Musick; the libretto was written by the young
playwright John Crowne. He linked politics with love, based on the second book of
Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and dedicated it to Mary of Modena’s step-daughter, the twelve year old Princess Mary who played Calisto. It has been called a “lavish pastoral-ballet”, but is more of a long allegorical drama with 111 performers and spoken by some 12 “noble” ladies of the court and 8 gentlemen who danced in the prologue, the musical scenes confined to the prologue and entr’actes performed by professionals from the theatre. Mary of Modena’s involvement is posited since the form of *Calisto* is taken from the five-act spoken plays with musical *intermedii* performed at the weddings of Italian nobles in the late sixteenth century, and, so it is suggested, she would have been able to advise, although she was not one of the performers. One masque we know she was involved in was Dryden’s *An Evening’s Love; or, The Mock Astrologer*, after she came to the throne, when she advised on the costumes. John Povey wrote to Sir Robert Southwell in February 1686:

> ... The Masquers were twelve couples whose habits were of several nations, and prescribed by a picture sent to each of them from the Queen, and the least habit cost above a hundred pounds, and some above three hundred pounds, ...
Part II

The Theatre and Dedications: "... all are so ambitious of making their court to you."

At the request of her brother-in-law Charles II, Mary of Modena wrote on 9 February 1678 to her brother the Duke of Modena asking to borrow his acting companies to enliven English court entertainment. It seems that she enjoyed the public theatre too, given the number of performances she attended (see Appendix E). Yet David Roberts makes a somewhat sententious observation in The Ladies that she "... overcame an unfortunate early experience of the public stage to become, with her husband, a regular if somewhat aloof spectator." He ascribes this "unfortunate" experience to John Banks's successful play presented by the United Company, Vertue Betray'd, or, Anna Bullen. A Tragedy, but this is not a particularly "early" experience of the theatre for her since she saw it on 4 August 1682, almost nine years after her arrival. In this version of her life, Ann Boleyn, Henry VIII's second wife is "a Luth'ran" rather than a Catholic like Mary of Modena. She becomes a blameless victim of a series of court intrigues, and although a faithful wife is called "false" and accused of adultery, cast off and executed. The final scene focuses on her emotional suffering; no doubt that, although they were of different religions, there were many resonances, such as being a second wife and court intrigues, with which Mary of Modena could identify. Roberts argues that "... it was found, however, that the play, not quite the model "ladies" play which usually graced such occasions, forced the Duchess to keep to her bed after seeing it performed". However I assume that he has identified the wrong play. A much more likely "early experience" of an "unfortunate" play is Dryden's abject failure, the priapic The Kind Keeper, or Mr
Limberham which had only three performances before it was banned, probably by 21 March 1678. It has long been argued that the prime mover for the ban was Charles II or the Duke of York, since they were the most prominent “keepers” of mistresses in the country. But as Dryden wrote that the play owed its genesis to a story Charles II “the King ... who is parcell poet with me in the plot; one of the designes being a story he was pleas’d (sic) formerly to tell me”, it is unlikely. The King’s “designe” may be captured in the scene where Aldo entertains four or five prostitutes; this is not a “ladies” play but Dryden says in the Preface that it was intended as an “... honest satyre against our crying sin of keeping”. While the play offered many opportunities for displaying nudity, and also could have been offensive to Mary of Modena because of her husband’s penchant for keeping mistresses, the most plausible explanation for the person behind the ban is that offered by James Anderson Winn who suggests that it was not the King or the Duke of York, but Mary of Modena herself who objected because she saw in it reflections of her Italian entourage. In a scene which disparages both Italians and the Italian language, Woodall pretends to be an Italian “seignior” when he is caught “in flagrante delicto” with Mrs Tricksy, “a Termagant kept Mistress” who tells him he “... shall pass for my Italian Merchant of Essences”, but who replies that he speaks no Italian “... only a few broken scraps which I pick’d up from “Scaramouch” and “Harlequin” at Paris”. Many ridiculous “scraps” of Italian language are subsequently tossed about so that it is unsurprising there was disapproval in the York household. In the Dedication, Dryden writes that:
"... those Things which offended on the Stage, might be alter'd or omitted in the
Press: For their Authority is, and shall be ever sacred to me, as much absent as
present, and in all alterations of their Fortune, who for those Reasons have
stopp'd its farther appearance on the Theatre."316.

It seems that Dryden was keen to keep the patronage of the Duke and Duchess of
York, and this would fit their “Fortunes” at this date of 1678.

The Popish Plot of 1678-79, first stirred in September 1678 by Titus Oates,
caused MacCarthyite hysteria and forced Charles to send the Yorks into exile, first to
Brussels then to Scotland; Dryden’s dedication opens with reference to this as “... the
Great Plot of the Nation”317. The prospect of popery and subjugation to France and
Rome crystallized an opposition of Protestants, republicans and rebels to exclude James,
Duke of York from the succession and replace him with Charles II’s dim Protestant
bastard Monmouth. The conspiracy theory gained momentum with the mysterious
murder of a judge, Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, the seizure of Mary of Modena’s secretary
Edward Coleman for his supposedly treasonable correspondence with Père la Chaise, and
the exposure of the Earl of Danby revealing intrigue between Charles II and Louis XIV
that “agreed well” with Coleman’s letters. Hence anti-Catholicism reached near hysteria,
with broadsides and rumours persuading the public that James, Catherine of Braganza
and sundry Jesuits were to inaugurate Catholic rule by killing the King, putting London
to the torch and Protestants to the sword. As a result, thirty-five Catholics were executed
at the height of this mania.
Three years later with attempts at James’s exclusion thwarted, the Yorks returned and Dryden wrote separate prologues of welcome to London and the theatre for both James and Mary of Modena. The "PROLOGUE To The Dutchess On Her Return from SCOTLAND" was spoken at a performance of Thomas Otway’s Venice Preserv’d, or, a Plot Discover’d on 31 May 1682 at the Duke’s Theatre before Mary of Modena in honour of her first appearance at the theatre since her return; the "EPILOGUE to Her Royal Highness on Her RETURN from SCOTLAND" was written by Otway himself. The cause of this production was political and exploited the furore of the Popish Plot: although the scene is removed to Venice, it is a celebration of Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftesbury’s fall, and the collapse of the “Whigs” manoeuvres to exclude the Yorks from the succession. Antonio, in Venice Preserv’d, is a portrait of Shaftesbury which emphasises his lewdness, disability and oratorical presumption; it also resembles Dryden’s portrait of Shaftesbury the Whig leader as Achitophel in Absalom and Achitophel (1681) and the barely suppressed fury of The Medal (March 1682). These are all written with an unmistakable indication of their writers’ loyalties. Dryden’s Prologue was separately printed as a broadside the following day, and is a stately rhetorical panegyric in praise of Mary of Modena and her beauty, which has an undoubtedly partisan political stance:

When factious rage to cruel exile drove

The Queen of beauty and the court of love,

The Muses drooped with their forsaken arts,
And the sad Cupids broke their useless darts.
Our fruitful plains to wilds and deserts turned,
Like Eden's face when banished man it mourned.
Love was no more when loyalty was gone,
The great supporter of his awful throne. 320

(Lines 1-8)

Mary of Modena is Venus, the chief patron of the arts, but her absence has deprived culture and reduced aesthetic pursuits. Dryden alludes in lines 22ff to the Bible story of Joseph’s dream and seven years of famine, but does not forget to mention a welcome revival of the stage under the influence of her presence:

But now th’illustrious nymph returned again
Brings every grace triumphant in her train:
The wondering Nereids, though they raised no storm,
Foreslowed her passage to behold her form:
Some cried a Venus, some a Thetis passed,
But this was not so fair, nor that so chaste.
Far from her sight flew Faction, Strife and Pride,
And Envy did but look on her, and died 321.

(Lines 12-19)
Her return as "th'illustrious nymph" is another Stuart Restoration, since Mary of Modena's beauty has driven away political unrest and suffocated envy. Her eyes, like the Medusa's terrible head, are a powerful weapon, and Dryden emphasizes her purity and chastity as other weapons for the restoration of culture:

*Pleasing, yet cold, like Cynthia's silver beam,*

*The People's Wonder and the poet's theme.*

Her presence restores love and the arts and Dryden concludes his Prologue, with an appeal against "Faction" and "Discord".

Agnes Strickland, in her Victorian *Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest ...* (1856), unearthed stanzas to "York's lovely duchess" written during their exile in Scotland by what she calls "a now forgotten lyrist". The identity of the writer remains a mystery but reflects Dryden's and Otway's hopes:

*See, led by her great admiral, she is come,*

*Laden with such a blessing home*

*As doth surmount our joy;*

*And with a happy omen speaks the princely boy.*

*Heaven grant him live,*

*Our wonted peace and glory to retrieve;*

*And, by a just renown,*

161
Within its lawful centre fix the crown ... 323.

Otway's Epilogue has similar praise from her; he hopes that "... this poor Land ne'er lose that Presence more. With "Our mighty Blessing ... at last return'd/ The joy arriv'd for which so long we mourn'd" he also gives voice to the rumour that Mary of Modena was pregnant, and Otway hopes that a "Royal Boy" will be born 324. Unfortunately, she gave birth to a daughter Charlotte Mary in August 1682 who died in October of that year of convulsions 325. Otway however proclaims his allegiance to the hoped-for "Boy" as a successor to the King, although he concludes with a challenge to France and her power.

Otway was the son of the Reverend Humphrey Otway, the Rector of Woolbeding, Sussex, who was a loyalist and faithful to the Court; Thomas Otway had already dedicated Don Carlos to the Duke of York in 1676 and The Orphan: or, The Unhappy Marriage to Mary of Modena in 1680. Otway's allegiance to the Stuarts is plain in both the dedication of The Orphan to her and in the politicised Prologue which is offered as a tribute to James, Duke of York's naval victories, together with their return from exile in Scotland on 24 February 1680. It was a temporary return only, as the Exclusion Crisis was to peak in October that year:

Since back with joy and triumph he is come,
That always drove fears hence, ne'er brought 'em home.
Oft has he ploughed the boist'rous ocean o'er,
Yet ne'er more welcome to the longing shore,
Not when he brought home victories before.
For then fresh laurels flourished on his brow,
And he comes crowned with olive branches now³²⁶.

(Lines 26-32).

The play based on The History of Brandon, Part I of The English Adventures, (1676), possibly written by Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery is not overtly political, centred as it is on a private family in a rural retreat in Bohemia, and the competition between Polydore and Castalio, two brothers, for the love of their beautiful foster sister Monimia. Their father Acasto is a retired courtier determined to turn his back on the corruption of court life. But an atmosphere of court corruption pervades the play: Acasto frequently speaks of the evils of the court and the rakish Polydore has acquired "the arts of fine persuasion" which distinguished the "libertine" element of the court of Charles II. In setting the play in rural Bohemia, Otway can distance himself from his critique of the corrupt nature of the contemporary English political scene. It could be said that Acasto's loathing of the corruption of the court where neither merit nor honour are rewarded, but flattery and hypocrisy are the rule, reflect Otway's "outsider" status at this time; although he had royalist sympathies his impoverished state (he is said to have died from starvation in 1685 at the age of 34) and his comment that he received only "the pension of a prince's praise" rendered him "anti-court". It has been claimed that Mary of Modena did not respond generously as a royal patron to Otway, since she "failed to attend any of the first performances" and was "very much indisposed with a cold"³²⁷. Since the first
performance was somewhere between 24 February 1680, the date of her return and Saturday 6 March 1680 it is not surprising she failed to appear. In a letter to her brother on Monday 8 March 1680 she writes:

“I am at last arrived safe and sound in this place, where I hope to remain a long time, if God pleases. I would have written yesterday, but was still too much fatigued by the long sea voyage of eight days, and the number of people about me left me not an ounce of time”\textsuperscript{328}.

Otway remarks on her absence in his Dedicatory Epistle:

For though fortune would not so far bless my endeavours, as to encourage them with your royal Highnesses presence when this came into the world; Yet I cannot but declare it was my design and hopes it might have been your divertisement in that happy season when you returned again to cheer all those eyes that had before wept for your departure, and enliven all hearts that had drooped for your absence. When wit ought to have paid its choicest tributes in, and joy have known no limits, then I hoped my little mite would not have been rejected; though my ill fortune was too hard for me, and I lost a greater honour, by your Royal Highnesses absence, than all the applauds of the world besides can make me reparation for\textsuperscript{329}.
It can be inferred from Otway’s Epistle to Bentley that she did not make Otway the usual generous present for a printed dedication by an author of a play, who would usually expect to receive 20 guineas. Although he had drawn attention to her ancestors, the house of Este and their patronage of the arts: “For Tasso and Ariosto, some of the best, have made their names eternal by transmitting to after-ages the glory of your ancestors,” it is possible that she failed to respond since his Epistle to Bentley the publisher in *The Souldier's Fortune* (sic) his anti-whig city comedy (1680), six months afterwards points to Otway’s feelings of neglect:

> For Mr Bentley, you pay honestly for the Copy; and an Epistle to you is a sort of an Acquitance, and may be probably welcome; when to a Person of higher Rank and Order, it looks like an Obligation for Praises, which he knows he does not deserve, and therefore is very unwilling to part with ready Money for.

His theme of loyalty and rejection are echoed in the play when Beaugard remarks that “Loyalty and Starving are all one.” It can be concluded however, that it was not that Mary of Modena felt that Otway’s work was beneath her notice, but there were other important developments, such as her daughter’s illness in August and the threat of exile, the loss of children, friends and country which distracted her. Since the Exclusion crisis was growing again and the King’s ministers now claimed that there was a real danger of rebellion, Charles ordered James and Mary of Modena to prepare for their third term of exile, and a second long journey to Scotland; they left London on 20 October 1680. While she failed to see Otway’s play dedicated to her at this time of crisis, it was finally
presented at Court on Monday 10 January, nearly two years after she became Queen Consort and two years after Otway’s death.

Few women were in a position to be able to offer practical help and assistance to writers, although Thomas Otway, according to Thomas Wilkes in *A General View of the Stage*, did receive 20 guineas from a Duchess; he dedicated *Venice Preserv’d* to the Duchess of Portsmouth, the same play he wrote an *Epilogue* for to the disappointing Duchess of York on her return from Scotland. George Etheredge dedicated *The Man of Mode, or, Sir Fopling Flutter* to the Duchess of York, and the fact that dedications of plays were most frequently to Duchesses, whether or not they were interested in the form shows, according to David Roberts that “... only a few very distinguished ladies were thought capable of effective action in favour of a play”. Etheredge dedicated his comedy to Mary of Modena with the words:

*I am very sensible, madam, how much it is beholding to your indulgence for the success it had in the acting, and your protection will be no less fortunate to it in the printing: for all are so ambitious of making their court to you, that none can be severe to what you are pleased to favour.*

It was his third and last play first produced at the Dukes Theatre in March 1676, yet still seen at Court on 30 November 1685 after the Coronation, since every week there was a play at Court. It was a strange offering to the still very young Mary of Modena, since Dorimant the “hero” is very much an Italian “Machiavellian” character who
dissembles, is cunning and is frequently referred to as a “devil”. While he was a loyal
servant as a diplomat in Ratisbon during the reign of James when he succeeded his
brother Charles II, it seems Etheredge too suffered the neglect that Otway complained
about. In November 1688 at the time of the “Glorious Revolution” he wrote “At such a
time as this a man is not to wait for instructions, but to hazard all to save his King and
Country. I should be glad of a word now and then to encourage me but the want of that
shall never coole (sic) the passion I have to perform my duty”\textsuperscript{335}; he adopts a rather more
realistic approach than Otway.

Not only were prologues, epilogues and dedications of plays directed at Mary of
Modena but on a visit to Oxford made on 21 May 1683 a ceremony took place at the
Oxford Theatre when Verses to the Duke and Duchess of York and “Lady Ann” were
spoken and were followed by a brief “Pastoral”. It expresses the loyal feelings of the
Oxford Scholars towards them, since it was just over a year previously that Mary of
Modena had returned to London at the end of her Scottish exile to a clamour of praise
and rejoicing. On 6 May 1682, James had been sailing back to Scotland to collect her in
the Gloucester which had been wrecked with the loss of nearly 150 out of 250 courtiers
and seamen on board:

\textit{VERSES Spoken before the Duke and Dutchess of YORK and Lady ANN, In
Oxford Theatre, May the 21\textsuperscript{st}. 1683.}

\textit{By the Ld. S ... and Mr. C ...}
To the Duke

9 We miss a Royal Brother by his side;

Ld. S ...

10 We long'd to see those Charms which him o'recame,

Mr. C ...

You, Madam, was our only Joy and Pride,

To the Dutchess.

Who represented half the Stuarts Name

Ld. S ...

Wou'd you then know how much you're welcome here?

Think what a Joy in Loyal Breasts did Flow,

When fatal Gloster all our hopes did bear,

Which the Gods lost to shew their Care of You.

(Full text see end note)\textsuperscript{336}

It appears also that writers like Etheredge, Otway and Dryden dedicated their work to women because they subscribed to the conventional gender values seventeenth-century English society ascribed to the arts, particularly the “feminine” aspects of creativity traditionally symbolised by the figure of the muse. While the common notion was that woman was the weaker sex, Dryden’s “Epistle Dedicatory” to Mary of Modena in his published libretto The State of Innocence, and Fall of Man: an Opera (written in 1674) suggests that his view of women was sometimes at odds with the “opera’s”
mysogyny which he based on Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. He praises her virtue by
describing her “Majesty of Mind” as moral armour:

... *your Person is a Paradice, and your Soul
a Cherubin within to guard it. If the
excellence of the outside invite the Beholders,
the Majesty of your Mind deters them from
too bold approaches; and turns their
Admiration into Religion. Moral perfections
are rais’d higher by you in the softer Sex ... lines 21-28*337

Dryden was a conventional misogynist but in writing that “*Moral perfections are
rais’d higher*” in women he was refuting the assumption that women were open to
temptation and had inherited this weakness from Eve. He was of course also recognizing
that there was a very useful and long-standing link between court women, particularly
Duchesses, and masques, and drama with music. James I’s wife, Anna of Denmark,
participated in masques and worked closely with Inigo Jones and Ben Jonson on their
content, while Queen Henrietta Maria performed in many that were staged for Charles I’s
court. It was therefore not unexpected that Dryden should dedicate *The State of
Innocence* to Mary of Modena given her interest in music and musical events, and her
“Illustrious” “*Family of Este to which Ariosto and Tasso have ow’d their Patronage*”338.
Although not one note of music for this “opera” was ever written it gave Dryden an opportunity to acknowledge her beauty as a motive for the making of art. It has been argued that The State of Innocence, may have been intended to celebrate her marriage to the Duke of York in November 1673, since it was hastily written in a month and remained unrevised. Dryden announces his motive was her beauty; the “Epistle Dedicatory” is a sustained and rapturous panegyric on her beauty and virtue. It is far in excess of the usual “courtly” praise because he uses language from the writings of St. Teresa since he expected her to be conversant with them, and consequently to take his analogies seriously. Such passages abound:

“You render Mankind insensible to other Beauties ... You have subverted (may I dare to accuse you of it) even our Fundamental Laws; and Reign absolute over the hearts of a stubborn and Freeborn, people tenacious almost to madness of their Liberty”

while he manages to conflate St. Teresa with Milton’s images from Paradise Lost:

“I confess my self too weak for the Inspiration; the Priest was always unequal to the Oracle: The God within him was too mighty for his Breast: Her labour’d with the Sacred Revelation, and there was more of the Mystery left behind than Divinity it self would enable him to express. I can but discover a part of Your Excellencies to the World; ... Like those who have survey’d the Moon by Glasses, I can only tell of a new and shining World above us ... but Beauty is confin’d to a
more narrow compass: 'Tis only in Your Sex, 'tis not shar'd by many, and its
Supreme Perfection is in You alone ... the Prize of Beauty was disputed only till
You were seen; but now all Pretenders have withdrawn their Claims341.

Exaggeration was part of the “complimentary manner” although this is more
appropriate language for writing about the Virgin Mary than the Duchess of York; Steven
N. Zwicker rages against it as an “astonishing application”, since it utterly denies
Paradise Lost’s “... spiritual and ideological authority”342. Dryden of course had visited
Milton, (who died on 8 November 1674), to request permission to adapt Paradise Lost as
an opera; it could even be seen as emphasizing Christian unity rather than diversity, with
the still then Anglican Dryden adapting the Puritan Milton and dedicating it to a Catholic
Duchess343. Zwicker however concedes that Dryden, in working through the idioms of
patronage and praise, was probably “... indulging in a bit of scandalous political
flirtation”.344

Certainly Mary of Modena’s beauty was a danger to a Protestant succession given
Catherine of Braganza’s barren marriage to Charles II, but overall The State of Innocence
lacks direct political reference, and it is only in his dedication to Mary of Modena that he
asserts that her beauty dazzles even “stubborn” and “Free-born” English men, notably the
Whigs, the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Duke of Buckingham. The decision to dedicate it
to her suggests a political motive, since the timing of the publication was 12 February
1677 which was three days before Parliament reconvened. It offered an opportunity for
Dryden to praise James, Duke of York, although risking the charge of “Papist”, as a
"Prince .. whose conduct, Courage, and Success in War, whose Fidelity to His Royal Brother ... and whose Magnanimity in all His Actions, seem to have been rewarded by Heaven by the gift of you "345. Perhaps The State of Innocence is best seen as Dryden's political act of loyalty to Mary of Modena's husband James, Duke of York, and a gift of music to his music-loving Italian patron.
In assessing female patronage in the seventeenth century, social conventions that minimized a woman's individuality and autonomy, and also challenged the exercise of power, have to be considered. Natalie Zemon Davis argued that at the start of the sixteenth century, the elevation of some women into positions of authority, provoked concerns regarding woman's proper role and the threat, more generally, of female domination; consequently there was redefinition of the female role which tended to limit their activity as patrons. With social constraints on women, patronage could be seen as a form of self expression, an opportunity to achieve a certain authority by supporting the arts. The new feminine ideal was a passive role articulated by Baldesar Castiglione in *The Book of the Courtier* (1528); the third book is devoted to the qualities of the ideal court lady, the *donna di palazzo*, and centres on the knowledge of painting, music and literature necessary to her. This becomes a debate on the merits and equality of women compared to men, with Cesare Gonzaga arguing that a woman's function is to inspire male achievement, while the splendour of the courts depends on her.

Mary of Modena, as I have shown, was interested in music and the theatre and was both patron and inspiration; she requested the loan of her brother Francesco II's acting companies and borrowed his musicians. However it was only after women had been released from marital responsibilities, and were past child bearing, could they become really active in art patronage. Widows, such as Bess of Hardwick, gained control
of their finances, while Mary of Modena’s ancestor Isabella d’Este turned her attention to her projects after having borne children; Mary of Modena’s mother Laura Duchess of Modena, both widowed and released from childcare, went to live in Rome where she enlarged the convent of Ursuline nuns in the Via Vittoria and bestowed portraits of herself and her daughter in the refectory. This was not the case with Mary of Modena herself who, as a daughter of a dynasty of Italian patrons, nevertheless had examples of eminent patrons and collectors. Her immediate paternal ancestor, her grandfather Francesco I founded Modena’s picture gallery; Janet Southorn observes that the Este Gallery was formed from a number of pictures “salvaged from Ferrara, the rump of former family collections, [which] had been combined with new acquisitions in the creation of something new, whole and complete ...”. Her mother, as Regent after her husband Alphonso IV’s death, had the church of Sant’ Agostino rebuilt as an Este “Pantheon”. The Duchess Laura therefore promoted the dynastic interests of her husband’s family, gave expression to her piety and defined her own status as Regent. Donations and commissions of religious work for convents, churches and chapels extended outside the family but reflected back on the family as public patronage in the form of public piety and served wider dynastic interests. These were appropriate acts for Laura, Duchess of Modena, but for her daughter in England, an anti-Catholic country, they were not.

**Benedetto Gennari (1633-1715)**

Mary of Modena’s patronage of the arts was closely connected to her Catholicism, and her presence in England linked the country to the culture of Catholic
Europe. This was underlined when, just before the Stuarts finally went into exile in France as a result of their adherence to the Catholic religion, a new edition of Giovanni Torriani’s *Vocabolario italiano e inglese* was published in London in 1688 and dedicated to her\(^3\). Her countryman, Benedetto Gennari of Bologna, came to London in 1674 the year after her arrival in England. A nephew and pupil of Guercino\(^3\), he had spent sixteen months in Paris painting for Louis XIV whom he admired, and the Duc d’Orléans. Guercino, based in Cento, had as his patron Mary of Modena’s grandfather Francesco I so that Gennari’s choice of the English court as a base is no mystery. He would probably have stayed in France had she not come to England, since he secured a number of commissions, completing fifteen pictures while there; painters of the Bolognese school were well received in France\(^3\).

Although it was most likely that it was her presence in England which caused Gennari to alter his plans to return to Bologna, Mary of Modena’s commissions were modest, and it was not until she became Queen Consort that she was one of his major patrons. Gennari’s success had much to do with his Catholicism and his willingness not to specialize. He produced portraits, mythological themes and traditional images of the Roman Catholic faith, painting many devotional pictures for the Catholic Queen, Catherine of Braganza’s private apartments, as well as a series commemorating major Feast Days and some altar-pieces for her.

The relationship between artist and patron was beneficial to both since Gennari benefited from the financial rewards of employment, with a network of other patrons at
court including Charles II and Catherine of Braganza, as well as the prestige of serving eminent people; Mary of Modena defined her status in a small way at first as a female royal patron, commissioning devotional rather than purely aesthetic works. Gennari followed the Stuarts into exile in April 1689, joining the court at St. Germain-en-Laye, and only returned to Italy in April 1692, when Mary of Modena sent him to her brother where the commissions would be more lucrative than at the exiled court. He painted portraits of Mary of Modena’s uncle Duke Rinaldo II d’Este and his consort Carlotta Felicità of Brunswick, and entered the service of the Duke Vincenzo di Guastalla and also worked for Count Alfonso di Novellara.

Mary of Modena’s few commissions reflect the two most usual areas of female patronage, the church and the family. While the Duke of York commissioned mythological/classical pictures of Perseus and Andromeda (1674-75), Bathsheba, and Il genio della Poesia (1676), her first commission, according to Gennari’s own register (Raccolta di memorie di Benedetto Gennari), was a copy executed in c.1676-77 (fig.78) of a portrait by Lely of 1674, described by Gennari in his entry no.25 in his London list as: Un quadro mezza figura ritratto della signora Duchessa di Yorch che poi fu portato a Modena. This is based on Lely’s portrait painted to celebrate her marriage where she is shown picking orange blossom (see Chapter 2). The London and Modena courts often exchanged works of arts, including for example, a work by Grinling Gibbons the wood carver which found its way to the Este Collection in Modena. Female patrons were concerned with the continuity and promotion of the dynasty/family and Mary of Modena promoted the Stuart family, of which she became a member on
marriage. Gennari’s commissions register records that portraits of herself and her husband and of her two step daughters, the Princesses Mary and Anne, were commissioned to be sent to Modena (no.17 Un ritratto in un ovato della Principessa Maria e Principessa Anna sua sorella figlie del sig. Duca di Yorch e della sua prima moglie e questo fu mandato a Modena). A second portrait of her (fig.79), based on a portrait by Simon Verelst c.1675-8 (see below), was copied by Gennari in 1681 twice in small ovals which were to be presented “a due signori Italiani” (two Italian gentlemen)\(^358\), one of whom was thought to be Count Ugo Molza an intimate of the Este family.

Her first commission of a religious subject seems to have been in about 1677 when he painted a Penitent Magdalen for her bedroom at Windsor\(^359\), and later in 1682 he executed La Sacra Famiglia (now at Birmingham City Art Gallery) (fig.80) and St. François de Sales for her private chapel at St. James’s\(^360\). The purpose of these pictures was devotional not aesthetic; she stopped at Lyons on 22 and 23 October 1673 on her way to England, and in a letter to Sister Mary of the Visitation Convent at Modena she records her devotion to de Sales, the Bishop of Geneva (1567-1622), who had helped Jane de Chantal found the Order of the Visitation:

This morning we went to Communion at the Sisters of the Visitation, where is preserved the heart of my dear father, St. Francis of Sales, which I saw with the greatest of pleasure and kissed the case which contains it\(^361\).
Having been deprived of her vocation to enter the Order in Modena, she commemorated the sacrifice she had made for Catholicism by commissioning his "picture". Gennari records that he did another painting of the same size as the de Sales, showing St. Francis Xavier, and that they both were hung in the same private Chapel, one on the right hand side and the other on the left. St Francis Xavier was a Jesuit whose life was written by another Jesuit, Dominique Bouhours; Dryden translated this lengthy work by royal command and dedicated it to Mary of Modena shortly after the birth of James Francis Edward on 10 June 1688, which is discussed in Chapter 7. While the dedication comments on the efficacy of prayers to the saint by Louis XIV's mother, the previously "barren" Anne of Austria, it seems that Dryden, as a recent convert to Rome, had become an apologist for the Catholicism of the Stuarts, although he was an enemy of the Jesuit faction and the notorious father Edward Petre who exerted considerable influence over James when he became king. Dryden was put in a position of serving up propaganda with which he was not entirely in sympathy.

Once Mary of Modena became Queen Consort she was able to commission more religious work from Gennari, religion being one of the most important contexts for female participation in the cultural and spiritual life of this period. Her exercise of patronage in the form of piety culminated in a series of altarpieces for the Queen's Chapel, the focus of the court's religious life, until the King's new Catholic chapel at Whitehall was completed. The first, painted in 1685, was La Beata Vergine col Bambino e San Giuseppe (fig.81) possibly for the high altar and depicts Mary sitting with the child in her arms and St. Joseph who offers him a book to read. The second painting, which
Gennari records was also "for the Altar" in the Chapel at St. James's, was a Crucifixion with St. John, Mary Magdalen and the Virgin to be displayed every year at passiontide. He painted "the whole figure of St James" appropriately enough which Gennari said she had hung in one of the little side altars of her chapel at St. James. One of his last religious works for her chapel was Busto della Vergine (fig. 82) painted in 1688 to hang in the sacristy of her chapel. It is an exact copy of the face and physical position of the Virgin depicted in Gennari's La Sacra Famiglia of 1682 (see fig. 80). She was not involved, as many female patrons were, in any large architectural projects, but she did put in hand alterations at the Queen's Chapel which included a curved altar rail, and a "great niche" was "cut out of the maine wall" of the chapel in order to accommodate the font in 1686.

Foreign Painters

Benedetto Gennari and the decorative painter Antonio Verrio were the Italian representatives of painting at the English court, but there were many who were not Italian. Foremost among the other foreign artists for whom Mary of Modena sat were the Dutchman Simon Verelst and the German Caspar Netscher, as well as the French artist Henri Gascar favourite of Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth.

Gennari painted Mary of Modena on several occasions, notably copies of Verelst's and Lely's early portraits of her to be sent to Italy as gifts, but he went on to do original portraits of her when he followed her into exile in France (see Chapter 8). A portrait traditionally attributed to Gennari (fig. 83) supposedly of Catherine of Braganza is
now thought to be of Mary of Modena\textsuperscript{370}. It is certainly not Catherine of Bragazna and bears a strong facial resemblance to Verelst's portrait of Mary of Modena which Gennari had copied (fig.85). The hairstyle is the same, although Verelst offers us a version of her as Flora, while Gennari could be offering a portrait of Mary of Modena as Diana or as a Cleopatra with a huge drop pearl since the costume seems to be a conflation of his portraits of Hortense Mancini and Elizabeth Felton\textsuperscript{371}. Dwight C. Miller notes that Gennari's style of painting metamorphosed from "gracious Guercinoesque" in Bologna to "tight, rather brittle stylizations of costume detail and that characteristic metallic sheen of drapery surfaces"\textsuperscript{372} while he was in France and England. This change could have been a response to the conventions of portraiture that he encountered in Northern Europe as Miller suggests, and certainly copying portraits by Lely and Verelst would have encouraged this transformation. Giampietro Zanotti, Gennari's first biographer, commented that in twenty years away from Italy he "painted in a style so diverse from ours"\textsuperscript{373}.

In our obsessively artist-centred world today, where a name confers value on a painting, we should heed Michel Foucault's anti-literary essay "What is an Author?" in which he declares "What does it matter who is speaking?"\textsuperscript{374}. Although in this he is invoking the floods of words produced by our society (rather than pictures) he is stating that what should be attended to is the way these are classified into canons and genres - we create a canon of great writers and artists so that the artist's name becomes a property or a commodity. In the same way that Foucault argues that literary criticism is directed at creating "authors" who mirror the profundity and uniqueness of their texts, we could
argue that art criticism creates "artists" whose work is unique and great and whom we then place as the picture's origin, and value them over others for financial gain; for example, Sir Peter Lely is placed at the top of the hierarchy in the second half of the seventeenth century, and his portraits are valued over others. The copy Gennari made of Lely's early "orange blossom" portrait is of no less "value" than the "original" since it conveys some idea of what Mary of Modena looked like, how she was seen by the artist and how she wanted to be presented, but all within the context of the conventions of the time. In 1966 John Pope-Hennessy based his study of Renaissance portraiture on the premiss stated as his first sentence that "Portrait painting is empirical" and described portraits as "transcriptive", reflecting a likeness. He also thought that the genre could reveal the human psyche, but he failed to take into account that in the process of transcribing "reality" a portrait will idealize the subject and will not reveal "a new sense of the mystery and the uniqueness of the human personality."

Gennari's portrait of "Catherine of Braganza" which is most probably "Mary of Modena" is of a woman who looks like some other portraits of "Mary of Modena", but not of "Catherine of Braganza"; since she is in "fancy dress" costume invented specifically for portraiture, it tells us more about the conventions of late seventeenth-century portraiture than the sitter. It is an example of Roland Barthes' assertion that "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author", which could be rendered as "the birth of the modern spectator must be at the cost of the death of the Artist"; it invites us, as the spectator, to an active participation in the production of meanings and interpretations that are infinite and inexhaustible. This portrait, like so
many others, does not refer to some eternal truth about the face and body language of the sitter whether she was "Catherine" or "Mary" but offers endless speculation. We can see however, quite obviously, that Gennari was working within a tradition of artists who wanted the patronage of those who could afford "the rich ornaments" as Zanotti calls them. He observes that Gennari carefully executed "... crowns, pearls and gems, gold filigree, some with gleaming white and some with gold thread, velvets of various colours ... richly adorned and encrusted pillows not to be equalled by whatever diligent Dutch craftsman ..."\textsuperscript{377}.

Simon Verelst (1644-1721)

The "diligent Dutch craftsman" Simon Verelst, who came to England as a flower painter, died here a successful, if conceited, portrait painter. How did he choose to represent Mary of Modena within the portrait conventions of the time? She was a very keen horsewoman, so not surprisingly one of Verelst's portraits shows her in fashionable male riding habit (fig.84); the other shows off Verelst's ability at still life, flower painting and detailed embroidery, in what was, at the time, considered to be the finest portrait of Mary of Modena (fig.85), and which exists in several versions and copies\textsuperscript{378}. The choice of male riding habit worn in fig.84 was probably more than an expression of her personal preference, since Van Dyck's mistress Margaret Lemon had been painted by Samuel Cooper in "male costume" as early as 1635. Later Frances Teresa Stuart, Duchess of Richmond and Lennox was painted in male riding habit, when she sat to Jacob Huysmans in 1664 and Samuel Cooper in 1666, reflecting a fashion noticed by both Samuel Pepys and Anthony Wood for court women to wear male riding costume as day wear. Hortense
Mancini, Duchess Mazarin was, however, said to have caused quite a stir when she arrived in London in 1675 attired in male costume\(^{379}\). Sitters wore tailored doublets and coats with deep skirts and petticoats dragging under their coats, but the "masculine" cut of the garments was associated with the dominance of male tailors in the production of outdoor clothing for women rather than with an overt fashion for "cross-dressing". The androgynous effect was however both intentional and, as we have seen, noticed\(^{380}\). In this three-quarter length portrait, standing in a landscape dressed in a male riding habit of grey velvet embroidered with silver, with pink satin bows, holding a feathered and be-ribboned hat in her right hand, a hunting crop in her left, it is difficult to tell whether the figure is male or female.

This portrait is thought to have been painted between c.1675-1680, and although it was fashionable to be represented in this dress she had in any event begun to ride regularly in Edinburgh in 1681 on her doctor's orders after the loss of her daughter Isabella in her fifth year in March. So a later date, about 1682 to celebrate the Yorks' return to England from Scottish exile is a possible date for the execution of this particular portrait. Mary of Modena had begun to spend long periods of time at her devotions in Scotland in 1681, and her doctor complained to Father Ronchi her chaplain. James, Duke of York disapproved of women on horseback, but Ronchi in one of his reports writes that the Duke was "greatly pleased" and "admir\(es\) her in that habit and carrying herself in so masterly a fashion"\(^{381}\), so much so that this picture, possibly commissioned by him, is recorded as hanging in his Bedchamber at Whitehall during his reign\(^{382}\). She had two falls from her horse. Her near fatal riding accident happened on 2 October 1681 riding.
on sandy ground; she was thrown, dragged along and kicked unconscious injuring her left side when her long skirts became entangled. She wrote to Lady Bellasis on 20 April 1682 that she had "... realy been so ill for these many months, that i have hardly been able to writt at all: my falls did hinder me for some time, and since, my beeing with child has don it ...". She promised her mother never to ride again, a promise which she kept until her mother died; but three years after her accident she rode daily.

The androgynous "riding habit" portrait is a rather unusual aspect of the many representations of Mary of Modena, if a quite fashionable one. Much more conventional is the portrait painted by Verelst between c.1675-1678 (fig.85) copied in miniature by Susan Penelope Rosse (fig.85a). In this three-quarter length portrait known in several versions she is shown with her right arm resting on a pedestal by a vase of flowers. With another pink rose in her left hand resting in her lap, Verelst associates her with the goddess Flora by alluding to her beauty and fertility. The portrait has a curious, unearthly light, which makes her skin appear almost white and, combined with a harsh outline, the exaggerated light and dark lends it a distinctive and very individual quality which came to characterise Verelst’s work. The embroidered flowers on her gown are indeed the work of a “diligent Dutch craftsman”, but also, together with the elegance of gesture, is reminiscent of the work of Henri Gascar.

**Henry Gascar (c.1635-1701)**

Gascar’s patrons were mostly Catholics like Charles II’s mistress Louise de Kéroualle, Duchess of Portsmouth, and those who had returned from exile to England
with the Restoration court. The suspicion that Portsmouth was a French spy and that both she and Gascar had close links to Louis XIV and the French court provoked rumours that Gascar too was a French agent. 386

The continental influence is manifest in that both Gascar and Verelst had an ability to paint "Embroidery, fine Cloaths, lac'd Drapery, and a great Variety of Trumpery Ornament" in fig.85 and fig.86. Gascar painted a pair of small pendant portraits of James, Duke of York and Mary of Modena, both very conventional representations, half-length. James is very much the man of action, standing wearing an elaborate breastplate and holding a baton, a seascape in the background. She is represented in a continuation of the Flora theme as the beautiful wife with a large bowl of flowers (fig.86) similar to the Verelst vase in fig.85. Gascar used this pose type for other sitters most notably for a portrait of Louise de Kéroualle painted in c.1672 now at Hartwell House, Buckinghamshire (fig.87). Gascar uses the same props, the bowl of full-blown flowers, symbol of perfect yet transient beauty, embroidered dress with lace at the sleeve and ornate carved table. The Duchess of Portsmouth appears in the pose reversed to face right, but both wear a gold embroidered cream dress, green wrap, similar pearls and hairstyle. The difference is that Mary of Modena sits on an ornately carved red chair, as befits a royal Duchess; the royal mistress's seating arrangements are not shown. Portsmouth cups a blown rose with her left hand, but Mary of Modena holds a sprig of orange blossom in her left hand which could indicate a date of c.1674-5 for its execution, shortly after her marriage in 1673, since Gascar was using this pose between 1672 and 1675. Flora was cast as both goddess and courtesan, a role suited to the
Duchess of Portsmouth, but Gascar is careful to ensure that Mary of Modena is shown as a married woman who is the goddess of flowers.

Caspar Netscher (1635/6-1684)

Another “outsider” who perfected the “continental” style was the German Caspar Netscher who made his career in Holland. He started as a painter of genre and subject pictures and was a pupil of Gerard ter Borch at Deventer, whose style of small highly finished genre pictures he learned to emulate. In 1662 he settled in The Hague and by 1670 had almost abandoned genre painting, specializing instead in elegant, small half-length portraits in oil for court circles. He worked in the increasingly French manner of its fashionable portraitists, giving special attention to the accurate representation of the costly fabrics (particularly white satin) and clothes worn by his aristocratic and patrician patrons.

There are three portraits of Mary of Modena attributed to Caspar Netscher. In one, which appeared in the summer exhibition of the Old Masters Galleries (1 May – 30 June 1967)\textsuperscript{389}, she is represented as the faithful wife with a whippet (fig.88), a symbol used to magnificent effect by the Dutchman Willem Wissing in 1685 when she became Queen Consort (discussed in Chapter 6). Her hair is piled high in the fashionable French style of the 1690s and unusually, since she had dark hair, it appears to be quite a light colour. This tiny portrait is meticulously painted with great attention paid to the fabric of her dress. She stands, holding the collar of the whippet which sits on the top of a pedestal to her right against the background of a garden. It is almost certain that this portrait was
painted by Caspar Netscher's son Constantijn Netscher when Mary of Modena was in exile in France in the 1690s, and would account for the hairstyle and colour since she had started to go grey. From the early eighteenth century, paintings by both Caspar Netscher's sons, Constantijn and Theodor, have been misrepresented as works by their more famous father because they adhered to his style and form in their early works; only later did their own distinctive styles mature. A second portrait traditionally called "Mary of Modena, Queen of James VII and II" hangs in the King's Room at The Binns, West Lothian (fig. 89). It bears little resemblance to other documented portraits of her. While it shows little facial resemblance to either of the other portraits attributed to Netscher, (particularly as it has the double chin of an older woman), it has the hallmarks of Netscher's technique of rendering the texture of costly materials and the standardised pose of his small-scale half-length portraits. I remain unconvined that this represents Mary of Modena, but it is probably by Caspar Netscher.390

Caspar Netscher follows the international late baroque mode of the garden background with cypress trees in the last portrait in which she is represented in the conventional role of motherhood with her daughter Isabella (fig. 90). In this portrait she wears a dress remarkably similar to Verelst's portrait of her with a vase of flowers (see fig. 85), and with similar hair and pearls. She holds a dog in her lap which is being stroked by a small child at her left. This came on the market at the Château Marey-Monge Sale Pommard, Brussels on 26 April 1926, where it was advertised as Portrait de la reine Marie de Modène et son fils le prince François-Edouard. This appears to be
by Caspar Netscher, and if it is, then it is not possible that the child is her son, James Francis Edward since he was born in June 1688 and Netscher died at The Hague in 1684.

It is almost certainly her daughter Isabella born 28 August 1676, named after Isabella, Duchess of Parma, the pious aunt of Mary of Modena\textsuperscript{392}. In this painting Isabella wears a feathered headdress, attribute of the goddess Minerva who functions as a symbol of wisdom, and a benevolent and civilizing influence. She had previously been painted as a baby by Lely (in c.1677) who represented her as innocence clutching a lamb in a full-length portrait seated almost naked in a landscape. When she was two and a half years old, her parents James, Duke of York and Mary of Modena began a period of exile in Brussels and Edinburgh which was to last intermittently for nearly three years. On 3 March 1679, they sailed to Holland and after visiting her eldest step-daughter Mary, wife of William of Orange at The Hague, they eventually took up residence in Brussels. They had been refused permission to take their daughters Anne and Isabella with them. By this time Anne was fifteen years old and the reason given was the alleged malign influence of her Catholic father on Anne's Protestant religious opinions. After an appeal by James on 8 August, the two princesses were allowed to join their parents for a brief visit so that the Duchess Laura of Modena might see her first surviving grandchild. They sailed on 19 August 1679 for Flanders accompanied by Lady Bellasys\textsuperscript{393}. It is possible that Netscher, who visited Berlin in 1679, would also have painted this portrait of Mary of Modena with her daughter during their stay in Brussels, or on one of the visits to The Hague to see Mary and William, since Netscher worked there. Mary of Modena's first period of exile in the Low Countries was from March 1679 to October 1679, so it is certainly a
possibility that Netscher painted the portrait between August and 7 October 1679. The Yorks returned to London in mid-October 1679, but the reverberations of the so-called “Popish Plot” caused Charles II to insist that James should leave England again. They left on 27 October 1679 to go into exile in Scotland, only to return in February the following year. Yet again on 20 October 1680 they returned to Edinburgh leaving their daughters behind. Isabella had been seriously ill for a few months before they left and they were never to see the child represented as wisdom by Netscher again as she died on 2 March 1681 in her fifth year.

Caspar Netscher’s portrait of Mary of Modena with her daughter Isabella is a conventional European portrait of ideal motherhood. The traditions of “western” painting have long been concerned with racial or social difference as a principal means of indicating the value of human beings, although the term “western” itself is not easily defined since it identifies a large body of people with diverse concerns, ideologies, historical origins and, particularly in the seventeenth century, religions, so that at that time religion was the metaphor for racial and cultural difference. However, the artists and writers discussed in this chapter who represented Mary of Modena, did so within the accepted conventions of the period, regardless of their country of origin or their religion, although she was frequently represented as a “type” rather than as an individual.

The poet and playwright Aphra Behn frequently used the images of racial and cultural difference throughout her work, as a source of dramatic contrast and for exploring class and gender difference. Her female characters in her plays are usually viewed as
marginalized on gender grounds and tend to identify themselves with those who are outsiders by virtue of their race or nationality, while in her poems she aligns herself in fantasy with Catherine of Braganza and Mary of Modena. In the following chapter, I consider how the Catholic Aphra Behn, and Mary of Modena’s Maids of Honour, the artist and poet Anne Killigrew, and the poet Anne Kingsmill, (later Finch, Countess of Winchilsea) as women represented the community of women at court with Mary of Modena at its centre.
CHAPTER 5

Venus Attired By the Graces: Aphra Behn, the Maids of Honour
and “Portraits” of Mary of Modena

Mary of Modena was an “outsider” not only because of her religion, but also on
the grounds of her gender and her nationality. Nevertheless, however much of an
outsider Mary of Modena was, it is immoderate to describe her, in the words of Carol
Barash, as a “silenced outsider”\textsuperscript{394}, particularly since Barash sees her as the focus of a
female “literary community” at Court:

“... in the 1680s, we see both Anglican and Catholic women generating a
mythical, political and religious community around Mary of Modena’s piety and
virtue\textsuperscript{395}.”

Mary of Modena did indeed have a reputation for piety and virtue; she had
received a convent education and she was able to make a spirited defence of herself
against what she saw as an unwelcome alliance with England so refuting the words of her
husband James, Duke of York who thought she was “so innocently bred”\textsuperscript{396}. She wrote
and spoke French and Italian fluently, had a good knowledge of Latin and quickly
learned to speak English, and to write and spell it rather better than her step-daughters
Mary and Anne\textsuperscript{397}. As the previous chapter demonstrated she introduced Italian music,
artists and actors to England; she was an inspiration to, and in a small way a patron of,
artists and writers, even encouraging her Maids of Honour to translate Greek and Latin poetry and Italian romances.

**Versifying Maids of Honour**

The earliest works of one of Mary of Modena's Maids of Honour Anne Kingsmill (later Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea) are translations from the Italian. Although she clearly had been unusually well educated for a woman of her time, and in spite of being one of Mary of Modena's six Maids of Honour, Kingsmill had only a cursory knowledge of Italian; her translations for the most part are from French or English versions. At court in 1683 she was introduced to the works of Torquato Tasso by Mary of Modena. In 1674 Mary of Modena had ordered Edmund Waller to write some lines in her own copy of Tasso after Waller invoked the Italian poet's connection with her ancestors when he presented her with a copy of his own verses:

*And make you through as many ages shine,*

*As Tasso has the heroes of your line,*

Anne Kingsmill acquired a translation of Tasso's *Aminta* and turned the first act into verse. She had second thoughts after finishing it and in her prose Preface to the privately circulated folio manuscripts of her poems she records that she would devote herself only to religious verse since, although "*convinc'd, that in the original, itt must be as soft and full of beautys, as ever anything of nature was*", there was nothing of a "*serious morality, or usefulness*" in it. In spite of this lack of morality she discerned in the folio edition of her poems she selected five pieces from the *Aminta* for
Agnes Strickland singles out Anne Kingsmill and Anne Killigrew another "Versifying Maid of Honour" as Kingsmill called herself for their virtue and morality, and compared it with the "disgraceful conduct" of the other Maids. These two were "much beloved" apparently by Mary of Modena as they were "ladies of the most irreproachable virtue, members of the Church of England, and alike distinguished for moral worth and literary attainments...". Both Kingsmill and Killigrew remained Anglican, had a stern morality and both reflected the severity of Mary of Modena's household in their writings. Anne Kingsmill kept to her promise and much of her later verse is religious, while Anne Killigrew wrote with a didactic purpose. Her poems, for example *A Farewell to Worldly Joys*, *An Invective against Gold* and *The Miseries of Man* and the emphasis on "Virgin Love" in *A Pastoral Dialogue* chime with the devout Catholic values of Mary of Modena's court. Her court was opposed to the licentiousness associated not only with her brother-in-law Charles II, but her own husband James and his mistresses, one of whom was her Maid of Honour Catharine Sedley.

Anne Killigrew had died in her mid-twenties in June 1685 from smallpox, and is famous because John Dryden in his dedication of *An Ode To the Pious Memory of the Accomplisht Young Lady Mrs Anne Killigrew* prefixed to her posthumously published *Poems by Mrs Anne Killigrew* (1686), described this "Youngest Virgin-Daughter of the Skies" as "Excellent in the two Sister-Arts of Poësie, and Painting", (see Appendix F). Dryden presents her as an ideal of her kind rather than as an example since the poem is a celebration of the *ut pictura poesis* tradition in which poetry and painting were praised as liberal and sister arts and because they were ennobling. Her poems are artless but
moral impress; since Dryden writes in Stanza 5 that: "Her Morals too were in her Bosome bred/By great Examples daily fed, What in the best of Books, her Fathers Life, she read," while she herself refers to her own "frozen style", which requires an input of "Poetique fire". While he praises their undoubted moral, rather than literary quality, he discusses her paintings in far more detail. Dryden compliments her portrait painting for capturing "live" subjects, but in his reference to painting as "the Dumb-Sister" in Stanza 6 and repeated in the opening lines of his poem "To Sir Godfrey Kneller" (1694) he leaves us in little doubt that he thinks that words are superior to paint. She painted subject pictures and small, rather stilted portraits including her own self-portrait in which she draws attention to herself as a poet by pointing to a piece of paper (fig.91); Dryden obviously thought these had greater merit than her verse, although she herself would probably have considered painting as a diversion rather than a profession.407

Anne Killigrew's father, Henry had been Chaplain to Charles I and was an old Royalist appointed master of the Savoy Hospital. He was also a prebendary of Westminster and, significantly, almoner to James, when Duke of York. Her late uncle Thomas had been a Groom of the Bedchamber to Charles II and master of the revels. Her brother Henry, referred to by Dryden as her "Warlike Brother on the Seas", was a naval captain at that time sailing in the Mediterranean.408 Her family helps situate Anne Killigrew's appointment as Maid of Honour within a context of dynastic networks of patronage. Her brother later became an Admiral. He died in 1712 and it was at Admiral Killigrew's sale in 1727 that Vertue listed Anne Killigrew's paintings in Henry Killigrew's possession: Venus and Adonis; Satyr Playing the Pipe; Judith and
Holifernes; A Woman's Head; Venus attired by the Graces; Herself. Of these pictures by her I saw I can say little. She calls attention to herself as an artist by explaining three of her paintings in her poems: St. John Baptist, Herodias Daughter Presenting to her Mother St. John's Head in a Charger, and Two Nymphs of Diana's, one in a posture to Hunt, the other Batheing; her descriptions of these paintings suggest too that it was the moral or religious topic which took precedence over the affairs of Mary of Modena's court.

The "Court Artist"

It is presumed that Anne Killigrew painted for her own amusement. In the tradition of female court artists, women painted portraits, usually of the female members of the household, although they frequently participated in the general activities of the court circle too. While it is unlikely that Anne Killigrew was appointed as a "court artist", as a member of the court with an ability to paint, her appointment would be in keeping with Mary of Modena's descent from a dynasty such as the Este who had been patrons of artists and writers. Women court artists had first emerged in Western Europe in the sixteenth century so that Anne Killigrew would be in a tradition discussed by Baldassare Castiglione in the third book of The Book of the Courtier where a woman's attainments and accomplishments were similar to the male courtier with a bias towards the humanities which required a knowledge of literature and painting, music and conversation.
Dryden admires two court portraits in Stanza 7 of his pindaric Ode: "Our Martial King" who is James II, and Mary of Modena "Our Phenix (sic) Queen" who was "portrai'd too so bright ...". Anne Killigrew’s paintings are divided by Dryden into the genres of landscape and portraiture with the landscapes deemed French classicism and therefore connected to Louis XIV; Anne Killigrew, like Louis XIV, rather absurdly "conquers" landscape. Dryden, however, prefers her portraits. The English portrait style is associated with the royal iconography of James and Mary who exhibit the regal virtues. In James’s case, because he had a "Warlike Mind, his Soul devoid of Fear./His High-designing Thoughts, were figur'd there", he was therefore an "ideal" king. This small full-length portrait of James II once attributed to Sir Peter Lely is competently painted and is still in the Royal Collection (fig.92). This was painted probably between 6 February and 15 June 1685, that is, between James’s accession and Anne Killigrew’s death, since the portrait shows him wearing the Garter standing by the steps of a terrace; to his left is a coat of arms surmounted by a crown with the inscription "JACOB’ II REX". To his right, allusions to classical art are provided by a carved figure on the column which resembles Ceres a symbol of plenty and prosperity, possibly an optimistic view of the future under James II; the urn on the column is interesting for its busy-looking cherubs together with a female figure about to leap from it.

The rather domestic, quiet, very amateurish nature of this portrait is echoed in a portrait called, rather pointedly, "The Duchess of York" which is said to be signed by Anne Killigrew (fig.93). The Heinz Archive in the National Portrait Gallery owns a photograph of this painting sent in January 1939 when it was at Rømers Porträttateljé,
Djursholm, in Sweden. From Dryden's *Ode*, it is known that Killigrew painted a portrait of Mary of Modena, but it has been assumed “lost” and “untraced” for many years. This particular portrait called “The Duchess of York” bears little resemblance to other portraits of Mary of Modena; although she has the signature long nose and face, her chin is too fat, although this may be an amateur rendering of the conventional “soggiatura”. "Our Phenix (sic) Queen” represents beauty in Dryden's view:

- *Our Phenix Queen was portrait’d too so bright,*
- *Beauty alone could Beauty take so right:*
- *Her Dress, her Shape, her matchless Grace,*
- *Were all observ’d, as well as heav’ly Face.*
- *With such a Peerless Majesty she stands,*
- *As in that Day she took from Sacred hands*
- *The Crown; ’mong num’rous Heroins was seen,*
- *More yet in Beauty, than in Rank, the Queen!*

_Mary of Modena and Anne Killigrew: From Virgin Mary to Venus_

This portrait could possibly be Anne Killigrew's interpretation of her patron, Mary of Modena. The photograph of it shows a woman of very ordinary domestic “beauty”, but in the lines quoted above by Dryden it may not be only physical beauty to which he alludes, but beauty of spirit. Both her name “Mary”, and Dryden’s description of her “heav’ly” qualities of Peerless Majesty” and “matchless Grace” when receiving her crown “from Sacred hands” suggest that she is being compared to the Virgin Mary, a comparison which would have pleased the devout Catholic in Mary of Modena. Mary of
Modena became James II's Queen Consort in 1685, the same year as Anne Killigrew's death. It is understandable that Dryden refers to Mary of Modena's crown as a token of her triumph, and draws a parallel with the Virgin Mary's Assumption when she became Queen of Heaven also with a crown as the symbol of her supremacy. Marina Warner interprets the symbol of the crown as distorting the Virgin Mary's relationship with other women since it was important that she was cast in the "exceptional" role. The honour received by the Virgin as queen excluded other women "... and the fact that the Virgin was female was mitigated by her regal precedence over all other women. Of course, it is only natural for men to attempt to convey the idea of excellence according to the lights of their society". On this reading Carol Barash's view of Mary of Modena as a "silenced outsider" is wide of the mark since she was not only the focus of the community of women at court, but was also seen to be part of a cult of the Virgin as queen which according to Marina Warner had upheld the status quo "to the advantage of the highest echelons of power" for centuries.

Anne Killigrew ventured into the realms of mythology in her pastoral "Love, the Soul of Poetry" which upholds a courtly cult of Venus. She also used mythology in a painting which shows influences from Lely's studio and his collection of Italian masters, called Venus attired by the Graces (fig.94). This featured in Admiral Killigrew's sale of 1727 mentioned by Vertue. Mary of Modena becomes Venus rather than the Virgin Mary according to Carol Barash, but she is still at the apex of the hierarchy, although Barash tries to claim that this shows court life indirectly as a community of women as well as a hierarchy. Why is Venus attired by the Graces supposed to be a
representation of "court life" in Mary of Modena's household? The explanation offered by Barash is that firstly the "Graces" are of different ages although she does not say who of Mary of Modena's court she thinks they represent; secondly that they appear to be unflustered and unraped by the satyr who blends into the background. The painting reflects the creation of "a protective circle" around the queen at its centre and that the Graces are performing functions, such as dressing Venus, similar to her serving women. It is not clear exactly what the two Graces behind Venus are doing in Killigrew's painting, while the third one kneeling appears to be telling her that there is a satyr approaching in the gloom, since she is pointing to it over her right shoulder.

Why is this painting not simply just an act of Anne Killigrew's imagination? Dryden's emphasis in the Ode is on painting as an exercise of imagination; the most plausible explanation for this painting is not that it is a depiction of "court" life, but that Anne Killigrew invented or imitated the Arcadian groves with Venus, nymphs and satyrs. It is allegorical and fantastic and shows her acquaintance with a classical education which she demonstrates in her poem On a Picture Painted by her self, representing two Nymphs of DIANA's, one in a posture to Hunt, the other Batheing. She may also have seen, or been told about, the imaginative, poetic painting of the Italianate Dutch artists such as Jan Both (c.1618-d.1652) and Cornelis Poelenburgh by Mary of Modena who had visited Holland in 1678 and 1679. Both's work, which indirectly owes much to Claude Lorrain (1604/5-1682), was admired in England and immensely influential on the development of landscape painting in the Northern Netherlands; his evocations of contemporary Italy with its intense light which he painted after his return to Utrecht from Italy would have
appealed to Mary of Modena. Anne Killigrew’s *Venus attired* ... bears a striking resemblance to Both’s *A Landscape with the Judgement of Paris* (1645-50) (fig.95), in the National Gallery, London. This idyllic landscape is imaginary but draws on Both’s recent experiences of his four years in contemporary Italy. The almost sculptural figures, with a bearded naked man or “satyr” in the background in shadow are by Both’s friend Cornelis Poelenburgh (1594-1667) and transform an Italianate landscape into a mythological picture. While Minerva is modestly represented here with her back to us, Killigrew, like Claude Lorraine, shows her figures partially clothed. It is possible that Mary of Modena would have seen the painting by Both when she visited The Hague in October 1678 or April 1679. Since although its provenance is doubtful before, it was recorded in the Benjamin da Costa Collection in 1752.\(^{419}\)

**Mary of Modena and Aphra Behn: From Venus to Virgin Mary**

Mary of Modena is frequently represented as “Venus”, and her beauty is extravagantly praised by Aphra Behn in the almost eight hundred lines in celebration of her “Godlike Patron”, *A Pindarick Poem on the Happy Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty James II and His Illustrious Consort Queen Mary*, (London, 1685) (discussed in Chapter 6). It may have been stretching credulity to consider Anne Killigrew’s painting of the Graces as a portrait of Mary of Modena and her Maids of Honour, but Aphra Behn refers to the Maids as Nymphs in Stanza 10:

> And now the Nymphs ply all their Female arts

> To dress Her for Her victory of hearts;

> A Thousand little LOVES descend!
Young waiting Cupids with officious care

In smiling order all attend:

This, decks Her Snowy Neck, and that Her Ebon Hair.

(Lines 230-235) 420

This spectacle of female beauty with her ebony hair almost takes over as subject of the poem. Once the “Nymphs” have dressed Mary of Modena, Behn praises the transforming theatricality of her coronation robes in Stanza 19:

And now the Royal Robes are on,

But oh! what numbers can express

The Glory of the Sacred Dress!

(Lines 465-467) 421

She is referred to by Behn not only as Venus, but Cynthia, Laura and Juno, but after she reappears clothed by the Nymphs in her “Sacred Dress” she becomes Tasso’s Armida in Stanza 22. Behn refers to Mary of Modena having been “born of more than Kingly Race, Monarchs and Poets did thy Lineage Grace, (Lines 755-756), including Ariosto, Dante and Torquato Tasso. In Stanza 22 she becomes the beautiful enchanter Princess Armida from Tasso’s Gerusalemme liberata, (Jerusalem Delivered), who rides into the Christian camp and lures the principal knights away from their siege of Jerusalem to Armida’s lush “gardens” in the Dead Sea:

Thus all adorn’d with Sacred Beauty’s Charms

Through the vast Christian camp the fair
INCHANTRESS Rode,

And where the noblest Warriers wond’ring

stood,

Her killing eyes dealt their resistless harms.

(Lines 533-536)422

If Mary of Modena was an “outsider”, since she was figured as “exceptional” as a queen, as the “Virgin Mary”, and because of her nationality and religion, then in this poem Aphra Behn aligns herself in an oblique way with Mary of Modena. The pindaric ode allowed reference to be made to the writer as well as the subject, and Behn alludes to her own “outsider” status since she was not a member of the court. While she was usefully able to refer to the magnificent patronage of poets and painters by Mary of Modena’s Este family, she can also complain of her own exclusion from court in Stanza 11 when she writes:

Oh Blest are they that may at distance gaze,

And Inspirations from Your looks may take,

But how much more their happier stars they Praise,

Who wait, and listen when you speak!

Mine for no scanted bliss so much I blame,

(Though they the humblest Portion destin’d me)

As when they stint my noblest Aim, ...

(Lines 292-298)423
Behn feels that it is her own exclusion from the court, her "silent dull obscurity" that sets her at a distance, so that she is unable to see and hear, which obviously affects her ability to write well. She would like to be rewarded with money and position at court.

**Court Life**

There seems to be little conclusive evidence that Behn moved in court or aristocratic circles, although she was rumoured to be John Wilmot, the Earl of Rochester's mistress. She had a vexed professional relationship with Dryden, and her *Satyr on Doctor Dryden* attacking his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1685 at the beginning of the Catholic James II's reign is probably a response to what she saw as his opportunistic timing in order to ingratiate himself in court circles. This was galling for her since she also had Catholic sympathies and it is conceivable that she was a late convert like Dryden. Most of her Catholic references are late, the most overt is in the later suppressed section of the *Epistle Dedicatory of Oroonoko* in 1688 to Lord Maitland. The only explanation for her anger at Dryden's conversion to a religion concerned with images was his flagrant opportunism.

She was devoted to hierarchical and aristocratic arrangements, and she saw the court, with its relative freedom for women as enabling, since exceptional women whether writers, artists or prostitutes could flourish there; for example, she eulogized the royal mistresses, choosing to dedicate *The Feigned Courtesans* to Nell Gwyn, and *The History of the Nun* to Hortense Mancini, Duchess Mazarin, Mary of Modena's cousin. In
Feminism in Eighteenth-Century England Katharine Rogers refutes any claim that the courts of Charles II and James II were sexually promiscuous and denigrating to women and were therefore entirely negative experiences. Court life was actually educationally valuable and she cites the court wits such as Sir George Etheredge, Sir Charles Sedley and William Wycherley and the Earl of Rochester who were disposed to ridicule the morality of female subordination simply because it was associated with Puritanism. She concludes that they:

"... extended to women the right to plain speaking and pleasure seeking they claimed for themselves. Thus, without systematic concern for the rights of women, aristocratic literature challenged traditional restrictions upon their freedom and supported women in evading them". 426

So Barash’s literary “community” of women around Mary of Modena was aided, perhaps unwittingly, by men.

Anne Killigrew certainly had the opportunity to exploit her talents and exemplary character at the court of Mary of Modena, and the fact that she practised the “two Sister-Arts” was noteworthy in Dryden’s view. She either wrote very little or very little survives: the facsimile copy of her Poems (1686) consists of thirty three mainly short pieces, and mostly they are conventional, derivative and moral. They reflect almost nothing of the wider Restoration court life of which she was a part, and are mostly bitter, sorrowful, and lacking beauty and grace. Her verse compares poorly with Anne Kingsmill’s, and their common art seems not to have produced a friendship between them
since if there was a friendship it has left no trace in their poetry. Friendship was very important to Kingsmill following the “Glorious Revolution” and her exile from court and London the centre of cultural activity. After the Glorious Revolution she wrote many poems celebrating the mainly aristocratic and family members who shared her political and cultural sensibilities, particularly those like the Thanets who offered shelter and support during the arrest and trial of her Nonjuring husband Heneage Finch. Kingsmill and Killigrew were earnest, shunned frivolity and were devoted to Mary of Modena, creating what has been called "... a little oasis of moral purity, and of spiritual and intellectual aspiration." Perhaps the only reflection of her life at court is Killigrew’s description of her painting “On a Picture Painted by her Self, representing two Nimphs of Diana’s ...”. This could be interpreted as a political criticism of the Restoration court and a representation of herself and Anne Kingsmill as the two virtuous members of Mary of Modena’s household:

We are Diana’s Virgin-Train,
\Descended of no Mortal Strain; ...
We Fawns and Shaggy Satyrs awe;
To Sylvan Pow’rs we give the Law:
Whatever does provoke our Hate,
Our Javelins strike, as sure as Fate; ...
Though Venus we transcend in Form,
No wanton Flames our Bosomes warm.
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The court seemed also to provide Anne Kingsmill, like Anne Killigrew, with plenty of opportunity to write. Myra Reynolds argued in 1903 that Anne Kingsmill found that the court was not the "earthly paradise" she had been anticipating, but it seems that her time at court was relatively happy since she met her husband Heneage Finch there who was a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to James, Duke of York. She also came into contact with many well-known literary figures including Dryden to whom she paid tribute in later years, and it was there that her devotion to Mary of Modena developed and the lifelong loyalty to the Stuarts and the Jacobite cause was fostered.

In about the year 1709 she wrote a poem *A Tale of the Miser and the Poet* in which she looks back with nostalgia on the days at the court "When all was Riot, Masking, Playing; When witty Beggars were in fashion". This is not necessarily sentimental approval of the life at court but time has tempered her memories. The poem is partly a dialogue, a comparison between the contemporary scene, where James's daughter Anne is on the throne and Mammon, representing the Whigs, holds sway, and the days of the Restoration court where art and wit were in the ascendant. The Poet, representing Royalist sympathies, is told by Mammon that "... Brave Sir, your Time is ended,/And Poetry no more befriended./I hid this Coin, when Charles was swaying".

The poem Anne Kingsmill (as Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea) wrote after the death of Mary of Modena (discussed in Chapter 8) in 1718 "On the Death of the Queen*, is a quiet meditation on her days as a Maid of Honour at Court. Given the number of intervening years it is nostalgic, offering a portrait not only of Anne
Kingsmill, Maid of Honour but a rare memory of Mary of Modena as she holds court, and it is testament to Mary of Modena’s ability with languages as she talks to the “heads of state”:

*With dutious tribute of recording verse*

*In which may truth with energy be found*

*And soft as her compassion be the sound*

*Bless’t were the hours when thro’ attendance due*

*Her numerous charms were present to my view*

*When lowly to her radiant eyes I bowed*

*Suns to my sight but suns without a cloud*

*Towards me their beneficial aspect turn’d*

*Imprest my duty and my conduct warn’d*

*For who that saw the modest airs they cast*

*Bur from that pattern must be nicely chast*

*Peculiar Souls have their peculiar sighs*

*And thro’ the eye the inward beauty shines*

*Then who can wonder if in hers appear’d*

*Superior sense to be reveer’d & fear’d*

*Endearing sweetness to her happy friends*

*And Holy fire which towards the alter tends*

*Bles’t my attention was when drawing near*

*(My places claim) her crowded audience chair*

*I heard her by admiring States addrest*
With embasies in different tongues exprest
To all that Europe sent she gave replies
In their own speech most eloquent & wise
Soft was her talk and soothing to the heart
By nature solid perfected by art
The Roman Accent which such grace affords
To Tuscan language harmonized her words
All eyes all listning sense upon her hung
When from her lovely mouth th' enchantment sprung
What Livia was when Rome Augustus sway'de
And thro' a woman's wit the world obey'd
What Portia was when fortitude and love
Inflicted wounds which did her firmness prove
And forcing Brutus to applaud her worth
Drew with the steel th' important secret forth
Such was URANIA ...”

This is not a portrait of Mary of Modena as a “silenced outsider”; Urania was one
of the muses who appears in Milton's Paradise Lost, a goddess of creative inspiration
and, being the muse of astronomy, she would be crowned with a circle of stars. This is
not a woman who treats her Maids of Honour as equals but expects them to do their duty.
She herself is “superior”, virtuous, intelligent and strong. In this portion quoted she is
compared with other worthy Italian women: Livia who influenced Augustus on the
world stage and Portia who made Brutus acknowledge her worth. This poem records her
death as both a personal loss and symbolic of the loss of a way of life. Here Kingsmill
expresses her Jacobite sympathies eloquently as does On the Lord Dundee her elegy for
James Graham Claverhouse who had led Scottish troops south and "borne the cause of
Kings ... " on behalf of James II.434

The 1688/9 Revolution saw the fortunes of Anne Kingsmill and her husband
Heneage Finch change dramatically. He was arrested in 1690 as he tried to join James II
and Mary of Modena in exile in France. Although he was tried and acquitted, Anne
Kingsmill's poems become strongly political and evoke the distress and upheaval caused
by loyalty to their former mistress and master, the Stuarts. The Losse seems to lament the
breaking of a close personal friendship or link, and is probably about the flight of Mary
of Modena to exile in France, since Anne Kingsmill uses the figure of Urania as she does
in her poem "Upon the Death of the Queen"; in The Losse the departure is of Urania:
"Urania is no more, to me no more./All these combin'd, can n'er that losse deplore"435.
In her poem The Petition for an Absolute Retreat which was collected in her Miscellany
Poems on Several Occasions (1713), Anne Kingsmill writes about her own "exile" as
"Ardelia" in Kent with the Jacobite sympathisers the Thanets who offered them shelter:

Back reflecting let me say,

So the sad Ardelia lay;

Blasted by a Storm of Fate,

Felt, thro' all the British State;

Fall'n, neglected, lost, forgot,
Dark oblivion all her Lot;

Faded till Arminda's Love,

(Guided by the Pow'rs above)

Warm'd anew her drooping Heart,

And Life diffus'd thro' every Part; 

"Ardelia" (Anne Finch) can continue to praise Mary of Modena and James II in the safety of her political Arcadian retreat offered by "Arminda" (Catharine Countess of Thanet). This is a garden, actually the Thanet's Hothfield estate in Kent, which is represented as a substitute Garden of Eden which has been deprived of its "ideal" Mary of Modena. While Carol Barash sees this poem representing "... a politically oppositional community of privately pro-Stuart women," it would seem that two or even four women, counting Lady Thanet's two oldest daughters, Catharine and Anne Tufton, hardly constitute a "community". Nevertheless, this is a politically conservative poem where to be "pro-Stuart" means freedom, and to be "pro-Whig" means to be engaged in the pursuit of wealth and material goods. Anne Finch continued to write her political poems in support of the Stuarts: A Song on Greife was inspired by the events of 1688, and The Change again uses the theme of Arcadia ruined by the loss of Mary of Modena brought about by betrayal:

What River will her Smiles reflect,

Now that no Beams thou can'st direct? ...

... Her Favour ev'ry one pursues,

And losing Her, thou all must lose.
No Love, sown in thy prosp'rous Days,
Can Fruit in this cold Season raise: ...⁴³⁹.

Caesar and Brutus written in 1689 is overtly constructed around the theme of betrayal and To Mr. F. Now Earl of JV written to her husband, again in 1689, associates the new monarchy with the muse of tragedy since Melpomene is now a prostitute having “given a Bond./By the new House alone to stand,” will write only of “War and Strife.”⁴⁴⁰. Anne Finch alludes to the language of Book I of John Milton’s Paradise Lost (1667) to compare the fall of the Stuarts with the loss of Eden, and expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise in Fragment:

For Paradise she heard was plac'd on high,
Then thought, the Court with all its glorious show
Was sure above the rest, and Paradice below.
There plac'd too soon the flaming Sword appear'd
Remov'd those Pow'rs, whom justly she rever'd,
Adher'd too in their Wreck, and in their Ruin shar'd.
Now by the Wheels inevitable Round,
With them thrown prostrate to the humble Ground,
No more she takes (instructed by that Fall)
For fix'd, or worth her thought, this rolling Ball.⁴⁴¹.

These are poems which are intensely autobiographical, expressing her strong loyalty to Mary of Modena and James II, and evoking her own sense of great personal, as
well as national, loss; the political upheaval brought about by their exile had private as well as public implications.

The World of the “précieuses”

Carol Barash’s argument that Mary of Modena’s court was a “literary community” is an overemphatic and rather inaccurate representation of the côte­rie surrounding Mary of Modena. She compares it to the French tradition of précieuses who were aristocratic female intellectuals and she exploits the thesis of Erica Veevers in Images of Love and Religion that Henrietta Maria’s court provided a “crucial link” between the “French heroic tradition and its English imitators.” Barash interprets Veevers as saying that there were two ideals at work in this tradition: the Neoplatonic religious poetic ideal and the politically engaged. These two ideals fused after the Restoration into a “gynocentric subculture” which drew upon the image of the heroic woman, or femme forte to make claims for both political and artistic authority; that is that English women writing as femmes fortes were “able symbolically to admire and protect the late Stuarts, male and female alike.” Certainly Mary of Modena encouraged, and was actively engaged with, music, theatre and literature as described in the previous chapter. However, leaving aside the point that apart from Sarah Churchill only two of the Maids of Honour were actively engaged in writing, Veevers herself argues that préciosité had different phases in France so that it is difficult to determine which phase Henrietta Maria “imported” and it is also difficult to define it exactly since it refers to a social fashion, and fashions which influence manners, virtue and art will be different for different periods. But Barash appears to be using the “salon” type of préciosité where
people of both sexes with shared interests gathered informally and "a great lady
dispenses her beneficial influence to a côte rie of "servants", who in turn praise her in
verse". She conflates the various "meanings" of préciosité and she sees that court
culture allowed women not only a "heightened world of drama and art" but a "pastoral
world of women's friendship, and a symbolic matrix in which women were central". She
thought she might stop writing completely; it was her marriage and the exile
of Mary of Modena and James II that encouraged her to start writing again. She wrote
politically because of her opposition to the Revolution, and as Veevers points out,
précieux groups not only required a protected atmosphere in which to flourish, and Finch
had that seclusion and female friendship, but that also these groups tend to appear only
when established values and "civilized" standards are under threat", which they were.
So it was only after Mary of Modena's court was a memory, when she had found a
political subject and a quiet “room of her own”, and found female friendship with the Thanets that Anne Finch really became a poet.

Anne Finch was a Maid of Honour only from spring 1682 until her marriage on 14 May 1684 when she resigned her position. Plagiarism and ambition are the subjects of Anne Killigrew her fellow Maid of Honour who was dead of smallpox two months after Mary of Modena was crowned on April 1685. In Upon the Saying that my Verses were made by another she describes circulating her poems in manuscript since to have them printed was an act of self display and she compares herself to Esops Painted Jay adorned in the fine feathers of some established male poet, only to be stripped naked:

What ought t’have brought me Honour, brought me shame!

Like Esops Painted Jay I seem’d to all,

Adorn’d in Plumes, I not my own could call:

Rifl’d like her, each one my Feathers tone,

And, as they thought, unto the Owner bore.

(Lines 34-38)

She was encouraged at first by praise from a “judicious” source, but her ensuing bid for recognition results in humiliation although in the end she re-commits herself to poetry willingly accepting “Cassandra’s Fate,/To Speak the Truth, although believ’d too late”.

Aphra Behn and Anne Finch followed the old convention of assuming literary names, i.e. Astraea and Ardelia rather than their own names, and Killigrew, but not Behn,
avoided the formal ode and the epic; Killigrew wrote from what was a clearly delimited society and she was remote from politics. Mary of Modena's two "versifying Maids of Honour" while they were at her court, never forgot that they wrote and would be read, in manuscript, as women. In his Ode to Killigrew, Dryden spends Stanzas 4 and 5 attempting to establish her sexual innocence. In stressing her innate talent by ascribing her accomplishments to "Nature" — "Art she had none, yet wanted none:/For Nature did that Want supply"; he managed to avoid describing her as a learned woman. While obviously not threatened by her familiarity with the Bible and mythology he was aware that learned women had always been the targets of misogynist satire encouraged by the criticism of Juvenal in, for example, the sixth satire, finally translated by Dryden in 1693, and described by him as "a bitter invective against the fair sex":

*But of all Plagues, the greatest is untold;*

*The Book-Learn'd Wife in Greek and Latin bold.*

*The Critick-Dame, who at her Table sits:*

*Homer and Virgil quotes, and weighs their Wits;*

*And pities Didoes Agonizing Fits.*

But of all Plagues, the greatest is untold;
The Book-Learn'd Wife in Greek and Latin bold.
The Critick-Dame, who at her Table sits:
Homer and Virgil quotes, and weighs their Wits;
And pities Didoes Agonizing Fits. (Lines 560-564)

It was Aphra Behn who broke with all the literary traditions for women at that time. She saw herself as a "professional" who wanted to be paid, and if the public wanted "bawdy" then she would provide it. She stressed in the epilogue to *Sir Patient Fancy* (1678) that women write as well as men when she defended "bawdiness" in the original production spoken by Nell Gwynne who described it as:

"tis a Woman's Comedy,
... What has poor Woman done, that she must be
Debar'd from Sense, and sacred Poetry?
...

And if you're drawn to th'Life, pray tell me then,
Why Women should not write as well as Men.\textsuperscript{453}.

In the last lines Behn also defends female writers' right to "copy" men as “copying" was an original and “positive” act. Her anger at prejudice against women is expressed in her statement appended to The Lucky Chance (1687) that her plays would have been admired more if the audience had thought that a man had been the author. Janet Todd concludes that this statement aligns Behn with Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, who was the only woman to publish extensively in English before her, since she became "... mentally hermaphrodite, feminine in her commerce and in the prejudices felt against her, and masculine in her involvement in high culture and intellectual art demanding status despite her sex."\textsuperscript{454}.

**Feminist Literary Criticism**

Twentieth-century feminist literary critics such as Elaine Showalter in *A Literature of Their Own* (1977) and Marcia Holly in *Consciousness and authenticity: towards a feminist aesthetic*, (1975) ignored the wealth of writing by women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries enabling Showalter to announce that women did not think of themselves as professional writers before 1800, which would have come as a
surprise to Aphra Behn. The argument that women not only write about different things from men, but that they write about them in a different way, frequently lay behind feminist literary criticism in the 1970s and 1980s and buttressed examination of historical female writers. Additionally, many feminists argued that since men and women were biologically different as individuals this affected the learning of language, and their relationship to language was different. As Joyce Carol Oates once memorably wrote in “Is there a Female Voice?”:

*If there is a distinctly "female" voice – if there is a distinctly "male" voice – surely this is symptomatic of inferior art? ... A feminist "theme" doesn't make a sentimental, weak, cliché-ridden work valuable ... Of course the serious artistic voice is one of individual style, and it is sexless;*

The critics of the 1970s had failed to understand that women’s writing does not disclose female essentialism any more than a text written by a man does. Aphra Behn’s work exposes the way that language refuses to be pinned down to an underlying essential meaning. Jacques Derrida argued that language is structured as an endless deferral of meaning, and that an essential, stable meaning should be considered metaphysical. Showalter and Holly represented traditional humanism; in effect the patriarchal ideology and the concept of the unitary self. They assumed that good feminist fiction would present images of strong women with which the female reader could identify. Luce Irigaray and Hélène Cixous argued that this integrated self is constructed on the male model, reducing the text merely to a passive “feminine” reflection of a given masculine world. Julia Kristeva’s view is that it is not the biological sex of a writer but the position
that the writer takes up. Like Aphra Behn, she refuses essentialism and her three-tiered position is that women reject the dichotomy between masculine and feminine. In *Women's Time* (1981) she writes that:

*In the third attitude, which I strongly advocate — which I imagine? — the very dichotomy man/woman as an opposition between two rival entities may be understood as belonging to metaphysics — what can “identity”, even “sexual identity”, mean in a new theoretical and scientific space where the very notion of identity is challenged?* 458.

Aphra Behn’s identity is at issue as there is still no complete picture of her life. She lived in a very different world from the intimate court circle of Mary of Modena familiar to the Maids of Honour Anne Kingsmill and Anne Killigrew; they were free from the commercial pressure that shaped Behn’s work. There was a vast social gulf between Anne Kingsmill and Aphra Behn, although they had in common their loyalty to Mary of Modena and James II and Anne Kingsmill’s political poetry post-Revolution reflected Behn’s earlier political work. Behn and Kingsmill had the county of Kent in common; it was Behn’s birthplace and Kingsmill as the married Anne Finch, lived the rest of her life there after 1689. Behn died in April 1689 and after her death Anne Finch wrote a “contest” poem *The Circuit of Apollo* in which the god of poetry judges a female competition to find a poet worthy of the crown. There were not many poets in Kent apparently, since only four women reply to his summons: Ardelia who is Anne Finch, Alinda, Laura and Valeria. The existence of so few poets impelled Apollo to stand on the banks of the Stour where:
He lamented for Behn o're that place of her birth,
And said amongst Femens was not on the earth
Her superior in fancy, in language, or witt,
Yett own'd that a little too loosly she writt; ...

While Finch praised Behn's talent, with reservations about its "morality", she commented curtly on Behn's origins in a manuscript note that:

Mrs Behn was Daughter to a Barber who liv'd formerly in Wye, a little market Town (now much decay'd) in Kent: though the account of her life before her Works pretends otherwise; some persons now alive Do testify upon their knowledge that to be her Original.

Aphra Behn was writing for the market place, not the court, so it is inevitable that the wife of Heneage Finch would consider Behn's work bawdy and "loosly writt". Behn's writing ability and her knowledge of languages suggest that she received an education and was higher up the social scale than a daughter of a barber, and the first biography published in 1696, The Life and Memoirs ... as a preface to her collected works of fiction assumed she was. Anne Finch lived in the area and may have known that Behn was not a gentlewoman by birth, but it seems that she wrote with a certain amount of malice or pique, since Behn was a far more successful and well known writer than Finch herself.
Behn’s detractors nevertheless focussed on the view that selling one’s work was like selling oneself. Although she was not a prostitute she had lovers, had a “loose” life, wrote from a subject position which defied essentialism and was crucially different from the chaste and virtuous Finch and Killigrew; in her Preface to The Lucky Chance Behn herself referred to her own writing as “My Masculine Part the Poet in me”. She lived by her wits, was on equal terms with men and was not a court woman. Virginia Woolf writing about Behn in A Room of One’s Own rather acidly sums up the aristocratic “intellectuals” who would have been encouraged by Mary of Modena:

*We leave behind, shut up in their parks among their folios, those solitary great ladies who wrote without audience or criticism, for their own delight alone. We come to town and rub shoulders with the ordinary people in the streets. Mrs Behn was a middle-class woman with all the plebeian virtues of humour, vitality, and courage; ...*  

So Aphra Behn wrote about prostitutes and bigamy, incest and murder, and immoral nuns who inhabit convents more akin to brothels.

**The Feigned Courtesans**

Aphra Behn’s play *The Feigned Courtesans, or, A Night’s Intrigue* has its heroines pretending to be prostitutes, disguising themselves as men and trying to find a place in the male network of control; although the latter is with little success the theme of prostitution had a certain “shock” value. Her female characters in her plays are
frequently seen as marginalized on gender grounds and tend to identify themselves with those people who are “outsiders” by virtue of race or nationality.

First staged in the spring of 1679, *The Feigned Courtesans* was set in Catholic Rome and dedicated to Nell Gwynne. It was perhaps an intended compliment to the Italian nationality of Mary of Modena since, although Behn used farce rather than drama to examine political questions, the play suggests that the only alternative to marriage is to enter a convent or brothel rather than to remain single. This is perhaps a direct comment on Mary of Modena’s alternative option when she was forced into marriage with the Duke of York rather than enter the Visitation Convent as she had planned. The play was selected for performance at court, but according to John Downes it “liv’d but a short time” on the public stage. If the play was intended as a compliment to Mary of Modena it was poorly timed since it coincided with the Yorks’ extended period of forced exile. The political furore caused by the “Popish Plot” and the subsequent years after 1678 dominated by the so-called “Exclusion Crisis” of 1679 meant that few new plays, particularly comedies, were produced and audience numbers were also reduced. The King’s Company closed temporarily for the 1678-79 season, and the prologue to *The Feigned Courtesans* refers to actors’ and playwrights’ difficulties at the time of the Popish Plot:

*The Devil take this cursed plotting Age,*

"*T has ruin’d all our Plots upon the Stage"*.
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In Behn’s plot, two sisters, Marcella and Cornelia have gone to Rome, the centre of Catholicism to evade the arranged marriage of Marcella to Octavio, and, pretending to be courtesans, call themselves Euphemia and Silvianetta. The “feigned” whores, like the “Great Whore” of Roman Catholicism itself, exist only in the imagination. They are chaste, but they dress and fight as men and plot to take control of their lives. Aphra Behn evoked sympathy for the victim of the double standard, whether it was Mary of Modena’s arranged marriage to a “foreigner” more than twice her age, or a prostitute, a woman who is also a victimized outsider. In this case both are “outsiders” as a result of meeting the needs of men. In the Prologue, Behn suggests that the Popish Plot is simply a dishonest scare and she defends Mary of Modena’s country and religion. There are no plotting papists in Italy, but unfortunately there is the Englishman Sir Signall Buffoon who apes Italian manners, and his tutor Tickletext, a stupidly patriotic and crudely anti-papist philistine; he condemns Roman church architecture because he is a religious bigot, but he is happy to have an Italian whore. While Aphra Behn questions woman’s “proper” role of submission and silence, her point is that in the Exclusion Crisis, the Whigs’ patriotism and their hostility to Catholic countries are both misplaced, and the Italian and the English have common codes of civility.

“Nothing of barbarity in his nature”: Oroonoko

Aphra Behn focussed on issues of cultural and racial difference in her work. She not only looked at cultural similarities and differences between different European nations but also similarities, differences and relationships between white and black people; for example The Unfortunate Bride has “a blackamoor lady”, a widow called
rather obviously Moorea, and *Oroonoko* and *The Adventure of the Black Lady* both have black characters. Hélène Cixous in *La jeune née (The Newly Born Woman)* (1975) demonstrated the dependence of the patriarchal value system on binary oppositions; for example in race (black and white) and gender (male and female). Each opposition was a hierarchy in which the "feminine" side is always passive and negative. Aphra Behn frequently destabilized these binary opposites. In *Oroonoko* the white, and supposedly "civilized" and the black "uncivilized" opposites are reversed so that Oroonoko a black prince had "nothing of barbarity" in him since he could have been educated in "some European court, while the whites are capable of "absolute barbarity"."  

There has been much ink spilt over the question of whether or not Aphra Behn's supposedly anti-slavery novel *Oroonoko* is autobiographical, but this detracts from its meaning and function. It was published in 1688, a year of considerable anxiety for James II, Mary of Modena and the potential heir; the purpose of the story is political since the hero of *Oroonoko* is a king. Behn's support of the Stuarts was evident in her public poems of celebration. At his death in 1685 she wrote a pindaric to Charles II and a poem of consolation to the Dowager Queen, Catherine of Braganza. On James II's subsequent elevation to the throne she emphasized his heroics in battle and gave an elaborate description of the coronation in the pindaric to celebrate it. The announcement that Mary of Modena was pregnant in December 1687 was greeted with an ecstatic poem anticipating a male heir, and on 10 June when the male heir arrived, she celebrated the event with a congratulatory poem on the "... Happy Birth of the Prince of Wales". These three poems are discussed in later chapters dealing with these events, but they
demonstrate Aphra Behn’s literary responses to political events, connected with the Stuarts. *Oroonoko*, probably written between December 1687 and June 1688, is also dependent on being seen in its political context, as a novel which makes political points more subtly than a political tract.

In *Oroonoko* Aphra Behn makes a strong argument for the absolute power of legitimate kings. She appears to draw parallels between James II and the mistreated royal slave Oroonoko. Oroonoko is referred to not only by that name but also as "the Prince" and his slave name "Caesar", a name Behn uses in her poems about James II. This indicates that she was emphasizing a type, since "Caesar" alludes to a great leader, a soldier and in the seventeenth century "Caesar" meant an absolute monarch. She may have been attempting to gain sympathy for James since he was in imminent danger of being deposed. It seems that an important and timely political novel was expected of her since the second edition of the *Congratulatory Poem to Her Most Sacred Majesty on the Universal Hopes of All Loyal Persons for a Prince of Wales* advertised that "On Wednesday next will be Published the most Ingenious and long Expected History of Oroonoko: or, the Royal Slave. By Mrs Behn." Oroonoko is the grandson and only living descendent of the "King of Coramantien" and therefore the legitimate heir to the throne. Returning from battle Oroonoko falls in love with Imoinda, a beautiful and virtuous girl of 15, (the age of Mary of Modena, when she came to England as a reluctant bride), and in the novel everyone at court talks of Imoinda’s beauty. Janet Todd asserts in her biography of Behn that Imoinda is a portrait of Mary of Modena, arguing that Imoinda is "almost an anagram for Modena". Todd’s thesis is that Behn draws
parallels between Mary of Modena and Imoinda because both are loving women; this is explained in terms of culture in that the husband is a “god”, which is a foreign tradition since English husbands were not so regarded by their English wives. Because both Imoinda and Mary revered their husbands in an irreverent society, they were marked out as different but heroic. While this stretches credulity it is possibly a sort of explanation as Behn regards James II as a “god” in her poetry and the “outsider” Mary of Modena’s devotion to him was notorious. Where one can agree unreservedly with Todd is in her assertion that as with Mary of Modena’s pregnancy with the Prince of Wales in the first half of 1688, Imoinda’s pregnancy also exacerbated events. Certainly Imoinda, like Mary of Modena remained constant to the last, and although Todd does not say so, while Oroonoko finally kills Imoinda, Mary of Modena experienced the death of her former life, and had to start again in yet another foreign country.

Oroonoko has been called an early example of the “noble savage”\textsuperscript{472}, but while he may be “noble” he is not a “savage”, as Behn’s portrait of society is closer to Restoration England than Willem Bosman’s late seventeenth-century picture of coastal African countries which would be similar to Oroonoko’s country of Coramantien\textsuperscript{473}. Oroonoko does not look like other Coramantiens, and Behn is at pains to emphasize this: “His face was not of that brown, rusty black which most of that nation are, but a perfect ebony, or polished jet ... His nose was rising and Roman, instead of African and flat ...”\textsuperscript{474}. Neither does he lack an extensive education at the hands of a French tutor who was a man of “wit and learning”\textsuperscript{475}. So it seems that Coramantien, politically, socially and educationally is
Restoration England transferred to a warmer climate, with Mary of Modena, as Janet Todd claims, a template for Imoinda.

When James II and Mary of Modena became exiles in France, James’s daughter Mary and her Dutch husband William of Orange were pronounced Queen and King on 6 February 1689. Aphra Behn resisted the Whig politician and divine Bishop Burnet’s request for a poem on the usurping William III’s arrival\textsuperscript{476}. Her well known loyalty to the Catholic James II, "... an Unhappy dear Lov’d Monarch ..."\textsuperscript{477} caused her to stress Mary’s lineage as the deposed King’s daughter and she avoided any reference at all to her husband the Protestant William. So what eventually was written was \textit{A Congratulatory Poem to Her Sacred Majesty Queen Mary, Upon Her Arrival in England}, (London, 1689) in which Aphra Behn simply refers to Mary as "\textit{Great Caesar's Off-Spring}"; at least the new queen was one of her hero’s daughters:

\begin{quote}
"All Hail Illustrious Daughter of a King, 

Shining without, and Glorious all within, ...
\end{quote}

The poem emphasises throughout Behn’s past loyalty, most notably when she asks James her "\textit{Great Lord, of all my Vows}” permission to pay “\textit{tribute}” to his daughter\textsuperscript{479}. She did not, of course, wait for a reply since, unlike Anne Kingsmill and Anne Killigrew, she was a professional writer who had to earn a living and, as she was also a political poet, she had to come to terms with the new source of power, and respond to political events.
"Great Master of the Noblest Mysterie": John Greenhill

It was not only the powerful sources of patronage who were praised by Aphra Behn; she also used the "pindaric" form to praise her close friend the artist John Greenhill on his death in 1676\(^{480}\). Hardly an icon of national strength or a "Great Caesar", he was nevertheless regarded as the most talented of Lely’s pupils although his career was cut short by dissolute living. Coming home drunk from the Vine Tavern, he fell into the gutter in Long Acre and died the same night at the house of the painter Parry Walton (d.1699) in Lincoln’s Inn Fields.

Behn’s pindaric On the Death of Mr Grinhil, the Famous Painter touches on some of the issues that Dryden later used in his ode praising Mary of Modena’s "versifying" court artist Maid of Honour Anne Killigrew. This is a poem which also celebrates poetry and painting as "sister arts", but unlike Dryden, Aphra Behn is not concerned with making the claim that poetry is superior to painting. Once attributed to John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, this is a poem not about a drunk and dissipated man but one which verges on the erotic about a talented fellow artist who is able to improve his human subjects and make them "live" for ever:

\[
\text{The famous Grinhil dead! even he,}
\]
\[
\text{That cou’d to us give Immortalitie}^{481}.
\]

In fact she declares that his art was "Sacred as that of Poetry" and was "equally admired". In similar vein to Dryden’s ode to Anne Killigrew in which Dryden makes Killigrew’s success in painting the beautiful Mary of Modena dependent on the fact that
Anne Killigrew also had bodily beauty herself, so Aphra Behn nine years earlier had written about Greenhill's bodily beauty conferring artistic talent, since he was "strong", "manly" and "from himself he copied every Grace".

The painter of these "Glorious Births" which were superior to "Great Natures work" started out making crayon drawings of actors in character parts, moved to imitating Lely, particularly in Seth Ward, Bishop of Salisbury (Salisbury, Guildhall) commissioned in October 1673, and at the time of his death on 19 May 1676 had begun to anticipate Riley in his pastel of Philip Woolrich, (New Haven, Yale Center for British Art), and the oil portrait of Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke, (London, NPG). It was in 1676, just before his death that he was considered the artist fit to grant Mary of Modena "Immortalitie". In The History of the Painter-Stainers Company of London (1936), the author W.A.D. Englefield states that:

In April [1676] there is an entry to the effect that Mr Lilley was desired to paint the King's picture, Mr Howseman the Queen's, Mr Wright the Duke of York's and Mr Greenhill that of the Duchess of York. The portraits of the Queen and the Duchess of York are still in the possession of the Company ...

There is indeed a portrait still on the main staircase of Painter-Stainers Hall called Anne Hyde, Duchess of York by John Greenhill (fig.96); since Anne Hyde died 31 March 1671 the reference must be to the then current Duchess, Mary of Modena. This raises the question "was the portrait of Mary of Modena ever painted?" as according to Hillier Wise, Archivist to the Painter-Stainers Company, a resolution was made by the Company
on 6 April 1676 to commission this set of portraits, and Greenhill himself died on 19 May 1676 which did not give him much time to grant Mary of Modena "Immortalitie".

So who is the sitter in the portrait on the stairs? It cannot be Anne Hyde because the dates are wrong and the sitter’s features are not consistent with known portraits of her. They are consistent with the features of her daughter in Kneller’s portraits of Mary II (fig.97). However, Mary II was not crowned until April 1689, thirteen years after the death of “Mr Grinhil”. The sitter is portrayed in the coronation robes described by Aphra Behn that Kneller painted Mary of Modena wearing when she became Queen Consort in 1685 (fig.98), but the features are not “like” her verified portraits. The portrait is probably not by Greenhill and is Mary II by, or after, Kneller485.

These “portraits” of the “outsider” Mary of Modena, whether visual or textual, vary according to the circumstances of the artist concerned. None however evoke Mary of Modena in any sense in Carol Barash’s terms as being an “outsider” who was “silenced”. The “female literary community” to which Barash draws attention is an overstatement since Anne Finch found her true voice only after she had left the court and found a subject, while the short-lived Anne Killigrew wrote little and left us one doubtful portrait of Mary of Modena, and another which could be Mary of Modena as a “Venus attired by the Graces”, but which is really only testament to Killigrew’s classical learning. It was only Aphra Behn, “outsider” and not of the Court but a tough professional writer with her unswerving devotion to the Stuarts in her political writings, who paved the way for the acceptance of women’s public writing. The real “outsider” of
the disparate "group" considered here was the drunken Greenhill who wasted his talent with dissolute living. His "legacy" is a portrait probably of Mary of Modena's usurping step-daughter Mary II, and probably "after" Godfrey Kneller not Greenhill at all. Greenhill, it would appear, failed to execute his commission to give to Mary of Modena "Immortalitie".
CHAPTER 6

A Distressed Queen of Greek Tragedy:
Mary of Modena as James II’s Queen Consort

In her prose portrait of Mary of Modena in Lives of the Queens of England Agnes Strickland certainly granted her subject “Immortalitie”. In high-flown Victorian language, Strickland writes that Mary of Modena was a woman who “... comes before us in her beauty, her misfortunes, her conjugal tenderness, and passionate maternity, like one of the distressed queens of Greek tragedy, or romance, struggling against the decrees of adverse destiny”. Although her portrait is filled with domestic details and close attention to her education, family connections, manners and costume, Strickland’s Mary of Modena emerges from the page as the female counterpart of the male hero who embodies the motive force of history and the highest human ideals. Mary of Modena, according to Strickland, was one of those queens destined to be underrated by male historians, their contributions in terms of political activity ignored since she gives instances of it, citing in particular Mary of Modena’s personal influence with Louis XIV.

Mary of Modena in this portrait was, like all the queens Strickland writes about, a queen who was:

“... no ordinary woman, to be condemned on hear-say evidence; she is the type of the heavenly bride in the beautiful 45th Psalm:- ‘whatoever things are lovely,
whatsoever things are holy, whatsoever things are pure, and of good report’ in
the female character, ought to be found in her.489

While she was important to history, Mary of Modena’s importance in this account
is still attributed to womanly virtue; Agnes Strickland’s portrait does not challenge the
principle of female exclusion in conventional history, even if it does lend her a certain
“Immortalitie”.

The “Laura” of Petrarch

Nearly two hundred years separates Strickland’s account from Aphra Behn’s
Pindaric celebrating the coronation of James II and “His Illustrious Consort Queen
Mary”. Behn originally cast them as Mars and Venus, but by the end of the second
stanza, Mary of Modena is the idealized Laura of Petrarchan tradition. As in Strickland’s
version, Mary of Modena is a figure of femininity and softness, the beautiful seductive
Laura who evokes the Este family’s association with the Italian poets; and of course
Laura was the name of her mother, the Duchess of Modena (fig.99):

Paint him like Mars when Battails were in view,
And no soft Venus cou’d his Soul subdue;
All bent for nobler spoil than Beauties Charms,
And loos’d a while from Sacred LAURA’s Arms.
LAURA! the Chast! the Pious! and the Fair!
Glorious, and kind as Guardian – Angels are,
Earth’s darling Goddess! and Heav’ns tend’rest care!

(Lines 37-43).490
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Behn's "Pindarick Poem on the Happy Coronation..." is heavy with mythical allusion: Mary of Modena is addressed as Venus the powerful object of the people's desire, as Juno as part of James II's imperial might and as an allegorical "Queen" or "Goddess". From the time of Queen Elizabeth the tradition of royal iconography included biblical heroines and classical goddesses. "The Judgement of Paris" was a favourite motif from mythology (see Chapter 2) that was first used in Anne Boleyn's coronation pageants, and later in Elizabeth I and the Three Goddesses, a portrait painted of the "Virgin Queen" in 1569. Aphra Behn conflates this motif with the Petrarchan ideal of Laura in the "coronation" pindaric in which Mary of Modena combines the allegorical virtues of beauty, chastity and majesty in one being, consequently surpassing even the goddesses Venus, Juno and Minerva. In Petrarch's collection of lyric poems the Canzoniere, Laura is the poetic ideal itself; but whether or not Laura was a real woman, the central point is the fact that her physical attributes are evoked frequently, and her beauty is a talisman returned to repeatedly for inspiration. It is Laura's natural beauty which is her most alluring feature, and she seems to be a composite of Daphne, Beatrice, Proserpina, Francesca de Rimini, Minerva, Venus and Diana, all of them precursors to the Virgin Mary or Mary Magdalene.

Petrarch had inherited a "repertory of situations" from the romance tradition, that is topics which poets had addressed from the first recorded poem, such as the lady as ideally beautiful, ideally virtuous and miraculous, and love as virtue. Petrarch was aware of the duplicity of poetry written in praise of the "bella donna", but his main concern
was to keep Laura’s beauty and virtue to the fore while acknowledging the power she had to lead him astray. Behn cites Laura as an equivalent for Mary of Modena, a figure who embodies human beauty and passion on the one hand and human achievement and glory on the other. In Sonnet 186 of the *Canzoniere*, Laura the immortal beauty of the Christian era, is celebrated as a subject worthy of the genius of Virgil or Homer. Scipio (Cornelius Scipio Africanus) and Laura are “painted” as “flowers”, Scipio as the “ancient flower of virtue and of arms” and Laura as “the new flower” of beauty and goodness:

*Quel fiore antico di vertuti et d’arme,*

*Come sembiante stella ebbe con questo*

*novo fior d’onestate et di bellezze!*

*Ennio di quel caniò ruvido carme,*

*di quest ’altro io, et o, pur non molesto*

*gli sia il mio ingegno e’l io lodar non sprezze!*

*[That ancient flower of virtue and arms, what a similar star he had with this new flower of chastity and beauty! Ennius sang of him an inelegant song, I of her; and ah! may my wit not displease her, may she not despise my praises!] Lines 9-14.*

The “new flower” is Laura the subject of Petrarch’s sonnet and she is the symbol of his hope for a new golden age of peace. Behn refers to Mary of Modena as Laura, as a symbol of hope, peace and prosperity for the new reign in stanzas 19 and 20:
And will no trembling Note impart
To any Musick, but the Charming Names
Of Sacred LAURA! sacred JAMES.

XX

She Comes ......................

Behold the Badge of Peace and Innocence! ...

(Lines 487-491)

“Laura” is, for both Petrarch and Behn, a definition of the loftiest human goal that can be attained; Mary of Modena, like Laura, was an inspiration that moved poets to literary expression and artists to capture their beauty in paint.

The poetic descriptions of women by Petrarch and Dante defined the ideal of female beauty both in literature and painting. Agnolo Firenzuela’s Dialogo delle Bellezze delle Donne of 1548 discussed in Chapter 2 drew on these descriptions and codified what was thought to be beauty in women. Two of Petrarch’s sonnets in the Canzoniere numbers 77 and 78 praise Simone Martini’s painting of Laura, although at the same time Petrarch was able to think that Simone’s portrait (now lost, if it ever existed) failed to capture the real Laura as Petrarch’s own words could do. Petrarch praises the portrait in sonnet 77, thinking that Simone must have been in Paradise when he painted Laura:

Ma certo il mio Simon fu in Paradiso
onde questa gentil donna si parte;
ivi la vide, et la ritrasse in carte

per far fede qua giù del suo bel viso.

[For certain my friend Simon was in Heaven,
the place from which this gracious lady comes;
he saw her there and copied her on paper
as proof down here of such a lovely face.]

But in sonnet 78 he laments that Simone had not brought her alive as Pygmalion would have done; Providence might have been even more generous giving her eyes, lips, a voice and intellect since when he speaks to the portrait she fails to respond. In effect, the painted portrait failed to capture the real woman

“O. Dea. Certe”

Mary of Modena was captured by Roettier in her official coronation medal as a goddess. James II’s official coronation medal was also executed by John Roettier to be distributed on the day of the event, 23 April 1685. Mary of Modena’s coronation medal has a laureate bust of her with her hair collected into a knot with 2 lovelocks and a mantle fastened with a brooch to her right shoulder. The device James chose for the reverse is her figure seated in flowing robes on a mound, like Britannia, above which is O. DEA. CERTE, an allusion to Mary of Modena’s beauty and grace, inscribed from Aeneas’s address to his mother Venus (fig.100):
The coronation of James II and Mary of Modena took place on St. George's Day, 23 April 1685, but in the creation of a suitable ceremony for his goddess, James had difficulty finding precedents. No queen-consort had been crowned in England apart from Anne of Denmark\(^{499}\) since Anne Boleyn. James's mother, Henrietta Maria, at age 16 was not only not crowned at the coronation of 2 February 1626, but she was also not present in Westminster Abbey to see her husband crowned as Charles I. Since she was conditioned to accept the Catholic Church's ruling on the subject she refused a ceremony that would take place in a Protestant church and would be performed by Protestant clergy. James and Mary of Modena had a private Catholic ceremony of anointing and crowning the day before on 22 April 1685. This was performed by James's Confessor the Franciscan Father Mansuete in Whitehall Palace. James had appointed a Commission for the correct order of the ceremony in all its detail to serve as a precedent for future ceremonies. The Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, presided over the Anglican ceremony the following day, but James and Mary of Modena did not receive the Sacrament as was usual, although apart from the procession from the Tower to the Abbey the ceremony was not radically changed. Sir John Reresby referred to this in his Memoirs:

*The King was crowned, with the Queen, in the Abbey of Westminster by the Bishop with all*
the pompe and splendour imaginable; only ther
was noe cavalcade thorow the citty as heretofore.
The King and Queen went privately to the
Palace in Westminster, wher they, the nobility,
and all the officers of the Crown putt on their
robes, and soe went thorow the Palace Yeard
(railed in and prepared on purpass) in procession
to the Abbay ...

Others remarked on the changes; John Evelyn thought "the solemnity very
magnificent", but "(to the great sorrow of the people) no Sacrament, as ought to have
ben ...". The exiled Bishop Burnet whose personal prejudices against France,
Catholicism and James in particular also recorded in his largely inaccurate History of His
Own Time his own hostile account:

The coronation was set for St. George’s day. Turner was ordered to preach the
sermon: and both king and queen resolved to have all done in the protestant form,
and to assist in all the prayers: only the king would not receive the sacrament,
which is always part of the ceremony ... The crown was not well fitted for the
king’s head: it came down too far, and covered the upper part of his face. The
canopy carried over him did also break. Some other smaller things happened that
were looked on as ill omens: and his son by Mrs Sidley (sic) died that day. The
queen with the peeresses made a more graceful figure.
In spite of his acknowledgement of Mary of Modena’s bearing and grace, this was writing with hindsight by somebody who plotted, with William of Orange, the king’s downfall. John Evelyn, however, at the time looked upon the new reign with optimism, thinking that:

"... the King begins his reigne with
greate expectations and hopes of much
reformation as to the former vices, &
prophanesse both of Court & Country"503.

The Abbé Gaspard Rizzini, a Venetian attached for many years to the House of Modena, and its agent in Paris for thirty years, wrote to Mary of Modena’s brother the Duke of Modena that:

_The coronation ceremonies passed with such pomp, such order and great and universal applause that can hardly be described ... the vigorous strength with which Her Majesty the Queen sustained the long fatigue of such a great function, lasting from 10 o’clock in the morning until 7 in the evening, and the weight of her robes and jewels during the long walk and other ceremonies, which made us fear that, still being only convalescent, they might be a cause of suffering and prejudice to her health. The acclamation at the moment of her crowning were, if not greater, at least, as great as the King’s, and accompanied by tears of emotion ..._
Mary of Modena had been ill, described as an inflammation of the chest, but she recovered in time, not only to take her place in the ceremony, but accepted the “liabilities of all small debtors” in Britain imprisoned for sums under £5 which released 80 from Newgate.

James II may have made few, although important, changes for the ceremony, but he ordered expensive ornaments to adorn his goddess Mary of Modena, as Francis Sandford, the Lancaster Herald of Arms recorded. Sandford published a record of the Commission’s work and described the ceremony itself in The History of the Coronation ... complete with quaint illustrations, valuable in themselves for future generations; Mary of Modena appears tall compared with her ladies (fig.101) and her regalia is shown in detail. Since the crown jewels had been sold off during the Interregnum and Charles II had been unmarried at the Restoration there was no regalia for a queen and it had to be specially made. Sandford lists a circlet of gold with diamonds, “a string of pearls round upper edge – purple velvet cap lined white taffata” (sic) she wore to the Abbey, another the same as James but “lesser and lighter” with which she was crowned and a “Rich Crown” or State Crown to wear on the return to Westminster Hall which weighed “19 Ounces Ten-penny weight” and which cost “whol value £119,000 sterling – Made by Mr Richard Beauvoir Jeweller.” She had a new Queen’s Scepter (sic) of Gold with a Cross, an Ivory Rod with a dove and a Rich Ring made of gold with a large Table Ruby & 16 small rubies (fig.102). Ropes of pearls held her purple velvet train to her shoulders and every seam of her dress was covered with diamonds.
Coronation Portraits

All this finery as well as her beauty were captured in paint by two artists: William Wissing, a pupil and studio assistant of Sir Peter Lely until Lely's death, and Wissing's rival Sir Godfrey Kneller. John Riley painted a modified coronation portrait (fig. 103) of her in a very unregal "undress" robe and mantle. He lifts it into formality with the addition of a sceptre in her hand and a crown by her left shoulder. It was wrongly identified as Mary II in the 1947 Althorp Catalogue, which is hardly surprising as it was probably not painted from "life". It appeared in the 1851 Althorp Catalogue as well as being in the New Gallery Exhibition No. 163 in 1889 as Kneller's work; then in 1947, Waterhouse speculated it could be by Wissing, but according to the National Portrait Gallery it appears in Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough's manuscript list as being by "Mr Royelly". Nicolas de Largillierre's (1656-1746) portrait of the new queen consort is known now only in a beautiful mezzotint by John Smith (fig. 104). In "the History of Huntingdon" by R.C. (R. Carruthers) published in 1824 there is a list of the "... many fine pictures, Family Portraits, and others of interesting personages" with number 23 listed as Mary of Modena, Queen of King James II. This portrait then, later identified as the work of Largillière (sic), was in the Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon collection until sold by the executors of the Earl of Sandwich at Christie's, London, on Friday 4 March 1927 and is now in a private collection. This could possibly be the original: lot 25 is a portrait of Mary of Modena "... in Classical dress, with pearl ornaments. In a sculptured oval 29in by 24in", and chimes with the mezzotint by Largillierre in that they both are in ovals and the mezzotint shows her hair threaded with pearls. Largillierre visited London three times in his career, and on his third visit in 1686
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after he had been accepted into the Académie Royale, Paris on 30 March 1686, he painted a portrait of James now in the National Maritime Museum and its pair, the lost portrait of his consort. On 9 December and 13 December 1686 the mezzotints by Isaac Beckett and John Smith respectively after these two portraits were advertised for sale in the London Gazette and the prints by John Smith were published frequently thereafter by Alexander Browne. After the exile of the Stuart royal family in December 1688 the portrait of Mary of Modena by Largillierre was used as a basis for propaganda to attack the invasion of William of Orange and laud the magnanimity of Louis XIV in offering them sanctuary. It is a rather ugly anonymous print published by Nicholas de Larmessin; a version with the addition of a cross hanging from a pearl necklace round her neck is now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (fig. 104a).

The portrait by Largillierre was painted on the occasion of James II and Mary of Modena's accession to the throne, but since it was painted in 1686 it was not a coronation portrait. The coronation portrait by Sir Godfrey Kneller exists in several versions, although the State portrait itself is now lost. A version thought to be by Michael Dahl but in fact by Kneller in an oak leaf and acorn frame was sold from the Combe Abbey collection at Sotheby's in 1968 and a small modello, apparently autograph, of this and the "lost" State Portrait by Kneller was also sold at Sothebys in June 1960 (fig. 105). They are identical being full-length, full face wearing the coronation crown and jewelled robes, with a sceptre in her left hand which rests on a table beside her. A throne behind leaves the spectator in no doubt this is a "power and authority" portrait, even if Mary of Modena was a queen consort. The portrait which displays the robes and regalia to best advantage
is the three-quarter length portrait by Kneller based on the *Modello* and lost State Portrait, and now at Chirk Castle; it is illustrated in Chapter 5 as fig. 98. She rests her hand on her crown, rather than wearing it and neither sceptre nor throne are visible. This design was published as a head and shoulders in mezzotint in two versions by John Smith (fig. 106 and fig. 107) and produced in mezzotint by J. Beckett and in line-engraving by R. White (fig. 108).

A truly dreadful portrait by Kneller of the queen consort hangs with one of James II at Arundel Castle. She appears to be either sporting a moustache or imitating a hamster with its cheeks full; something has gone wrong with the lower half of her face (fig. 109). Informal, but with an ermine-trimmed mantle, this is a full-length foretaste of the rather poor series painted for Mary II of her "principal ladies" by Kneller shortly after 1690. An imitation of her mother’s patronage of Lely, these are dull and restrained, totally lacking the allure and colour of the "beauties" of Lely’s brush. Lely was adaptable to his sitters’ vanity painting not nature’s truth, but nature’s corrected perfection. The "Windsor Beauties" may not be Lely’s best work but they capture the grace, insolence and wanton aspect of Charles II’s court. Kneller’s court commissions were business commissions and an opportunity to make money. His staid "Hampton Court Beauties" reflect this paramount concern and reveal nothing of William and Mary’s entirely conventional and lack-lustre court.

In an altogether different class is the outstanding formal coronation portrait painted by the independent-minded William Wissing. This portrait particularly lends
itself to Wissing’s elegant style and is rich in the detail of the ornamentation and drapery associated with the regalia. Again it is full-length, but Mary of Modena is seated in her coronation robes, wears the small state crown on the top of her head, and holds her sceptre in her left hand, her arm resting on a cushion. It was painted in 1685, probably shortly after the coronation. Wissing painted this portrait twice, for two court figures: Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of Somerset who was a patron of Wissing and Kneller (fig. 110) and Anna Scott, Duchess of Monmouth and suo jure Duchess of Buccleuch, who was married to Charles II’s eldest bastard son James Crofts, later Duke of Monmouth (fig. 111). She was known for her literary and artistic patronage; she was one of Kneller’s earliest patrons and she was taught drawing by the mezzotint publisher Alexander Browne who dedicated his treatise on art Ars Pictoria (1669) to her. The portrait in the Buccleuch Collection was possibly presented to her since she led the eight Duchesses in Mary of Modena’s coronation procession. The capital on the column behind her differs from the version in the collection at Petworth House and it also lacks the putto who flies down to hold a wreath of what appears to be laurel over the Queen’s head. This was possibly commissioned by Somerset, also known as the Proud Duke, although it too could have been presented to him since he was named a Gentleman of the Bedchamber a month after the coronation in May 1685, and in August he was appointed Colonel of the Queen’s regiment of dragoons.\[508\]

These two portraits are very close to the three-quarter length version in the collection of the Earl of Mansfield, Scone Palace (fig. 112) which is more relaxed as she leans towards her left, rests her arm on a table, cradles her sceptre and has her crown near
her right arm. Wissing's coronation portrait, like Kneller's was made more widely available, this time in a mezzotint by R. Williams (fig. 113). A small but curious copy of this mezzotint in oil on glass, 11½ x 9½ (fig. 114) was made as well as an engraving with the legend “Marie Eleonor d’Este Espouse de Jacques II” for distribution in France.

A very plausible coronation portrait of Mary of Modena exists in the P. Davie Collection in the USA (fig. 115). It is, impossibly, attributed to Lely, who had been dead five years before she was crowned. Lely influenced Wissing his pupil and this appears to be by Wissing, following the same hairstyle, although his signature jewelled edging to her robes is missing. She leans her left arm on a tasselled cushioned ledge on which stands a very Wissing-like jewelled orb; this is incorrect as this was not part of her regalia. She holds the small state crown in her right hand. This certainly appears to be a variant on Wissing's coronation portrait but could possibly be after Wissing. At the time of her accession in 1685 she sat to Wissing for a portrait which exists in two designs, but which uses the same head. The two designs, in three-quarter length exist in several versions; a signed version of the first design is in the National Portrait Gallery, London, and was purchased in 1866 (fig. 116). She wears a red and blue dress: the bodice is red and the jewelled edging around the shoulders is blue with a blue robe. She sits beside a column, with her dog beside her and a palace beyond. Her delicacy and beauty are emphasised by the white rose at her right which identifies her with the Stuarts. Her long-necked elegant pose bears comparison with Parmigianino's *Madonna dal collo lungo*, or *Madonna of the Long Neck*. Elizabeth Cropper's argument in her article “On Beautiful Women” in the *Arts Bulletin* (1976) is that beauty in both the Madonna of Parmigianino
and in Firenzuola's "Dialogo delle Bellezze delle Donne" are in keeping with the description of beauty first articulated by Petrarch. Mary of Modena can be seen here as the beautiful virgin queen, since, as in Petrarch's Canzoniere, his final canzone no.366 lauds the Virgin Mary as "madre, figliuola et sposa", and Mary of Modena's accession promised that she would indeed produce an heir, that she was the daughter of her adopted country and the wife of its new king. The placing of her right hand across her breast to hold a lock of her hair not only echoes Hendrick Goltzius's portrait Helen of Troy (1615), but is a deliberate meditation on the power of women's beauty.

In other versions of this design she wears variously an ochre or gold coloured dress with a blue wrap, and a crown appears above the rose or is a substitute for it. In the second design of this portrait type she wears an elaborately embroidered dress, a crown is at the base of the column, the palace is grander and a parrot/cockatoo has taken the place of her dog (fig.117). It is similar to the signed portrait of her stepdaughter Mary II when Princess of Orange in the Royal Collection. James II's patronage of Wissing caused Wissing to be sent to The Hague in 1685 to paint portraits of his daughter Mary and his Dutch son-in-law William. In the original three-quarter-length, Princess Mary is seated in a landscape and holds her veil in her right hand (fig.118), and, since the portrait proved to be popular, many versions and variants of the original in the Royal Collection survive, not all by Wissing's hand.

Wissing enjoyed the patronage of the Brownlow family in Lincolnshire; his portrait of Elizabeth Brownlow, (later Countess of Exeter and 2nd wife of John 6th Earl of
Exeter) as a child is painted, as in the portrait of Mary of Modena, with a cockatoo. Given that Wissing was born in Amsterdam it is hardly surprising that Dutch symbolism should sometimes creep into his portraits. Many Dutch seventeenth-century paintings and contemporary literature were preoccupied with the virtuous and well-trained young woman’s life. In Jacob Cats’s *Houwelyck* (Marriage) the preface to the first chapter is the *Maep-hde-Wal2e* (Maiden’s Coat of Arms), an illustration in which one of the young women holds a parrot, one an embroidery sampler, and songbooks and a dog are at their feet (fig.119). The inscription “*Leer-sucht*” means willingness to learn; the parrot is equated along with the other symbols of virtue with docility because it is easily tamed and can be taught to speak. The presence of parrots in paintings by Frans van Meiris the Elder, (*Young Lady with a Parrot*, London, National Gallery), and Gabriel Metsu, (*Young Lady with a Parrot*, Moscow, Pushkin Museum), signifies the proper training of their mistresses. In Jacob Duck’s painting *Musical Ensemble with Cockatoo* (c.1660) (Private Collection) the bird perched on a swing above the table can be variously interpreted as a creature which imitates what it hears, as a bird of love, or as an eloquent singer. It was also sold as a very expensive family pet having been imported from Indonesia. What is the exact significance of the cockatoo in Wissing’s knowingly ambiguous portrait of the new queen consort can only be guessed at, but it is probably a symbol of affluence, virtue and, since Pliny the Elder refers to its remarkable powers of speech in his *Natural History*, the cockatoo may be a gesture by Wissing towards Mary of Modena’s not inconsiderable accomplishment as a linguist.
This very popular portrait type by Wissing produced a magnificent line engraving by J. Blondeau, made in Antwerp (fig.120) with its legend in Latin. It is in an oval frame with ornaments and was published by J.J. de Rubeis in Rome. The portrait type was also adapted to a miniature in c.1685 by Peter Cross “Limner in Ordinary to his Majesty” since July 1678. This miniature in a seventeenth-century oval silver-gilt locket, portrays Mary of Modena at the time of her accession in a blue dress and white chemise, and is engraved on the back: Mary D’Esté James the Second’s Queen.

Purcell’s Coronation Music

The Organists of the Chapel Royal and of Westminster Abbey were in charge of the music at Coronations and their duties included composing the music and the anthems required for the service; nine anthems in all were sung at the coronation service of 1685 including a Te Deum by William Child (1606-1697) an organist and composer of anthems, services and psalms. Dr John Blow was “Master of the Children of H.M. Chapel and Organist to the King” and for the Coronation in 1685 composed Anthem II God spake sometime in visions and said. Henry Purcell’s title was “Gentleman of the Chapel – Royal and Organist of St. Margarets Westminster” and composed Anthem I sung by the choir of Westminster when the King and Queen had just entered the church. Sandford records too “… that when the QUEEN entred (sic) the Choir, the King’s Scholars of Westminster School, in Number Forty, all in Surplices, being placed in a Gallery adjoyning to the Great Organ – Loft, Entertained Her Majesty with this short Prayer or Salutation, VIVAT REGINA MARIA; which they continued to sing until His Majesty entred (sic) the Choir …”513. Sir Hubert Parry introduced the traditional
“vivats” of the Westminster boys into the middle of the anthem “I was glad” and since the Coronation of Edward VII these are always sung\textsuperscript{514}.

Purcell composed the symphony anthem\textsuperscript{515} My Heart is Inditing of a Good Matter for the joint vocal forces of the Chapel Royal and Westminster Abbey numbering 20 boys, 48 men and 24 violins\textsuperscript{516}. This brought the ceremony to an end with the crowning of Mary of Modena as Queen. Because James was a Catholic, because she was both a Catholic and an Italian, and because England’s future under a Catholic monarchy had been rumbling since the Popish Plot of 1678, the Exclusion Bills to exclude James from the succession in 1679, 1680 and 1681, and the Rye House Plot of 1683, it is likely that the text of Purcell’s anthem was deliberately edited\textsuperscript{517} so that Mary of Modena was seen to be the wife who had forsaken Italy and taken upon herself the duty of devotion to her husband, the Stuart dynasty and Britain. She is the submissive, dutiful wife who in Vers. 10 At His Right Hand shall stand the Queen and Vers. 14 all Glorious within, Her Clothing is of wrought Gold." She is admonished by the choir to “Hearken O Daughter, and consider, incline Thine Ear, forget also thine Own People, and Thy Fathers House”. But in renouncing her Italian homeland, her reward is the promise in Vers. 17 Instead of Thy Fathers, thou shalt have Children, whom thou mayst make Princes in all Lands.\textsuperscript{518} If the promise of children was, in the abstract, a joy and blessing for Mary of Modena and James II, it was perhaps an ill-omen for the reign; the birth of their son lead to their exile in France.

Monmouth’s Rebellion: an ill-omen
Dryden’s operatic celebration of the triumph of the Crown over the Exclusionists, *Albion and Albanius* which opened at the Queen’s Theatre, Drury Lane on 3 June 1685 was to have been a piece to herald the new reign but during the sixth performance, and only seven weeks after the coronation, news reached London of Monmouth’s landing. So, interrupted by the invasion of Charles II’s bastard son and then incipient civil war, *Albion and Albanius* was an ill-omen for James and Mary of Modena, and set the scene for the ill-fated events that followed.

As discussed in Chapter 4, Charles saw parts of this operatic allegory, but before its public performance he was dead, and the unchallenged accession of James and Mary of Modena meant that any hopes that James Scott, Duke of Monmouth had of succeeding his father were groundless. Dryden writes a cautionary tale which starts in the Interregnun, at a time when Augusta, who represents Londoners, tried to mend her broken marriage vows and concludes: “*But here below,/Let Princes Know/’Tis fatal to be good*”⁵¹⁹. It seems that Dryden was issuing a warning. Although James and Mary of Modena came to the throne at a time of calm, Venus, who is probably Mary of Modena, tells Albanius that all he will reap will be ingratitude, and so he must respond positively with strength:

*Albanius Lord of Land and Main,*
*Shall with fraternal vertues Reign;*
*And add his own,*
*To fill the Throne;*
*Ador’d and fear’d, and lov’d no less:*
In War Victorious, mild in Peace,

The joy of men, and Jove’s increase.\textsuperscript{520}

Monmouth, landing at Lyme Regis with only eighty-two men chose the wrong moment after Charles II’s death; strategically it was too soon as James had not had time to upset his subjects, his only Parliament was still voting him money and it promptly pronounced the Duke a traitor. Added to that all Whigs of substance were expecting James’s son-in-law William of Orange to lead them in rebellion, particularly since Monmouth’s betrayal of the Whig magnates after the Rye House Plot of June 1683 which Mary of Modena commented upon in letters of 25 June and 18 July 1683. To her brother she wrote:

\(...\) I have great news to send you – not of a false, but of a real plot devised by the Presbyterians against the persons of the King and the Duke \(...\); it is said that Shaftesbury, who is dead, knew it all, but it is believed that many (living) men of quality were cognisant of it, and it is hoped they will be discovered\textsuperscript{521}.

In a letter to the Superior at Modena’s Visitation Convent she writes that there were thirty-six men in prison and the greater number will be condemned to death. She hopes that “\(...\) this may be of great benefit to the Catholics, for now they will be fully justified of the plot of which they were accused, and which was most false\textsuperscript{522}.”

After the Rye House Plot, Monmouth was forgiven both by his father Charles II and James, still Duke of York. Forgiveness was not to be repeated; he was captured on 8 July at Ringwood hiding in a ditch, and was brought before James in Whitehall. Reports
that Mary of Modena was present at an interview at which Monmouth was not to be pardoned and that she had taunted him are not correct. Monmouth had in fact written to both Catherine of Braganza and Mary of Modena to intercede on his behalf, thinking that they would be sympathetic and he would be forgiven again. In the event neither were present, and Terriesi reported that only the King and the two Secretaries of State were present. Mary of Modena had marked Dryden's advice that *Tis fatal to be good to traitors, even if they are nephews, and replied in her letter to her brother that had Monmouth's offence been against herself she would have forgiven him, but usurping the crown was a matter for the King alone to decide. James II decided, Monmouth was sent to the Tower and executed on 15 July 1685.

**Purcell's good omen**

From the start of his reign James II was determined to bring order and reform to a "dissolute annexe to Versailles" as the court of Charles II has been characterised. The reforms had important consequences for its musical life; the instrumentalists were no longer divided into autonomous separate consorts, but were now all listed under the heading of "Private Music", and the twenty-four violins became a Baroque orchestra of strings, wind and continuo. The first list of the new Private Music was dated 31 August 1685; Henry Purcell is shown to be appointed Harpsicall (harpsichord) player. Purcell's duty as court composer was the setting of complimentary odes for the celebration of state occasions such as royal birthdays, New Year and the King's return from holiday. Odes for the King's birthday ceased under James II since his birthday on 14 October followed closely on the court's return to London from Windsor, so that the
welcome song was combined with the birthday ode. Mary of Modena had no birthday
odes written for her, and after the Revolution no more welcome songs were written, but a
birthday ode was required for each of the joint usurping monarchs Mary II and William
III. These odes can usually be dated quite accurately; they were written for performance
at court by court musicians and the odes written for the court of James and Mary of
Modena were usually performed in the evening: To night we have had a mighty
Musique-Entertainment at Court for the welcoming home the King and Queene” wrote
Pepys to Sir Robert Southwell on 10 October 1685. Purcell wrote three Welcome
Songs for James II and his first official composition was the Welcome Song “Why,
why are all the Muses Mute?” which refers to Monmouth’s abortive rebellion and flatters
James as the strong Caesar. This could be the music John Evelyn had heard performed at
Whitehall when, according to his diary, James’s birthday celebrations on 14 October
1685, eight days after the Court had returned from Windsor, preceded a court ball which
would have been held in the evening. It also demonstrates a certain informality and the
interest in music that Mary of Modena and James II had:

Being the Kings birth-day, was a solemn Ball
at Court; And Musique of Instruments & Voices
before the Ball: At the Musique I happen<ed>
(by accident) to stand the very next to the
Queene, & the King, who ta<ld> ked with
me about Musick ...
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The famous counter-tenor William Turner sang the ground bass aria from this welcome song:

*Britain, thou now art great, art great indeed!*

*Arise, and proud of Caesar's godlike sway,*

*Above the neighbour nations lift thy head*

*Command the world, while Caesar you obey.*

The defeat of Monmouth seems to be transformed by Purcell into a good omen for the reign of Mary of Modena and James II with Caesar's avenging thunder on the "accurs'd rebellion" being described graphically:

*... the threatening monster fell*

*Down, down from whence it rose to Hell."

According to Luttrell the celebrations were marked by "publick demonstrations of joy, as ringing of bells ...".

The court ode formed the basis of the St. Cecilia's Day Odes written to honour the patron of music and the Christian virginal inventor of the organ on 22 November, a practice begun about 1683 in England. Dryden had many of his words set to music by composers such as Pelham Humfrey, Louis Grabu, John Blow and Henry Purcell; his *A Song for St. Cecilia’s Day, 1687* had an elaborate setting by Mary of Modena's favourite composer, the Italian Giovanni Baptista Draghi. After the successful St. Cecilia's Day celebration at Stationers' Hall London, Draghi, who studied in Venice, was
appointed organist of James II’s Catholic chapel at Christmas 1687. “From harmony, from heavenly harmony” is on a much larger scale than previous odes and opens with an Italiante prelude rather than the traditional French overture and the choruses are based for the first time on “Italiante counterpoint rather than French dance patterns ...”\[^{332}\]. A tuneful Voice was heard from high ordering the jarring Atomes of chaos opens Dryden’s poem giving a vision of creation as harmony which is short lived since music can both “raise and quell” passion. The passions are connected with particular instruments: the trumpet “Exites us to Arms/With shrill Notes of Anger”, the violins proclaim “Their jealous Pangs, and Desparation,/Fury, frantick Indignation. The grand closing chorus is a vision of the apocalypse which “This crumbling Pageant shall devour”. The trumpet will sound and Musick shall untune the Sky” reflects perhaps the political dissonance that was slowly “untuning” the reign of James II and Mary of Modena; two years after the coronation the fairy tale was “crumbling”\[^{333}\].

“Dorinda ... hurts the sight”

Catharine Sedley, James II’s mistress and Mary of Modena’s former maid of honour, was responsible for “untuning” their marriage and for the passionate fury unleashed in the aggrieved wife. After the coronation in April, and the Monmouth saga of the summer, Mary of Modena’s health began to cause concern. Explanations ranged from a “chill”, a fall from her horse, to Terriesi’s letter of September 1685 to the Grand Duke of Tuscany:
There are no signs of appeasement in the Queen's aspect of the commOTION
aroused in her — it is said — by the report that the King has retaken Madame
Sedley into favour ... 534.

One of his "reforms" on his accession had been James's determination not to continue the
dissolute ways of Charles II; he sent Catharine Sedley away from court, even if 21 St
James's Square was not far from Whitehall. On 19 January 1686 she was created
Baroness Darlington and Countess of Dorchester. Mary of Modena took this "very
grievously" in John Evelyn's estimation since "for two dinners, standing neere her,
hardly eate one morsel, nor spake one word to the King, or to any about her, who at all
other times us'd to be extreamely pleasant, full of discourse & good humor ...". The
Roman Catholics were not pleased either because they "had so long valu'd the Sanctite
of their Religion & Proselytes" 535 James II's determination to impose frugality, thrift and
morality on the court was in keeping with his promise to set an example of sexual
continence by renouncing Catharine Sedley; however in endeavouring to put the
relationship with her on a dignified footing by creating her a Baroness and a Countess he
rather undermined this effort.

Mary of Modena had James II's conscience, a good cause and a collection of his
priests on her side; her role as Queen was to defend Catholicism against his hypocrisy
and sin and so she demanded he cease his affair with Sedley or she would withdraw to a
convent. Burnet wrote that as soon as Mary of Modena heard that "Sidley" had been
made Countess of Dorchester "... she gave order to bring all the priests, that were
admitted to a particular confidence into her closet ... to quiet them all, [the King]
promised them, that he would see the lady no more; and pretended that he gave her this
title in order to the breaking with her the more decently. And, when the Queen did not
seem to believe this he promised that he would send her to Ireland ... 536 According to
Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, the Lord Treasurer, the Earl of Rochester and other
Protestant courtiers had tried to set up Sedley as an Anglican rival to Mary of Modena
and the official royal mistress with the position and the influence over the King such as
the Duchess of Portsmouth had exerted over Charles II 537. This was a case of Mary of
Modena and the Catholic priests intervening in court politics and winning a decisive
victory against the Protestant ministers. Mary of Modena had a short-lived victory
however. Sedley went to Ireland in March but Luttrell reported that in November the
same year “Mrs Sedley, ..., is lately come out of Ireland, whither she was ordered to
retire” 538. James resumed the affair and saw other women in secret at Whitehall. While
the secrecy was undignified it helped to prevent the friction between James II and Mary
of Modena from hastening the “crumbling pageant” of the reign.

James and Mary of Modena’s accession had been peaceful, but not automatic,
because their Catholicism made them personally and politically unacceptable to many
English Protestants. Because of the Exclusion Crisis dominated by the ultra-Protestant
Whigs between 1679 and 1681 the Stuarts had formed an alliance with the Church of
England “Tories” led by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr William Sancroft, and
Lawrence Hyde, 1st Earl of Rochester and Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of Clarendon, James’s
Protestant brothers-in-law through his first wife Anne Hyde. It was this high church
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alliance who assured the accession. While he was a Tory king they were attached to the
Church of England and Protestantism, but he found their support began to erode with his
persistence in furthering the cause of Catholicism. The “crumbling” of the “pageant” was
the result of his committing political suicide through alienating the consent on which the
authority of his government rested. With his policy of outright religious toleration in
1687, cultivating Dissenters and compliant churchmen as well as Catholics he hoped to
gain what he wanted, a statutory enactment of Catholic emancipation. Dryden’s major
work of this period was his apologia for his conversion to Roman Catholicism The Hind
and the Panther, a personal religious poem. It is a portrait of the Anglican party which
argues that the spiritual authority of the Anglican church is compromised by self-interest,
a trait emerging as opportunism, greed and complicity in parliamentary affairs. The
Panther’s Fable of the Swallows concerns the disputes among Catholics, on the one hand
James and his rash foolish advisers like Father Edward Petre and the moderates, the
landed Catholic nobility, gentry and Dryden himself. Father Petre was greatly mistrusted
by Mary of Modena. James disregarded her advice that he would be unwise to appoint
his Catholic clerk of the closet to the Privy Council. However, the poem was read as
propaganda, supporting James II’s Declaration of Indulgence of 4 April 1687, rather than
as a statement of Dryden’s own faith. All James’ efforts to win both political and
religious converts were in vain and in fact stiffened Anglican opposition stimulating a
growing Anti-Catholicism in the Church of England. John Evelyn wrote on 2 March
1687 that:

Most of the greate officers both in Court, [& Country] Lords & others dismissed,
who would not promise his Majestie their consent to repealing the Test, & penal
statutes against the Romish recusants: There was to this end most of the Parliament men, spoken to in his Majesties Closset, & such as refused, if in any place, or office of Trust, Civil, or military, put out of their Employments: This was a time of greate trial: Hardly one of them assenting, which put the Popish Interest much backward: The English Cleargy, everywhere were boldly preaching against their Superstition & errors, and wonderfully follow'd by the people ...\(^{339}\).

There were those who did convert, like Dryden who acted from devoutness, but others converted out of venality, although all converts were seen by the Church of England as people who changed their views to meet the prevailing religious climate. The Converts was a satire written from this point of view offering the judgement that all converts are beneath contempt, and particularly the 2\(^{nd}\) Earl of Peterborough who converted at the end of March 1687\(^{540}\), and who was responsible for bringing the Duke of York an Italian Catholic as his bride:

\begin{quote}
I did intend in rhymes heroic
To write of converts apostolic,
Describe their persons and their shames,
And leave the world to guess their names;
...
Of earls, of lords, of knights I'll sing
That chang'd their faith to please their King.
\end{quote}
The first, an antiquated lord,
A walking mummy, in a word;
...

Why he's a favourite few can guess:
Some say it's for his ugliness,
For often monsters, being rare,
Are valu'd equal to the fair
(For in his mistresses kind James
Loves ugliness in its extremes);
But others say 'tis plainly seen,
'Tis for the choice he made o' th' Queen,
When he the King and nation blest
With off-spring of the House of Este,
A dame whose affability
Equals her generosity:
Oh, well-match'd pair, who frugally are bent
To live without the aids of parliament!
All this and more the peer perform'd,
Then to complete his virtues, turn'd; ...

This satire links Mary of Modena to "popery", although she is an “affable” dame; but it goes further in that it shows James II to be a hypocrite in his religion in mentioning his mistresses, and notably Catharine Sedley who was noted for her wit rather than her
beauty. Evelyn described her as not the most “virtuous” woman but a “wit”. She was celebrated as a court character and as Dorinda in Charles Sackville, the Earl of Dorset’s satirical verse Song where Dorinda’s sparkling wit, and eyes, United, cast too fierce a light, Which blazes high, but quickly dies, Pains not the heart, but hurts the sight\(^42\) is a reference to her squint; a contrast to James II’s wife’s legendary beauty. Dorset was opposed to James II, to his drive for toleration, to his mistress Catharine Sedley, and he supported the Seven Bishops and William of Orange’s decision to invade England; it is unsurprising then that he is credited with the satire A Faithful Catalogue of Our Most Eminent Ninnies which is concerned with the large number of mistresses James and his brother Charles II had had;

\begin{verbatim}
Oh, sacred James! may thy dread noddle be 
As free from danger as from wit ’tis free!
But if that good and gracious Monarch’s charms
Could ne’er confine one woman to his arms ... Lines 38-41\(^43\)
\end{verbatim}

It lists, rather pointedly, the children these liaisons had brought forth who all had to be given titles and land. James had a long list of mistresses, and Mary of Modena’s strictures about them, particularly the Catharine Sedley affair, meant that he was more discrete about his future conduct. With the approval of her priests a furious Mary of Modena gave James a flail with which to castigate himself when he indulged in backsliding. Macaulay records in his History of England ... that the flail, along with other possessions, was bequeathed to the Monastery of St Marie at Chaillot on her death\(^44\).
At this point as Queen Consort, Mary of Modena's situation was similar to that endured by her predecessor Catharine of Braganza. Catherine was known as the Queen Consort who failed to produce an heir, but who had also had to endure the ignominy of her husband's mistresses being flaunted at court; she could have resorted to the threat of the flail as Mary of Modena did, successfully it seems, with her arrogant and self-indulgent husband. Under the Catholic James II, Catherine had fewer difficulties with her religion than she had had under her nominally Protestant husband; for example, she and her household were suspected of being involved in an alleged conspiracy to kill Charles II during the Popish Plot of 1678, and she was publicly insulted in 1679 on her way to her chapel in Somerset House. After his death, she lived at Somerset House, established a community of nuns at Hammersmith, where she lived during the summer months, but increasingly, as a former queen consort with a negligible public role, she wished to return to Portugal. She finally returned, leaving England in March 1692, and arrived in Lisbon in January 1693. She resided in Bemposta, near Lisbon and became regent because of her brother Pedro II's ill health, and she died at Bemposta on the last day of December 1705. Like Mary of Modena, Catherine of Braganza suffered greatly, but remained devoted to a philandering husband; she was at his bedside until his death on 6 February 1685. It seems she would have known about his deathbed "conversion" to Catholicism, although would have played no role in it. As she was to do in her poems on Mary of Modena, Aphra Behn likened Catherine to the Virgin Mary in *A Poem Humbly Dedicated to the Great Patern of Piety and Virtue Catherine Queen Dowager. On the Death of Her Dear Lord and Husband King Charles II*, (1685), since she is a grieving woman, but is also able to overcome her grief. For Behn she becomes, in a bizarre way,
the mother of Charles II with heaven-given patience as he is represented as a Christ figure:

\[
\text{Methinks I see, you like the Queen of Heav'n} \\
\text{To whom all Patience and all Grace was giv'n;} \\
\text{When the Great Lord of Life Himself was lay'd} \\
\text{Upon her Lap, all wounded, Pale and Dead}
\]

(4; 11. Lines 106-9)

Catherine of Braganza, like Mary of Modena, had learned lessons of patience, grace and devotion through her strict upbringing in the Catholic church, and through suffering her husband's errant ways. Both Queen Consorts were pious, Catholic and foreign with philandering husbands. Both had trouble producing an heir and although Mary of Modena eventually had two children who survived childhood, Catherine was not so lucky. The only difference between them was that Mary of Modena was renowned for her elegant beauty, Catherine was short slight and although she had "excellent Eyes, her teeth wronging her mouth by sticking a little too far out". 545

Aphra Behn and John Dryden notwithstanding, increasingly in the short reign of James II, satire took over from the "beautiful woman" poems inspired by Petrarch. Norman Farmer asserts that by the end of the seventeenth century the heroic had given way to the satiric impulse in poetry, and caricature began to compete successfully with the beauty of the visual portrait. 546 The poetry of the Restoration circulated in a variety of forms from the copied manuscript to the printed anthology. Manuscript satires and
lampoons were copied and circulated in inns and coffee houses and from about 1680 an industry of hand copying and selling the latest lampoon or poem grew up. What is important is, poetry was a shared public discourse; this was not the Romantic period with the poem a medium for the outpouring of personal feeling. Poetry was written frequently as “occasional” poetry relating to specific political, public events, such as that by Aphra Behn to Catherine of Braganza on the death of Charles II, and was therefore a form of commentary on social and political events.

Aphra Behn’s political poems included poems of praise and poems written in commemoration of specific occasions, offering commentary on, and supporting, the rule of the Stuarts. They are not poems of personal feeling. George Granville, Lord Lansdowne wrote a poem shortly after the coronation of 1685 which appeared in the second edition of Granville’s Poems Upon Several Occasions published in 1716. The poem called On the Queen however did not survive transfer to George Granville’s Works of 1736 which collected all the work he wished to see preserved:

When we reflect upon our charming Queen,
Her Wit, her Beauty, her Imperial Mein;
Majestick, Juno in her Air we find,
The Form of Venus with Minerva’s Mind:
Who was so grac’d, she, she was fit alone
With Royal James to fill the British Throne.547
Eleven years after he precociously celebrated her marriage and her visit to Cambridge, Granville had scarcely moved on from the flattering poem to the beautiful woman with which he had previously engaged. It is not a poem about his personal feelings for her but again refers to the much used theme of the “Judgement of Paris” in order to celebrate the accession of James II and Mary of Modena and to show that, at the time, Granville supported the rule of the Stuarts. When Granville wrote this poem, Mary of Modena was the ideal Queen Consort; in three short years, because she bore a male heir, “the pageant” had “crumbled”, and her life took on the aspect, in the words of Agnes Strickland, of a “distressed queen of Greek tragedy”.
The real tragedy for the Stuarts and Mary of Modena was realised when England began the so-called “Glorious Revolution” because she had unexpectedly produced a male heir. Sir Godfrey Kneller painted a portrait of the child, James Francis Edward, beneath a richly embroidered crown. It was one of the most copied Jacobite portraits that became familiar through the widely distributed mezzotint of “The Prince of Great Britain” by John Smith (fig.121) and through copies such as Pieter Schenck’s mezzotint (fig.122) which omits the background detail. The child exacerbated a problem which had been festering for several years. Having had five miscarriages and four infant deaths\textsuperscript{549} it was hoped, rather than reasonably assumed, that Mary of Modena would not have any more children. Since the child was a boy he took precedence in the line of succession to the throne over James II’s elder daughter, the Protestant Mary of Orange, and he would almost certainly be raised a Catholic. It was widely suspected that James II was intent upon the recatholicization of England.

It is misleading to see James II’s policies as a desire to “establish” Catholicism in England; he wanted only to ensure its survival by putting his fellow Roman Catholics on an equal footing with members of the Church of England. In 1687 he issued an
indulgence proclamation suspending penal laws for Dissenters and Catholics, and in 1688, to ensure the co-operation of the Church, he reissued the declaration ordering it to be read in all parishes of the country. The order was disliked, disobeyed and the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft and six of his fellow bishops\textsuperscript{550} petitioned the King to excuse the clergy from reading the declaration on the grounds that it was illegal\textsuperscript{551} They were charged with sedition, tried and acquitted, but the trial created a rift between King and Church. It stimulated virulent anti-Catholicism within the Church of England, and enhanced the attractiveness of Protestantism in England that was focussed on Mary of Orange and her husband William.

The author displays a lack of enthusiasm for the bishops’ stance in the ironic, anti-clerical poem "The Clerical Cabal", particularly making sly comment on the double standards of the bishops who raised the problem of conscience, but who had not had a problem enforcing penal laws against the Dissenters who were bound by their consciences. The following extracts point to James’s declaration as an important factor that led to the Revolution:

\textit{When lately King James, whom our Sovereign we call,}
\textit{For reasons of state and the good of the nation,}
\textit{By advice of his Council commanded that all}
\textit{Should read in their churches his last Declaration;}
\textit{As soon as it was to the clergy reported,}
\textit{To a place in the City they in private resorted
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To advise on the matter and gravely debate

Whether conscience should truckle to reasons of state; ...

That should we submit to his Majesty's order,
The world would regard our Church thunder no further.

"That's true", says another, "and when the King's dead
You know that the Princess of Orange comes in,
And then this denial may stand us instead
To purchase her favour and fix us again.

Though of Passive Obedience we talk like the best,
'Tis prudence, when interest sways, to resist ...

No argument better than this can convince us

How much 'tis our duty to please the Dutch Princess;

But some will now say, since the Queen is with child,

If a male should be born, our project is spoil'd ...

The alarmist preaching of the Protestant clergy and their denunciations of the Church of Rome led to few English people being prepared to accept the prospect of another Catholic king. The announcement on 23 December 1687 of Mary of Modena's pregnancy ignited the smouldering ashes of the Popish Plot of 1679 and the Exclusion crisis, and raised the spectre of a Catholic heir who would indeed “spoil” the Protestant project.
A Myth is Born

Mary of Modena's childless state, despite numerous pregnancies, had prompted her mother Laura, dowager Duchess of Modena to bequeath a gold heart to the shrine of Our Lady of Loreto, commissioning prayers for Mary of Modena to produce a son and heir. Anthony à Wood recorded that on Sunday 29 January:

... a thanksgiving throut the nation (London excepted) for the Queen being breeding. Her breeding was occasion'd as the papists say by the prayers of the chaplayne of Our Lady of Loretto whome the duchess of Modena (mother to the said Queen) bequeathed a golden heart at her death, purposely to pray for her breeding a son: but the Protestants say 'twas by her being at the Bath last August. No bells in Oxford rang but Ch.Ch. and Magd. Coll., ...

In the Bodleian Library Oxford there is a manuscript called Astrea's Booke for Songs & Satyrs, a collected miscellany of lampoons written between 1685 and 1688, two of which are about Mary of Modena's pregnancy. The first encapsulates the entire poem in its title: The Miracle. How the Dutches of Modena being in Heaven pray'd the Virgin Mary that the Queen might have a Son And how Our Lady sent the Angell Gabriel with her Smok Upon Wch the Queen conceived. To the Tune of thou hadst better bin starved att Nurse:554. Her mother had died in Rome on 9 July 1687. The Grand Duke of Tuscany's envoy Count Terriesi wrote that Mary of Modena had:
"... fixed her departure for Bath ... for the 16th inst., it having been resolved at a consultation of her extraordinary physician that she should take them in moderation and drink the waters, cannot but do her good."

She had been deeply upset by the news of her mother's death, and the court went into mourning for 6 months. Since the time of Elizabeth I many people had been drawn to the waters of Bath reputed to cure medical disorders as well as female ailments. Sir John Reresby recorded that she was going to the Bath to restore her health; she stayed there with her court until 6 October at a house in Lyncombe because of a lack of accommodation which offered privacy and security at that time. James had gone on a progress during her stay and visited the holy well of St. Winifrid in Flintshire who was credited with interceding miraculously on behalf of barren women. Francesco Terriesi, the Tuscan envoy was able to report on 23 December 1687 (2 January 1688, NS) that:

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

It appeared to many that the joint efforts of St. Winifred and the waters of Bath were responsible. Celia Fiennes had visited Bath in, or before, 1687 and on a later visit noted:

"... the fine adornments on the Cross in the Cross Bath, fine carving of stone with the English arms and saints and cupids according to the phancye and
religion of King James the Seconds Queen Mary of Modina (sic), as part of her
thanks and acknowledgements to the Saints or Virgin Mary for the Welsh Prince
she imposed on us; ... 559.

James II’s Secretary of State for Scotland, the Earl of Melfort actually commissioned the
monument to commemorate the results of her bathing in the waters, the inscription noting
the conception was attributable to the spirits in the water. In stating that Mary of Modena
“imposed” the Prince of Wales on the country Celia Fiennes alludes to the Whig view
that the child was illegitimate and smuggled in to the palace in a warming pan.

The proclamation in late 1687 of the expected birth and the appointed Day of
Thanksgiving in London on 15 January and two weeks later on 29 January in the
Provinces was the point William A. Speck sees in his argument about the timing of the
rumours, that the “Orangist conspiracy” was born along with the “warming pan
scandal.” 560 John Evelyn recorded in his diary entry for 15 January 1688: “Was a
solemn & particular office used at our, & and all the Church<s> of London, & 10 miles
about it, for thanksgiving to God for her Majesties being with child: ...” 561 Mary of
Modena’s pregnancy became a subject for rumour, pamphlet and satire not only after the
birth on 10 June 1688 but before. The growth of anti-Catholicism and a Protestant
predisposition to refuse to recognise a Catholic heir meant that the English political
leaders were able to delude themselves and the nation into accepting the crude fiction that
the child would be a fraud. Although Mary of Modena’s child was not born until 10
June, according to Gilbert Burnet by April William of Orange had made the decision to
invade England; his condition was that he was “invited” to come and “rescue” England. The “Immortal Seven” malcontents duly sent out the “invitation” on 30 June. The “invitation” also contained a reprimand since William had congratulated James on his son’s birth: ... we must presume to inform your Highness that your compliment upon the birth of the child (which not one in a thousand here believes to be the Queen’s) hath done you some injury.\footnote{562}

Burnet himself doubted Mary of Modena’s conception at Bath and was an influential spreader of the “warming pan” myth\footnote{563}, but the Jacobite satirists in turn had their revenge on Burnet in the first year of William of Orange’s reign in Burnet’s Character:

\begin{quote}
Our laws (to traitors famously severe) 
Thundered him hence and topped him on Myn Heer 
Scarce had the church’s and the nation’s plague 
Escaped the deep and landed at the Hague ...
\end{quote}

(Lines 33-36)

Burnet had taken refuge in Holland from 1686 and according to the satirist persuaded William of Orange to invade, - “Against the father stimulate the son?”, - and was charged with spreading rumours against Mary of Modena:

\begin{quote}
We’ll whore his (James) wife and bastardize his son; 
If proof’s required we’ll outface the sun, 
Exalt their jealousies, foment their fears
\end{quote}
Of French invisible about their ears; ...

(Lines 53-56)\textsuperscript{564}

**King Lear’s Daughters**

The rumours of Mary of Modena’s supposedly fraudulent pregnancy was noted by James’s Protestant brother-in-law on 15 January 1688. Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon wrote that:

\begin{quote}
... the Queen’s great belly is everywhere ridiculed, as if scarce anybody believed it to be true\textsuperscript{565}
\end{quote}

Perhaps the most vicious, and for Mary of Modena, dangerous disbeliever was her youngest step-daughter Anne. Her letters to her sister, Mary of Orange, about Mary of Modena are discreditable, announcing her mission to convince her sister that not only was Mary of Orange the rightful heir to the throne but that a conspiracy was being hatched. On 14 March 1688 she wrote that Mary of Modena was:

\begin{quote}
... so positive it will be a son, and the principles of that religion being such, that they will stick at nothing, be it never so wicked, if it will promote their interest, give some cause to fear there may be foul play intended\textsuperscript{566}.
\end{quote}

Anne’s anger seems to have been motivated by jealousy combined with religious prejudice. As early as April 1687 she had written to Mary of Orange that “the Queen” was:
... the most hated in the world of all sort of people; ... she is a very great bigot in her way, and one may see by her that she hates all Protestants.\textsuperscript{567}

Mary of Modena was very reticent and shy, and did not allow ladies who were not of the Bedchamber to see her dressing, still less feel her "belly". But Anne believed it to be a "false belly", and on 20 March 1688 felt that in order to convince people she really was pregnant she should:

... make either me or some of my friends feel her belly; but quite contrary, whenever one talks of her being with child, she looks as if she were afraid one should touch her.\textsuperscript{568}

Undoubtedly the pregnancy and the Prince of Wales's birth are a fact, and Anne's rage appears to have led her to perpetrate hostility, if not originate the rumour that the pregnancy was false in order to discredit the birth, since it was most obviously not a Catholic plot to give England a Catholic heir. Anne was in Bath taking the waters for her health when the child was born, and declined to attend as a witness in October 1688 to swear depositions concerning the pregnancy and birth. Mary of Modena has been charged as culpable in that, once she was aware of the suspicions about her pregnancy, she should have ensured that the birth was properly witnessed and "proved". Although Anne wanted to create the impression that she was concerned to discover that the pregnancy was "real", it appears that she ensured she was not available. In 1692 the Jacobite Great Britain's Just Complaint by James Montgomery suggested that Anne deliberately found physicians who would advise her to take the waters at Bath at this
time, and Edward Gregg in his biography of Queen Anne in 1984 accepts this explanation. Howard Nennet, in his essay “The Traces of Shame in England’s Glorious Revolution”, gives a full account of the betrayal of James II by family and friends, (most notably John Churchill), but he points out that the betrayal by Mary and Anne was regarded by contemporaries, and James himself, as the greater treachery that “... seemed finally to have broken whatever little there remained of James's battered spirit”. 569.

James II’s daughters can be equated with King Lear’s two scheming daughters Goneril and Regan, a parallel not lost on the anonymous author of The Female Parricide in 1689:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Oft have we heard of impious sons before,} \\
\text{Rebelled for crowns their royal parents wore;} \\
\text{But of unnatural daughters rarely hear} \\
\text{‘Till those of hapless James and old King Lear.} \\
\text{But worse than cruel lustful Goneril, thou!} \\
\text{She took but what her father did allow;} \\
\text{But thou, more impious, robb'st thy father's brow.} \\
\text{Him both of power and glory you disarm,} \\
\text{Make him, by lies, the people's hate and scorn,} \\
\text{Then turn him forth to perish in a storm.}
\end{align*}
\]

(Lines 1-10) 570.
Mary of Orange's behaviour was criticized by John Evelyn in his diary entry for 22 February 1689 recording that:

... she came into W-hall as to a Wedding, riant & jolly, so as seeming to be quite transported ... Lay in the same bed & apartment where the late Queene lay: & within a night or two, sate down to play at Basset, as the Q. her predecessor us'd to do: ... This carriage was censured by many ... Divers Bishops, & Noble men are not at all satisfied with this so sudden Assumption of the Crown ....

Her explanation of her behaviour was not unlike Anne's, pleading her obligation to be a dutiful wife. In her memoirs she said she had left her father's misfortune, but been obliged to show, by her exuberance, that she willingly surrendered all executive power to William 571.

If Mary was compared with Goneril then Anne was Regan. In 1681 Nahum Tate had presented a revised King Lear at Dorset Gardens, imposing a number of "improvements" on Shakespeare in his "disgusting version" as Charles Dickens called it in the nineteenth century, but which became the standard acting text for the next 140 years 572. Not only did Cordelia have a confidante called Arante, but the Fool was removed and in the happy ending which restored Lear to the throne he abdicated in favour of Cordelia who marries Edgar. It is interesting that King Lear was never performed during the reign of William III and Mary, but was performed twice at Court in front of James II and Mary of Modena; firstly on 9 May 1687 and again on 20 February 1688.
During his reign James II had banned the public performance of Dryden’s play written in 1680, *The Spanish Fryar; or, The Double Discovery*, since it ridiculed the Catholic Church. Mary II, however commanded a performance of it in 1690 after the Revolution in order to publicly display her hostility to Catholicism. But because she had not read it, nor been advised that one of the major characters is a queen who deposes her father, she was acutely embarrassed by lines which seemed to reflect her situation:

*Her father’s crimes*

*Sit heavy on her, and weigh down her prayers.*

*A crown usurped; a lawful king deposed,*

*In bondage held, debarred the common light.*

The play was taken off the next day.

**Poems on the “Second Coming”**

On 29 March 1688 Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby had written to Mary of Orange’s husband, William that:

*Many of our ladies say that the Queen’s great belly seems to grow faster than they have observed their own to do; and because it is fit her Majestie should always have the greatest persons near her in this condition I hope the Princesse will take care that the Princesse Ann may bee always within call, and especially to see (when the time is neare) that the midwife discharge her duty with that care which ought to bee had in a case of so greate concerne. Our zeale here for the*
Protestant religion does apparently increase every day in all parts of the nation

At the end of December 1687 when the pregnancy was officially confirmed the Catholics had acclaimed the expected birth a miracle and assumed the child would be male. The Protestants, on the contrary, denounced it as a projected fraud since the Catholic assumption of the sex of the child so far in advance “proved” their case that it was a fraud.

Far from hoping to establish Catholicism in England, when looked at dispassionately, James’s modest policies (the repeal of the Test Act and the Declaration of Indulgence) amounted to little more than allowing Catholics to worship in public, be employed by the state or in the armed forces, and be educated at Oxford and Cambridge. Catholic writers such as Aphra Behn and the recently converted John Dryden of course fanned the flames of Protestant unease. Shortly after the Declaration of Indulgence, Dryden’s fable *The Hind and the Panther* had appeared in May 1687 in which he claimed the superiority of the Hind, that is the Catholic Church over the Panther, the Anglican Church whose spiritual authority he argued was compromised by self-interest, greed and opportunism.

Aphra Behn expressed a rather presumptuous Catholic position in *A Congratulatory Poem to Her Most Sacred Majesty, On the Universal Hopes of All Loyal Persons For A Prince of Wales* (published by the pro-James William Canning), since
hopes for a male heir were most certainly not universal. This is a highly-charged political poem that compares the forthcoming child’s birth to a second coming:

This is the Second Birth the World e’er knew,
So long Expected, so much Wanted too.

Like the first sacred Infant, this will come
With Promise laden from the Blessed Womb ...

(Lines 11-14)

Ironically the birth was very unexpected and particularly unwanted, but Behn seems to delight in this, questioning why so few poets had been inspired by “... a theme so glorious, and sublime” (Line 45). However, she hopes that she being one of the “few”, the child will be her patron as “POETS shall by Patron PRINCES live...” (Line 69).

This political poem not only celebrated Mary of Modena, but commented on James II’s difficult position; while she believed James was doomed, the child will disperse “... all the baneful Mists of Night” (Line 60) as a “young APOLLO, rising from the Gloom, Dress’d in his Father’s brightest Rays”. (Lines 59-60). James’s greatest act is “godlike” bestowing an heir on this “... stubborn Nation”, while Mary of Modena, praised for her beauty, is once again cast in the role of Virgin Mary:

And you, bless’d QUEEN, to whom ALL HAIL belongs
From Angels, rather than from Mortal Tongues;
Whose Charms of Beauty, Wit and Vertue join’d
To chuse you Second Bless’d of Woman-kind.
ALL HAIL –

O Sacred VESSEL, fraught with England’s STORE;
(A PRIZE more valu’d, ATLAS never bore;)

Guard safe our TREASURE to the wish’d for Shore.

(Lines 30-37).

Behn’s prophesy that Mary of Modena would have a boy was realized on 10 June 1688 when James Francis Edward was born, much to Protestant dismay. However, James II, not Mary of Modena, was the recipient of *A Congratulatory Poem to the King’s Most Sacred Majesty, On the Happy Birth of the Prince of Wales*. In Janet Todd’s opinion this poem was written by Behn to please James not the public, who were not only troubled by the implications of a Catholic heir, but “seething” with “warming pan” stories. The child was a Christ-like figure come to save the world, but she not only celebrated his birth, but voiced her concerns about the country’s disunity and ridiculed the ambitions of William of Orange:

*Methinks I hear the Belgick LION Roar,*

*And Lash his Angry Tail against the Shore.*

*Inrag’d to hear a PRINCE OF WALES is Born.*

(Lines 45-47)

Her poems were audaciously anticipatory and congratulatory earning criticism from John Baber in a poem to James on the birth which provoked a fierce attack from Behn in *To
Narcissus Luttrell commented that newsletters and gazettes were “… stuffed with nothing but rejoicings from Towns for the birth of the Prince⁵⁸⁰, although Anthony à Wood wrote that apart from Magdalene and Christ Church “Noe Colleges or Halls besides took any notice of the birth of this prince (no, not Jesus College) either by bonfier or ringing of bells”⁵⁸¹, precisely because they knew that he would eventually be a papist monarch. Sir John Reresby announced that on 9 July Mary of Modena appeared “… in publique the first time after her delivery. I carryed my wife and daughter to kiss her hand and to give her joy of the Prince of Wales. She was kind…”⁵⁸².

A wealth of material, rumour, satires, lampoons continued, but so did fulsome panegyric, the most notable by Dryden in Britannia Rediviva with its classical and pagan references, religious metaphor and allusion. He saw the child, as Behn did, as a Christ-like saviour sent to atone for the nation’s crimes, such as the Popish Plot and the efforts to exclude James from the throne. Behn and Dryden were obsessed with Mary of Modena’s beauty, and Dryden invokes that beauty, but this time suggests that it is a result of her piety. Her translation from her native Italy, “your native climate”, to England is conflated with the idea that she has come to earth bringing all the virtues from heaven:

But you, propitious Queen, translated here,

From your mild Heav’n, to rule our rugged sphere,
Beyond the sunny walks, and circling year;
You, who your native climate have bereft
Of all the virtues, and the vices left;
Whom piety and beauty make their boast,
Though beautiful is well in pious lost;
So lost as star-light is dissolv'd away,
And melts into the brightness of the day;

(Lines 304-312)\textsuperscript{583}

A month after the birth of James Francis Edward, Dryden’s translation of The Life of St. Francis Xavier from the French of Dominique Bouhours was advertised in the London Gazette (12-16 July 1688). He had been commanded to translate it (possibly by James II, rather than the Queen), and it was dedicated to Mary of Modena in a curiously worded address. It begins by referring to Anne of Austria praying to St. Francis Xavier who interceded on her behalf and after 20 barren years she produced Louis XIV. Dryden transfers this idea to Mary of Modena and tentatively suggests with “I know not Madam, whether I may presume to tell the World” that she had also prayed to St Francis as one of her “Coelestial Patrons\textsuperscript{584}”. Given the child’s second name was Francis it seems quite likely; that he had interceded to produce a male heir was accepted by Catholics, although as G.N. Clarke argued “In the seventeenth century people would believe anything. The Catholics thought the birth was a miracle ...”\textsuperscript{585}.
The Prince of Darkness

The Protestants were predisposed not to recognise a Catholic heir. It was this, rather than any irregularities in the birth of Prince of Wales, which occasioned the crude but convenient fiction that he was smuggled into Mary of Modena’s bed in a warming pan, and was therefore a fraud. Nonetheless it is a clear instance that the Protestants were as credulous and superstitious as the Catholics were believed to be. In a poem which also appears in Astrea’s Booke (vide supra) called An Excellent New Ballad Called The Prince of Darkness the myth that the child was born to an unknown mother at Whitehall and smuggled into St. James’s for a fake birth is rehearsed; the subtitle is “Showing how Three Nations may be Set on Fire by a Warming Pan”. It begins:

As I went by St. James’, I heard a bird sing,

"Of certain the Queen has a boy in the spring”.

But one of the chairmen did laugh and did say,

“It was born overnight and brought forth the next day”.

(Lines 1-4)586

The bed on which this supposititious prince was thought not to have been born appears on a commemorative medal (fig.123) and in an engraving “Sala Reggia” produced in Rome in 1688 featuring “The Birth of the Chevalier de St. George”, (fig.124). This is a view of the bedchamber at St. James’s; in it a very large baby is presented to the King by a priest while Mary of Modena languishes in the ornate bed in the background. The silver medal by Jan Smeltzing has on the reverse Mary of Modena
sitting up in the elaborately canopied bed holding the child. The medal was struck in Holland by order of the English Ambassador Ignatus White, and is clearly aimed at William of Orange giving him notice that claims to the throne had passed with the birth of a male heir.

The “warming pan” was an important deceptive myth since it preserved James’s eldest daughter Mary of Orange in the line of succession and, after the death of her husband William, the woman at the centre of the rumour, the spinner of lies, Princess Anne who later became Queen. The issue that the child was supposititious was kept alive by the powerful role played by the printing presses, particularly with the fear of Jacobite invasion in 1715 and 1745 when many of the earlier pamphlets were reprinted. Even in c.1745 a broadside was published showing the Young Pretender Charles holding a warming pan with the cover open depicting James Francis Edward, by then the Old Pretender, (fig.125). The myth was kept alive in the popular press too; after Mary of Modena, James II and the Prince of Wales had gone into exile, William Fuller produced a book republished eight times between 1696 and 1702 called *A Brief Discovery of the True Mother of the Pretended Prince of Wales*.

From the time of the child’s birth rumours were to continue that Mary of Modena was not the true mother. The gossip was that the mother was actually the wife of a miller even if, according to Count Terriesi, the envoy of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Queen’s chamber was public to all women who chose to enter, and the ante-room to all men; Catherine of Braganza was present the entire time. Before and after the birth
paternity had been awarded to the young Papal Nuncio, the unfortunately named Count Ferdinand d'Adda, as well as James II's clerk of the closet the voluble Jesuit, Father Petre, a strange choice since Mary of Modena hated him, and tried to halt his advance in James's estimation. The poem "Tom Tiler, or The Nurse, again to be found in Astrea's Booke, is a reference to a tilemaker's wife called Cooper who was brought in as wet nurse after the child was taken ill a month after his birth at Richmond, recorded in the Ellis correspondence. The poem itself libels d'Adda as the father:

His lady from the tiles and bricks
Kidnapp'd to court in coach and six;
Her arms a sucking Prince embrace,
Whate'er you think, of royal race;
A Prince come in the nick of time
(Bless'd d'Adda), 'tis a venial crime
That shall repair our breach of state; ...

(Lines 9-15)

From these examples the credibility of rumour-filled poems among the common people can be recognised.

William of Orange and Propaganda

Pamphlets, plays, broadsides and satires contributed to a calculated intensive propaganda campaign carried out by William of Orange and are testimony that the would-be invaders recognised the power of the non-elite classes. He exploited the
rumours since he could not possibly believe the birth was a fraud after the depositions of more than 70 people. A meeting of the Privy Council was called on 22 October 1688 resulting in over 70 witnesses (19 were Protestants) giving deposition that their belief was that James II had fathered James Francis Edward. The Prince of Orange had given the Dutch fleet orders on 6 October and put his plan into action "... to maintain the Protestant religion and freedom of the kingdom of Great Britain". He had also cited in his reasons for this action in Declaration of Reasons that there were ... just and visible grounds of suspicion that the Pretended Prince of Wales was not born by the Queen. He was going to refer this to Parliament.

The production of satires was sporadic during the seventeenth century, but peaked at times of crisis such as the Civil War, and the Popish Plot in 1679. Many were crude but from Cromwell's time the best satires on English affairs were by Dutch engravers. One of the most accomplished was the prolific Romeyn de Hooghe (1645-1708) with his attacks on James II at the instigation of William of Orange as he was preparing to replace James with himself on the British throne. The engraving The Flight of the Popedom out of England (fig.126) with verses in Dutch and English includes:

All th' Infernal Popish Crew

Bid to England an Adieu

They are Louis XIV about to fight William of Orange "the Belgic lion" who protects the Scottish thistle, the English rose and the Irish harp. James II with cross and rosary, Mary of Modena and James Francis Edward holding a windmill, (a visible slur that his mother
was a miller's wife), are in a cart drawn by a dog which according to the verses "fouls the Crown". Father Petre receives evil counsel from a devil as he flogs the dog onwards.

Father Petre stands by the side of Mary of Modena as she rocks the cradle in another busy baroque engraving by Romeyn de Hooghe called *L'Europe Allarmé pour le fils d'un Meunier* (BM Sat 1158) (fig. 127). This was adapted from an anonymous Dutch Protestant propaganda mezzotint (which has been attributed to Pieter Schenck) which shows Mary of Modena rocking the cradle with a prominent windmill on it. There are significant similarities between the Schenck mezzotint in reverse and the adaptation by de Hooghe since they both feature a windmill, and a bowl and spoon at the foot of the cradle with its untucked cover; Mary of Modena’s headress and the position of the baby in the cradle are also similar. In the mezzotint attributed to Schenck she is distracted by a biretta-wearing priest behind her chair. This is obviously a representation of the Jesuit, Father Edward Petre, James II's clerk of the closet and a member of the Privy Council, the "reputed father" of the child who embraces her lasciviously (fig. 128). This particular print demonstrates the way that engravers could completely alter the meaning since this is based on an "official" mezzotint by B. Lens (fig. 129) with prominent feathers of the Prince of Wales reinforcing his claim as son of James II. There is also a large vase of flowers, reminiscent of those in the beautiful, unearthly portrait of Mary of Modena by Simon Verelst painted when she was Duchess of York. While the Lens engraving is not an intimate portrait, Mary of Modena is shown as a virtuous mother, while the satire inverts the ideal and presents her as the embodiment of vice. The floral display also appears in an anonymous engraving based on the Lens grouping with carpet, in reverse
with the inscription Der Junge Prins. von Wallis (fig. 130). Jacob Gole too emphasised the rumour that the child was born to a miller's wife in his mezzotint, as Mary of Modena, seated holds the leading strings of the Prince of Wales who wears a plumed hat and plays with his windmill (BM SA 1164).

These vicious satires of the last quarter of the seventeenth century were produced to be distributed in quantity, and as the lowest form of "art" were used to undermine the character of the perceived "enemy", in this case Mary of Modena. Romeyn de Hooghe's satirical broadside from 1688 (fig. 131) shows a Hospital room for "Les Hypochondres". It makes great play of the rumour that Mary of Modena was a pseudo-virgin begetting a miraculous child without her husband. She lies in bed while a priest, Father Petre takes her pulse after the supposed delivery of the child. Priests hold up their fingers in tokens of secrecy, while the nurse holds the baby who has a windmill, a direct reference to the father as miller and the mother of this "miracle child" the miller's wife. The figures on the left are "Turks"; the Church of England is almost "over throwne" by the infernal council of the most Christian Turk, Louis XIV. The satirical print of the toppling Protestant church in England's Memorial (fig. 132) commemorates William of Orange's invasion to save it. A large orange knocks off James II's crown and Mary of Modena, holding the baby, says she and the child are offended by the smell of orange trees. Another orange knocks down Judge Jeffreys of the "Bloody Assizes", the Catholics are in flight, the Jesuits in league with the devil, but the eye of Providence protects the wobbling Church of England and, importantly, the Orange Tree.
An “Englishman” “William Loggan” enlisted the services of de Hooghe for an attack on the Jesuit Father Petre in "Sic Itur ad Astra Scilicet" ("This is the way to the stars, of course"), in 1688 (fig.133). The central figure is Father Petre carousing with other Jesuit priests while the peripheral figures are allegories of vice. The back wall has scenes of Catholic corruption and vice, e.g. a monk enticing a nun. The prints, (there are 2 variations), carry the signature “William Loggan at Oxford”; however since this was part of William’s Dutch propaganda campaign, the false name and place of origin disguise its real source as Holland, as the date 1681 on this one is a disguise for its recent origin. As Antony Griffiths has argued (Griffiths, 1998), in 1681 Father Petre was a minor functionary, and became significant only after the accession of James II in 1685. Griffiths also notes that there is no record of a William Loggan; the engraver David Loggan worked in Oxford until 1675, and one of his sons became a fellow of Magdalen College, but he was called John not William.

**Denigration of Mary of Modena’s Character**

These are just a few examples of the attacks on Mary of Modena. Because of her overt Catholicism, she is frequently cited as the cause of England’s troubles. A vicious attack on her was made in *A Dialogue between a True Protestant and a Timist*:

*Tim:*  
*I believe that false Queen was the cause of our trouble,*

*And wish she may pay for her treachery double.*

*May she never be freed*

*From guilt, horror, and dread.*

*Nay (what's worse) may she want a kind man at her need;*
And whoever she courts to her fulsome embrace,
Instead of a kiss, may he spit in her face.

Prot: Gramercy for that, and I'll add one wish more –
May she live to be old, to be ugly and poor.
As her years do increase may her lustful desire
And her breath be infectious to all that come nigh her.

(W7, Stanzas 8-9)

Another attack on her, A Hue and Cry, bemoans her decline from young bride to "termagant" queen who beats her husband:

Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! Can any bring
Tidings or tale of a lost Queen and King?
A daring lass! a furious termagant!
That at poor Jemmy oft would scold and rant;
Nay beat him too sometimes, or she's belied,
For which a skimmington should justly ride
To mortify each Amazonian bride.

Penthesilea, bold Semiramis,
Judith, or Jael, ne'er did more than this.
Those spent their greatest fury on their foes;
This, on her king and husband laid her blows.
When Duchess, she was gentle, mild, and civil;
When Queen, she proved a raging furious devil;
Hectored, or beat, all ladies she came nigh
That would not with her villainies comply;
Forced the good Princess Ann herself to fly ...

(Lines 1-16)\textsuperscript{593}

Mary of Modena may have been praised by many for her beauty and virtue, called a Madonna and likened to the Virgin Mary, but when it was convenient the mother, who is really a whore, creates a strong emotional impact. The politically useful myth of the warming pan, despite its unlikely character, was really premised on Mary of Modena's "whoredom". The author of \textit{The Address}, like most people, clearly wanted to believe she was the mother of the child but someone other than James II was the father, and thus he was illegitimate:

\begin{quote}
But whether Son of King or not,
Of England's Queen I was begat,
Though heretics call 't a Popish Plot,
Which nobody can deny.
\end{quote}

(Lines 17-20)\textsuperscript{594}

The author of \textit{The Progress}, thought to be Henry Mildmay, assumes neither she nor James were the parents:

\begin{quote}
When kings were kings, and men were men
(Will ever be such days again?),
\end{quote}
'Twas ere His Holiness's niece,
More infamous than her of Greece,
Completed England's Happiness;
When she was made the lawful mother
Of tiler's children's youngest brother,
Who was begot, or born, or made,
A Prince of Wales in masquerade ...

(Lines 49-57)\(^{595}\)

In this she is "more infamous" than Theodora the wife of the Emperor Justinian, so she is compared with a notorious courtesan.

These unflattering portraits of her as a hectoring, husband-beating whore were carried over into theatrical productions in the form of pamphlet plays in the 1690s. They resembled the products of popular culture, but these are full-length and complete with stage directions. They are, of course, anonymous and of the ones I examined in detail, one was called "a Tragedy" and two "Tragi-Comedy". James II is always the victim of a shrewish Mary of Modena who is portrayed as a whore.

In *The Banished Duke; or, The Tragedy of Infortunatus* dating from late 1690, Infortunatus is the Duke of Monmouth which displays its Protestant origins\(^ {596}\). Mary of Modena is a bad-tempered, unfaithful wife who, metaphorically and actually, wears the "breeches", which of course are scarlet since she is associated with the Whore of
Babylon. It is not strong on subtlety; she is called Papissa, her elderly husband Romanus. Unsurprisingly she has a fraudulent pregnancy in the form of a pillow which she pulls out from under her dress and throws at the members of the king’s council. A series of babies come in, carried in baskets by midwives, but unfortunately one of the babies turns out to be a girl. Father Petre appears and leaves with a baby of the correct sex tied on his back.

*The Abdicated Prince; or, The Adventures of Four Years. A Tragi-Comedy* portrays Mary of Modena as Hautefelia, Queen of Hungary who is "... a proud imperious bloody-minded Woman, Sworn Enemy to the Christians of Hungary, in Love with Count Dadamore". Count Dadamore, a thinly disguised Ferdinand d’Adda, the Papal Nuncio is "a special Favourite of the Queens, an Italian by Birth, and sent on a Secret Message by the Mufti to the Hungarian Court". The “Mufti” is the Pope, Cullydada is the cuckolded King of Hungaria Nova, James II and by page 9 Hautefelia/Mary of Modena has committed adultery in her mind with Dadamore. Time is found to execute the “darling of the People” Philodemus, Duke of Monumora (Monmouth again), and by page 35, Scene II is taking place in the Queen’s Bedchamber with Mary of Modena and Dadamore "rising from the bed". She commits adultery because she wants Dadamore to spawn a race of “pagan kings” (i.e. popery) against the Christian Hungarians. Dadamore worries this might fail, but Mary of Modena says, (in a reference to her mother’s bequest of a golden heart to the Shrine of Our Lady of Loreto), that the Holy Virgin, “the Great Laretto”, had promised success with the words:

> By thy industrious Zeal and Prayers I'm won,

> To grant and promise thou shall have a Son;
Italian Strength, or Gallick Policy,

Shall help to enlarge thy great Posterity.

'Tis order'd he must share a double Fate;

A Peasant born, a Prince Regenerate.

The rest of the play is a crude rehearsal of the ways in which this "Plot of a Sham Prince" was prepared for, even to the Queen’s "Belly" which "must be heightened by degrees, it must carry a similitude of a Natural Swelling". However, "honest" Remarquo, the observer of court intrigue, foresees that "Spight of your frauds we shall be shortly free From Tyrant Kings, and Pagan Slavery". Of course this prophesy comes to pass: the rabble shout that the houses of the Pagans will be pulled down, and so the palace of St Jacques is cleansed, the skies clear, the sun shines and the priests and crosses vanish. Remarquo lays the blame for the rout on the "Coward Soul" of the Queen who unfortunately:

... do's yet even refuse to own

Or to repent her Crimes against the Nation.

Her Crown, her State, her Grandeur, are the things

That cause her Tears and Curses; but better far

Some Watry drop from her should singly go,

Than Streams of Blood shou'd from the Nation flow".

The denigration of Mary of Modena’s character continued after the revolution; William of Orange himself reprimanded Mary of Orange for “unqueenly” behaviour, but
her reply that "she had done nothing but what the late Qu: had done" received the horrified response whether she meant to make Mary of Modena her example. This demonstrates William's complete rejection not only of Mary of Modena's conduct and bearing as Queen, but a rejection of all the Stuarts since the Restoration of Charles II.598

Dryden's Don Sebastian, published in January 1690, is not a precise allegory of the events after the revolution, but Don Sebastian is fighting outside his country, as James II was an exile from his own country, living in France and fighting in Ireland.599 From Dryden's point of view William of Orange was a tyrant who had usurped the throne, and this anti-Williamite play provided the opportunity to expose the illegitimacy of the new regime. Don Sebastian is a flawed hero who does not regain his crown rather as James, a once-heroic military leader in the past, is flawed by his religious leanings; the focus then is James as victim rather than William as conqueror. James was useful to Dryden in a dramatic sense because his plight as victim resonated in the cult of a royal martyr sent into exile that became a focus of later debate. The flight of the Stuarts into exile was not a cowardly act but an inevitable tragedy.

A few months after publication of Don Sebastian a pamphlet play in the same mould as The Banished Duke and The Abdicated Prince was published called The Late Revolution; or, The Happy Change. A Tragi-Comedy600. It refers to Dryden having taken the precaution to ask the Earl of Dorset, a moderate supporting William III to read it through twice. Nothing objectionable was found in Don Sebastian but the cautious Dryden dedicated it to the Protestant Philip, Earl of Leicester. The sarcastic prologue
says that *The Late Revolution* is a "Williamitish" play as opposed to *Don Sebastian* because:

*Sebastian better does the trick,*

*With Bobs and Innuendo's thick,*

*Which Abdicated Laureate brings*

*In praise of Abdicated Kings.*

The "*Dramatis Personae*" highlights the thrust of this play against "Father Petres". The cast comprises the Pope's Nuncio (Dada), 2 Popish Lords, Popish Ladys (sic), the Popish Midwife and several Popish Whores; those named in the case, apart from Father Petre, are Philanax (who appeared in *The Abdicated Prince*) and Misopapases, both noble lords, true Protestants and good Englishmen. William is praised, James "the late king" condemned: *Kings never lose their Thrones unless they have first lost their Peoples Hearts; Seldom unless they've also lost their own: The Late King has neither left, ours both". In short this is another crude rant against Catholics with most of the play taken up by the news of the landing of the Protestant liberator. The current belief that a plot to either capture, or even murder, Princess Anne was the explanation for her flight from London is adopted in a short scene describing Anne having a not very difficult battle with her conscience when she betrays her father (page 52):

*Nay, then 'tis time; tho' Duty and Nature strive,*

*And raise, by turns Debate, by turns Contest,*

*Expelling each the other from her Breast,*

*The Latter will, I hope, be strongest there.*
Her "mistaken Piety" towards her father loses out to fears for her own safety. Act III opens with a procession in the street at St. James's of "The King and Queen, The pretended Prince of Wales carrying to the Chappel. Father Petres, Jesuits, Fryars, Nuns, Irish men, Popish Lords" which changes to the interior of the chapel and Father Petre baptizing the child commencing with the "usual Custom of Conjuring the Devil out of him". The play closes with many characters deciding to support William by joining his army: England divided so long, has found unity in a trusted ruler; one who has a Protestant Queen rather than a Popish whore whispering in his ear.

"The Queen herself is fled": flight into exile

It was of course a spurious unity. George Granville, Lord Lansdowne the enthusiastic partisan of James II, who had written lines to Mary of Modena as a young royal bride, penned A Loyal Exhortation. Written in the Year 1688:

Of Kings dethron'd, and Blood of Brethren spilt,
In vain, O BRITAIN! you'd avert the Guilt;
If Crimes which your Fore-Fathers blush'd to own,
Repeated, call for heavier Vengeance down.
Tremble, ye People who your King's distress,
Tremble, ye Kings, for People you oppress;
Th' Eternal sees, arm'd with his fork'y Rods.
The Rise and Fall of Empire's from the Gods.\(^{601}\)
In 1715 Lansdowne went into exile in Paris, implicated in the planned French-backed invasion, and entered the service of the supposititious "Prince in Masquerade", by then James III.

Another poem, only mildly "Williamite", is A Letter to the Lady Osborne (1688) which was probably written just after Mary of Modena fled with the Prince of Wales to France in the early hours of 10 December:

Prithee what is’t to me if Princess Anne
Will eat as much again as any man,
Or if sh’has orange trimming on her head
She’s blameless, sure. The Queen herself is fled.

(Lines 18-21)⁶⁰²

Anne was most certainly not blameless, but Mary of Modena had indeed escaped to France on the day after 9 December 1688 when Sir John Reresby recorded sympathetically:

The Prince of Wales, poor infant was brought from Portsmouth to London, when everybody believed he had been sent to France; and on Sunday night, being the 9th, the Queen with the Prince went down the river about twelve a clock to a barge secretly prepared, and the wind being fair wafted over to Dunkirk.⁶⁰³

There are a number of examples of engravings of the flight of Mary of Modena, (for example figs.134, 135 and 136), but that by J. Stowe engraved more than a hundred years
after the event in 1796, based on James Opie’s painting of 1794, is by far the most powerful and dramatic (fig. 136). A strong light is thrown on Mary of Modena’s face, and the child, the attendant, the tightly knit group around her, and wind blown hair all add a sense of urgency. History painting had been given a boost in 1786 when Alderman Boydell invited English artists to paint subjects from the plays of Shakespeare which were then engraved; the Shakespeare Gallery in Pall Mall was opened in 1789. Opie became a “history painter” by contributing seven paintings as well as The Assassination of James I of Scotland (1786), and The Death of Rizzio in 1787. The rather theatrical nature of the illustration of Mary of Modena’s flight is in the romantic convention of Opie’s time, the late eighteenth century, and in keeping with that most “Romantic” of notions, the biographies of great heroes and heroines who are typically wanderers and outcasts. Mary of Modena clutching her child fits into this category perfectly as an exile from a society which has rejected and banished her. It was one of eleven paintings, including the death of Beckett and Mary Queen of Scots kneeling at the block, Opie made between 1792 and 1800 for Robert Bowyer’s ten volume edition of Hume’s History of England published in 1806. There was an additional volume of plates of the engravings made from the paintings; in this volume Mary of Modena’s dress, cloak and feathered hat are all rather late eighteenth - not late seventeenth - century in style. The painting, once in Devonport Town Hall and called variously Mary, Queen of James II, quitting the Kingdom (fig. 136) or Mary of Modena Secretly Embarking at Gravesend, is now known only in its engraved form as it was destroyed in a bombing raid on Devonport in 1941.
James received letters from the Court of France telling him that Mary of Modena and the Prince of Wales had arrived safely, and also received an invitation from Louis XIV to join them. James II had promised that he would follow her to France and "... he now abandon'd three Kingdoms, not so much to save himself, as to follow a Wife and only Son." On 23 December 1688 he sailed to France; on 28 December William accepted the responsibilities of government. James II and his son were Catholics in Catholic France as guests of England’s main enemy, Louis XIV and surrounded by fugitives from James’s Catholic Court, while his Protestant nephew and son-in-law was in England. Writing to Rome an English Jesuit commented on the astonishment of the Dutch at the success of William’s invasion and the fact that they "... laugh at the English for their cowardice and disloyalty to their prince". Sir John Reresby was cynical about the unseemly haste with which the English abandoned James and replaced him with William commenting that "... soe mutable are the minds of Englishmen that they are never long very fond of anything." This was not a parliamentary revolution, but a dynastic revolution and Protestantism, coupled with the ambition of William of Orange "... had triumphed over primogeniture".

This was a well-documented birth of a child who was rumoured to be supposititious. Whether James Francis Edward was smuggled into the birth chamber in a warming pan or was the son variously of a Catholic priest, a miller or a tiler, the clear message is that Mary of Modena’s actual role in the drama was marginal. Each side, Catholic and Protestant, was convinced by its own argument: she was either a virtuous wife of great beauty and grace who had forsaken her Italian homeland to produce a
rightful heir for England; or she was a foreign Catholic bigot who had seen it as her life's work to convert her adopted homeland to the Catholic faith and failed.
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

Mary of Modena in Exile: "beaucoup d'esprit et grandeur d'âme"\textsuperscript{606}

Mary of Modena was thirty years old when she arrived in France as a guest of Louis XIV and she was to live there in exile for half her life; she was sixty years old when she died in 1718. In reminiscing to the nuns of the Convent of the Visitation at Chaillot she recalled that on first arriving in Calais the thought of even a short exile was appalling, but that she was grateful the future was hidden from her\textsuperscript{607}. This memory contradicts a letter from her confidante, Countess Vittoria Montecuccoli Davia who accompanied her from England, to Mary of Modena’s brother on 7 January 1689:

\textit{... The Queen has betrayed no regret at having left her kingdom and all the rest; she lamented sorely over her separation from the King, whom she longed to see in safety ... her virtue is great ... you have a Queen for sister who is the admiration of everyone ... The King [of France] shows her the greatest esteem, and after providing her with everything ... he sent her a casket containing 6,000 louis d'or}\textsuperscript{608}.

This concluding chapter on the years in France is a summary overview, which includes a number of points which have not been raised before. While her years in England have been neglected, the thirty years of Stuart exile have been more than adequately covered by others\textsuperscript{609} starting in the seventeenth century with the letter writer and gossip Madame
de Sévigné. She informed her daughter that Mary of Modena, with only a nurse and one
servant to rock the Prince of Wales's cradle, arrived on Tuesday 21 December
accompanied by M. de Lauzun, and that Louis XIV had sent his carriages to meet them
on the road to Calais. The arrival of the Stuarts at the French court created great
interest and excitement, and the exiles were a constant subject for rumour and discussion.
Mme de Sévigné painted fascinating pen portraits of both Mary of Modena, who was
very much liked and "without affectation", and her fifty five year old husband:

> His Majesty sent the King of England ten thousand louis d'ors; the latter looks
old and fatigued; the Queen is thin, with fine black eyes swelled with weeping; a
fine complexion, but rather pale; a large mouth, beautiful teeth, a fine figure, and
a great share of sense; no wonder if with all these she pleases every one who
beholds her. Here is matter for general conversation, that will not soon be
exhausted.

Mme de Sévigné even details her attire on a visit to the indisposed Dauphiness,
describing her as "admirably dressed" in

> ... a black velvet robe, a beautiful petticoat, her hair tastefully disposed, a figure
like the Princess de Conti's, and great dignity of manner. The King received her
as she alighted ... The King, upon his return, highly praised the Queen; he said
"This is how a queen ought to be both in person and mind, holding her Court with
dignity".
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The exiled Stuarts received warm hospitality from Louis XIV who refurbished his own apartments at the château of St. Germain-en-Laye for them rent free and gave them an allowance of 50,000 livres a month. This though was thought to be no more than adequate to maintain the impecunious Jacobites who followed them to St. Germain.

The Unofficial Poet Laureate

The voice of Jane Barker, a devoted Jacobite who followed Mary of Modena and James into exile, insists in her poem *The Miseries of St. Germain* ... that the famine compounded by plague of 1694 and 1695 at the Court of St. Germain-en-Laye was a "curse" on the exiles, a delayed punishment for the pride and blasphemy of generations. The court was well financed but the vast number of civilian and military refugees after the Irish and Scottish campaigns on behalf of James II was insupportable in times of pestilence. The principal sources for a study of the exiled Jacobite community are the parochial registers of St. Germain-en-Laye; there seems to have been a spectacular increase in the population in 1692, mainly Irish, whereas between 1688 and 1691 the community was almost exclusively English.\(^{613}\)

Mary of Modena had informed Mère Angelique Priolo in 1693 that the household had been reformed on a "scale of economy" as the state of their "adherents" was "pitiable".
While Barker writes of the “miseries” of the exiled community, her admiration for Mary of Modena and James II was unshaken since she says that the “Royal pair” have...

“nought but pitty to bestow”:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \textit{How hard it is, to souls sublime and great,} \\
  \textit{When heart and fortune's disproportionate,} \\
  \textit{This is a mighty misery indeed,} \\
  \textit{When Royal hearts, do for their subjects bleed,} \\
  \textit{Because they can't assist them in their need.}  \\
\end{align*}
\]

Barker suggests that because they are unable to help financially their suffering is greater as “\textit{We find no miserie can eaqual (sic) theirs, ...}”\textsuperscript{615}.

This might have been one of her bids for patronage, and she may have been “\textit{known at court}” as Carol Shiner Wilson thinks, but she was not promised or awarded a pension so it is difficult to prove\textsuperscript{616}. She certainly endeavoured to be known, writing a number of poems in honour of James II and Mary of Modena and, after having written a poem for the birthday of the Prince of Wales in 1689, she presented her manuscript poems to James Francis Edward in 1700 as a New Years’ gift which she called \textit{A Collection of Poems Referring to the times; since the Kings accession to the Crown}\textsuperscript{617}. This is really a Jacobite verse history of nearly ninety pages expressing Barker’s loyalty to the Stuarts, while her heroic romance \textit{Exilius; or, the Banish'd Roman} celebrates loyalty, obligation and faithfulness to a cause using Roman history to illustrate the
problems of the present. This novel, although published only in 1714 after the death of Queen Anne the last of the Stuarts, was actually begun in the 1680s as a response to the Exclusion Crisis. It uses the fiction of the warming pan and invents a country "Mauritania" to make angry comment on the easily deluded English population:

This conceit was so push'd on by those princes, whose Interest it was that the King should have no Son, that the greater Part of Mauritania either believ'd, or pretended to believe this real Prince to be an Imposter; by which one sees, how easy it is to impose upon a Populace, who are generally ready to receive any Notion ....

The Lining of the Patch Work Screen (1726) alluded again to the warming pan fiction in the story The Cause of the Moors Overrunning Spain which has a usurper (William III) and a distressed queen escaping (Mary of Modena):

King - of Spain at his Death, committed the Government of his Kingdom to his Brother Don - till his little Son should come of Age, to take the Government upon himself. But Don - prov'd Traytor to his Trust; and by many false stories invented against the Queen and the Prince, so brought things about, as to make himself be acknowledg'd and Crown'd King of Spain. Hereupon the distress'd Queen made her Escape to the Moors, imploring that King's Protection; which he not only generously gave her, but also aided her with a formidable Army wherewith to invade Spain, in right of the young Prince ....
Barker was a devout Catholic and allusions to figures from the Bible inform her poems; the Prince of Wales is compared to Jesus, James II on his deathbed is a “glorious saint”. In her poem To Her Majesty the Queen, on the King's going to Calais this carnival 1696 she apologises for a cataract operation which prevented her from seeing the king off to Calais where an army had assembled to invade England, (which never took place); she casts Mary of Modena as Eve in the lines Not good to be alone, th'Almighty said, / And forthwith He for man a help-meet made, / Such you have truly been ... 620. However, Mary of Modena is also cast in the role of that perennial favourite of poets, the Virgin Mary. For Barker she becomes the ideal maternal figure to the exiles of St. Germain:

No saint so good, no Heroin so great
No wit so perfect, beauty so compleat,
So good a friend, and mother ne'er was seen,
So good a wife a mistress, and a Queen,
By your warm rays, starv'd vertue shall bud forth,
And Englands eyes, shall open to your worth,
No country so obscure or place so far,
Which shall not of your matchless merits hear,
And those who never heard of god before,
Shall now the god of Englands Queen addore. 621
Her work was both pious and didactic and her conversion to Catholicism in the mid-1680s was the central experience of her life. Unlike the Catholic Aphra Behn and Barker’s fellow Catholic convert John Dryden, she left England after the revolution and lived at St. Germain until 1704 when she returned to Lincolnshire.

**Dryden and “The Queen of Pleasure”**

Behn and Dryden chose to remain in England and take their chances with William of Orange. Behn wasted no time in celebrating Mary of Modena’s stepdaughter as regnant queen, Mary II, but Dryden did not forget his patron in exile and he made gestures of loyalty to the Jacobite cause. Although after the Revolution he portrayed himself as a “lab’ring Bee, when his sharp Sting is gone,” the displaced Laureate viewed the end of the seventeenth century in *The Secular Masque* (1700) from the point of view of Chronos crushed under the weight of the globe. Dryden divided the seventeenth century into four sections with 1660-1689 the age of Venus, while Chronos represents 1689-1700. Venus healed the wounds of civil war and is a symbol of renewal. Since Venus represents the reigns of both Charles and James it is Mary of Modena who Dryden casts as Venus. At century’s end the Restoration had failed to bring political harmony and Chronos laments that during the reign of Venus the weight of the world was light on his shoulders, but the Queen of Pleasure has already left, banished like Mary of Modena after the revolution of 1688:

*Chronos*

> The World was then so light,

> I scarcely felt the Weight;
Joy rul’d the Day, and Love the Night.

But since the Queen of Pleasure left the Ground,

I faint, I lag,

And feebly drag

The pond’rous Orb around.

(Lines 79-85)\(^{625}\)

The theme of exile is continued in Dryden’s pastoral lyric *The Lady’s Song*, possibly written in 1691, much earlier than *The Secular Masque*. The nymphs and shepherds choose their “May-Lady” Phillis but she refuses to be crowned Queen of the May since “Pan, and fair Syrinx, are fled from our Shore”, a comment on the Stuart exile. It was first published in 1704 after Dryden’s death, unsurprisingly since the last stanza expresses Jacobite feeling:

Away with your Sheephooks, and take to your Arms;

Then Lawrels and Myrtles your Brows shall adorn,

When Pan, and his Son, and fair Syrinx, return,

(Lines 16-18)

“Pan”, James II, died shortly after Dryden; the “Son” became the Old Pretender and “fair Syrinx” remained Queen over the water as there was no second Restoration\(^{626}\).
Mother of the Family

Dryden portrayed Mary of Modena as an Arcadian nymph and a Venus or Queen of Pleasure, rather different from the disguise she adopted for her flight to France; Francesco Riva her Wardrobe Keeper had made her a "common habit" of cloth cloak and black dress so that she "became" an Italian washerwoman. Jane Barker cast her as the Virgin Mary, a more "motherly" role, and in exile in France Mary of Modena chose to be shown in her portraits as a mother rather than a Venus.

The faithful Benedetto Gennari followed Mary of Modena into exile on 2 April 1689 and stayed at St. Germain-en-Laye until he returned to Bologna in 1692. While in France he produced thirty pictures, perhaps the most impressive being the full-length "assai grande ritratto" she commissioned of herself and the two year old James Francis Edward (fig.137). She is seated wearing a blue dress and ermine lined robes, steadying the child who stands on a table beside her. He is wearing the same silver dress, lace apron and bonnet Gennari painted him wearing in 1689, aged 15 months. This portrait (fig.138), with the child holding a parrot, is more successful than the double portrait with its very unflattering image of Mary of Modena. Painted in 1690 the double portrait was intended for James II then in Ireland, but he returned before it was completed. It was sent as a gift to her brother the Duke of Modena, and is now in a private collection in Modena. Gennari took a copy of this back to Bologna and a third version he made for his friend Francesco Riva.
Louis XIV's sister-in-law Liselotte of the Palatinate wrote of Mary of Modena and her son that "The Queen, ..., seems to be quite intelligent, and I rather like her. The Prince of Wales is a most well-mannered child; he very much resembles the portraits of the late King of England, is very vivacious, and has a pretty face ...". She was outspoken, biased and a compulsive letter writer; seventeen years after this letter was written in 1689 she berated one of her correspondents for still doubting James Francis Edward was Mary of Modena's son:

*I would stake my head on his being the rightful child. For one thing, he and his mother resemble each other like two drops of water. For another, a lady not at all partial to the Queen was present at the birth and told me, for the sake of simple truth, that she saw this child still attached to the umbilical cord. She has no doubt at all that he is the Queen's son.*

Mary of Modena's daughter Princess Louise-Marie also bore a striking resemblance to her mother; commissioned to celebrate her eighteenth birthday in 1710, Alexis-Simon Belle the successful portrait painter who became the artist most closely associated with the Jacobite court at St. Germain-en-Laye portrayed her picking orange blossom from a tree in a large decorated urn (fig. 139). It echoed the portrait Lely painted of her mother in c.1674 plucking a blossom from an orange tree at the outset of her marriage, although there is no evidence that this was a deliberate quotation.
She had given birth to Louise-Marie on 28 June 1692 thus confounding the warming pan myth based as it was on her inability to bear children. An anonymous engraving of Mary of Modena’s completed family becomes a dynastic statement, even in the absence of any inscription; this, together with the style of engraving, indicates that it was almost certainly produced in England. It has two large oval portraits, of James II after Kneller and Mary of Modena possibly after Wissing, and two smaller ovals of James Francis Edward after Largillierre (1692) and Louise-Marie (fig.140). These are arranged in a panel with roundels significantly bearing the arms of England, Scotland, Ireland and France. John Speed had designed and commissioned a family tree which was also a dynastic statement, on the accession of James II’s grandfather James I. *The most Happy Unions Contracted betwixt the Princes of the Blood Royall of theis (sic) towe Famous Kingdomes of England and Scotland* (1603), was an elaborate explanation of the Scottish royal family’s relationship to the Tudors, and was engraved by Renold Elstrack. The family tree is arranged in roundels and a dynastic model for fig.140 can be seen, but whether this is a deliberate echo of the original is open to question.  

Mary of Modena had to wait until 1694 before she could be painted with her completed family. Her predecessor Anne Hyde had been painted with her husband and two daughters by Lely in c.1668-70, although it was finished by Gennari only in 1680. Edward Corp in *King Over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689* mentions a family portrait made by Nicolas de Largillierre in 1691, prior to their daughter Louise-Marie’s birth, which was at St. Germain in a “*terrible condition*” and has not survived. Agnes Strickland described in *Lives of the Queens of England* a “*curious*
"contemporary portrait" of James Francis Edward which was the "relic of a family group":

The child was dressed in a "red and green tartan frock ... [and] ... a sort of fanciful helmet cap of dark blue velvet, with a plume of black and blue feathers. This costume, the queen certainly intended for a highland dress ... ". His elbow "... originally rested in the palm of his royal mother, while the king held him by the other hand."

When Strickland visited France the portrait of the Prince of Wales was all that could be restored when the family group was discovered by James Smith at St. Germain. According to Edward Corp even the part showing the prince is now lost. This was superceded in 1694 when Pierre Mignard painted a large new portrait of the whole family for James II's antechamber (fig. 141). This was the period of Mignard's decorative large group portraits. He had already painted the Grand Dauphin and his Family in 1687-8 so that Mignard was the obvious choice, having been appointed Premier Pientre in 1690. In 1694 he was 82 years old and he refused to go to Saint-Germain-en-Laye to paint the Stuarts since he had heard there was sickness there, so they went to be painted at Versailles instead.

Mary of Modena as mother of the family dominates the composition, which was unusual in this period of patriarchal superiority. The father of the family would normally have the prominent position visually representing the dominant patriarch. In this portrait
Mary of Modena appears to have that rôle. James is in profile on the right, and the crown is at the feet of their son James Francis Edward. In the three black chalk compositional studies, now in the Louvre, which show Mignard's first ideas, she was always centre stage; a head and shoulders portrait of Mary of Modena after Mignard based on this came up for sale at Christie's on 16 May 1952 (fig. 142)\(^6\). The finished life-size portrait of the family seated at a table on a terrace was placed in the antechamber to the King's Guard Chamber in 1695; James II in Garter robes looks feeble and foolish, Mary of Modena opposite looks intelligent, holding Louise-Marie on the table, and, pointing to the crown and sword on the floor stands James Francis Edward in a form of classical Roman kit.

The composition resembles Hendrick Gerritsz. Pot's little "conversation piece", *Charles I, Henrietta Maria and (?) Charles, Prince of Wales*, (c.1632) (fig. 143) in the detail of the positioning of the child on the table being held by its mother, although the Pot is a more theatrical, staged "tableau". James II sits, whereas his father Charles I merely looks small of stature.

**Queen in Exile**

Mary of Modena embraced the maternal role in exile. She commissioned numerous portraits of the exiled heir and his sister from Nicolas de Largillierre who had painted pendant portraits of James and Mary of Modena in 1686 in England. She chose Largillierre because not only was he known to the Stuarts, but he had established himself in Paris as one of the most successful portrait painters of the second half of the reign of Louis XIV. He was patronized both by the Court and the wealthy middle classes and
consequently he became rather too busy. After 1698 she commissioned François de Troy and Alexis-Simon Belle to paint her children’s portraits for diplomatic presents. During the 1690s de Troy had become the French Court’s leading portraitist, and Alexis-Simon Belle was his pupil and assistant. In 1700 Belle had won the Grand Prix (Prix de Rome) of the Académie Royale, although he refused to go to Rome to the Académie de France. Instead he built up his clientele in Paris and became a fashionable portrait painter in the early eighteenth century. It was in 1701 that he married Anne Chéron the miniaturist, became a court painter and in 1702 moved to Saint-Germain-en-Laye to work for the exiled Stuart court where he replaced de Troy as the official Jacobite court painter.

Mary of Modena’s qualities as a queen finally came into their own in exile. James II was old and tired and the French court, if the letter writers and diarists can be believed, from the start formed the impression that Mary of Modena was to be admired while her husband was dull. For example, “Madame” wrote:

You will see that the new popular songs aren’t precisely eulogies of our poor King of England. But they prove that, while people here love this King and hate the Prince of Orange, they admire the latter more than the former.

Last Thursday we had the poor King and Queen here. She was very serious but he was quite cheerful. I don’t know what to make of the people who praise his intelligence so highly, I see little sign of it.
Mark Kishlansky observes that James II was in fact "the most capable of all the Stuarts". He was resolute, decisive and had a "clear vision of the monarchy and of the state. Though his intellectual gifts were modest and his education haphazard, James pondered problems tirelessly". 635

After James II's death Mary of Modena became regent until James Francis Edward reached his majority in June 1706. She held her first council of regency on 24 September 1701 at 6pm. However, long before that, much of the day-to-day running of the court at St. Germain had devolved on to her during James's absence on campaigns. She could be dismissive of him, as when in trying to stem the duc d'Orléans chatter about jewels and furniture James told the duc that he himself had had plenty of money, had never wasted it on furniture, jewels or palaces, but had spent it on ships, cannons and guns. "Madame" recorded that Mary of Modena reminded him that: "... a lot of good they did you. Why, they have all been used against you!" This riposte was met by silence and "there the subject ended". 636

Many anecdotes are recorded about the French court and the exiled Stuarts' presence there. An engraving of Mary of Modena at prayer produced about 1694 is in the British Museum (fig.144) and another, full length seated on a cushion and gesturing to her right was published in France, and is in the Macdonnell Collection (fig.145); in both she is wearing a headdress of wired lace, exaggeratedly high, variously known as a Tour, Commode, the Fontage or the Cornette. She told the Superior of Chaillot, Mère Angelique Priolo that she had nearly burned herself to death one night by putting her
cornette in the candle when she knelt to pray. It flared up leaving only the wire.

"Madame" wrote in 1695 that "we don't dress our hair so very high now ... The head dresses are now worn bent forward and not straight up as they used to be." Later in 1716 "Madame" remembered that Louis XIV had hated exaggerated headdresses and "someone from England" had appeared at court who wore her hair dressed quite flat and the fashion at court went from one extreme to the other overnight. Whether the experience of "the fire", or whether because Mary of Modena was tall and thin and a high headdress was unbecoming, was the cause of this change is open to question.

Very few portraits of Mary of Modena were produced in France. Since the Stuarts were in exile, portraits of the deposed king and queen were needed only for gifts and decorative purposes. Gennari's *Raccolta di Memorie* lists the copies he made from the double portrait, and at least two more portraits he made of her in 1690 and 1691 prior to his return to Italy. According to Edward Corp both are lost, but there is a portrait at Stonyhurst College, Lancashire which is described as number 20 on Gennari's list as: "Ritratto della Regina in un ovato" (fig.146). This is listed in Prisco Bagni's catalogue *Benedetto Gennari e la bottega del Guercino*, (1986) which gives the date of execution as 1691. In 1799 Cardinal Alberoni left his estate to the Jesuits and this portrait of Mary of Modena together with the rest of Alberoni's collection was brought by the Jesuit agent Father Glover to Stonyhurst College in 1833. The curator Jan Graffius confirmed that there is no break in the chain of provenance and that this is Gennari's portrait of Mary of Modena. It is a poor likeness, but in my view Gennari's work deteriorated in France, as can be seen from the double portrait of her with her son in fig.137. Bagni has also
confirmed this is Mary of Modena and I support his interpretation. There is also a portrait very similar to the image of her in the double portrait which was sold at Sotheby's on 30 July 1969. Although attributed to Lely (who had died in 1680) this is an image certainly derived from Gennari and could be one of the “lost” portraits; the sitter has the signature long nose in both (fig.147). An exchange of letters between the Museo del Prado Madrid and the National Portrait Gallery, London about a portrait in the Prado presented by the Duke of Alba in 1922, seems to indicate that they also hold a portrait of Mary of Modena (fig.148). The letter of 1974 from the National Portrait Gallery confirms that it has always been known as “Mary of Modena by B. Gennari” and “As far as I can see there are no grounds for questioning the identity of the sitter or the artist”. Certainly, the image accords with the few other likenesses of Mary of Modena produced at this time, and particularly the image painted by Mignard in 1694. However Andrés Úbeda of the Prado confirmed to me that the gallery is still convinced that it does not represent Mary of Modena by Gennari, but is an anonymous portrait of Maria Sofia de Neoburg (1666-1699), wife of Peter II of Portugal. 640

Probably to celebrate their twenty-fifth wedding anniversary in the autumn of 1698, François de Troy was commissioned to paint portraits of James II and Mary of Modena (fig.149) which they exchanged to hang in each other's apartments. A year later she moved to another apartment and her husband began to live a semi-monastic life. After Largillierre became too busy, it was de Troy who monopolised the patronage of the exiled Stuart court as well as Alexis-Simon Belle, who had begun to work for the Court in 1699. Edward Corp makes the interesting point that it was not the Stuart court which
influenced the style of French portraiture, but the other way round. It was Belle, de Troy and Largillierre who were brought to the attention of large numbers of British patrons who bought their paintings and later on employed them. To meet demand Belle made reduced copies of de Troy’s 1698 portrait of Mary of Modena, selling them as pairs with his posthumous portrait of James II (fig.150), leading to the misattribution of the original 1698 portrait641.

The original portrait is still at Sizergh Castle, Westmoreland. This, together with a portrait of Louise-Marie painted by Belle in 1710, was given by Mary of Modena to her friend Lady Winifred Strickland, who shared her exile. Agnes Strickland’s frontispiece for her volume 9 on Mary of Modena of Lives of the Queens of England, is based on de Troy’s portrait (fig.151) and was engraved by permission of Walter Strickland of Sizergh in the nineteenth century642.

**Patronage**

Also still at Sizergh is Largillierre’s imaginary portrait of St Margaret Queen of Scotland, wife of Malcolm III of Scotland (fig.152). Full length, this portrait is half life-size; St. Margaret kneels in rapturous ecstasy at a small table on which rest a crown and sceptre, and the triangle, symbol of the Trinity is in the upper part of the picture. Engraved by Gantrel after Largillierre, the inscription in French acknowledges the new portrait of the Saint was at the behest of Mary of Modena to celebrate the birth of the Prince of Wales; St. Margaret of Antioch was the patron saint of childbirth. The model for this portrait painted in 1692 was always thought to be Mary of Modena, particularly
as the rich court dress, ermine-lined cloak and collar of an order are of the time of Louis XIV. St. Margaret’s brother Edgar Atheling had been part of the rebellion against William the Conqueror and took refuge at Malcolm’s court accompanied by his sister Margaret who Malcolm married the following year 1069. Mary of Modena modelled herself latterly on St. Margaret and there are certainly parallels in their lives. Edgar was convinced he would some day regain the throne of England, and Margaret’s husband Malcolm had great respect for her religious and cultural beliefs and interests. She did much to bring the Celtic Church in line with the Roman, and a papal enquiry in 1250 into her possible miracles led to her being canonised. In 1673, the year of Mary of Modena’s marriage St. Margaret was named one of the patron saints of Scotland.

St. Margaret’s legacies included the chapel at Edinburgh Castle named for her, and Dunfermeline Abbey begun in 1072. Mary of Modena kept a set of apartments at Chaillot, (for which she paid an annual rent of c.3000 francs), and became involved in the completion of the church of the Convent of the Visitation of St. Marie at Chaillot after they ran out of money. Founded by James II’s mother Henrietta Maria in 1652, The Stuart Papers include a description by a sister of Chaillot of the building of the church from 1702, Mary of Modena’s interest in it and her contributions to its funds in 1704. After the death of James II on Friday 16 September 1701 his heart had been placed in a silver-gilt heart surmounted by a crown and given to the nuns at Chaillot. She therefore had reason to benefit the monastery, having previously promised it a new wrought iron screen, and carved panels for the back of the altar. She told the Abbess of Chaillot that James II’s death meant that “we now have a great saint in Heaven”. She advanced the
cause of his sanctity and orchestrated a campaign to achieve his beatification. The French court was lukewarm and she lacked the financial resources to lobby Rome, so although there were stories of his miracles and cures, the cult of St. James never really took hold.

Unable to succeed in this endeavour, she took the opportunity after the death of her daughter in 1712 to testify her affection for Chaillot, and commissioned Pierre Gobert in 1713 to paint two large allegorical paintings in gold frames for the "grande tribune" of the chapel at Chaillot. Gobert had been painting portraits of members of Louis XIV's court since 1682 and had been accepted into the Académie Royale in 1701. One of his commissions for Mary of Modena was a posthumous double portrait that represented James II leading Louise-Marie to eternal glory; the apotheosis of James II and Louise-Marie is now lost. The other painted in c.1715 showed Mary of Modena in symbolic role-playing mode as Saint Helena holding the rediscovered wooden cross in her hand which she presents to her son James Francis Edward as Saint Edward the Confessor. St. Helena was a Christian saint who devoted the latter part of her life to good works and founding churches in the Holy Land after Christianity was officially tolerated in the Roman Empire by edict of her son Constantine the Great. It is obvious that Mary of Modena's son is shown as Edward the Confessor since the Confessor was a king's son in exile in Normandy from the age of nine years, but who finally recovered the English throne. The left hand side of the picture of Mary of Modena holding the cross is all that remains of this (fig.153).
Mary of Modena appears to have identified with these saints, testified by her long connection with the nuns of Chaillot, her position as its patroness, and her sponsorship of the girls and young women wishing to join them. Apparently she both promoted a fashion for giving dolls to mark a daughter’s first communion, birthday or entry into a French convent, but she also served as a model for one of the dolls which combined female beauty and fashionable taste with the role of ideal Catholic wife and mother.\(^{647}\)

Her taste in music, an important aspect of her patronage in England, continued to be influential. The Italian musicians employed at the Stuart court in exile propagated Italian music in Paris, and popularised the Italian cantata and sonata particularly. The exile of the Stuarts in France did not extinguish musical culture in England, so they left a valuable cultural legacy. However, Italian musicians such as the organist from the King’s Catholic chapel at Whitehall, Gian-Battista Casale, followed them into exile at the court at St. Germain, and Innocenzo Fede, in England from 1686, left and went with Mary of Modena to Paris where he became her master of the music.\(^{648}\)

**An Elegy for the Queen**

Portraits, however, continued to be the main commissions, particularly after James II’s death, even though musicians and poets as well as artists had followed them into exile. She declined to sit for her own portrait in old age, but if every picture tells a story then perhaps the most eloquent was the one which was never painted, since in refusing to sit she acknowledged her ageing with dignity. She did relent after a request from her absent son, and allowed Pierre Gobert to paint her in 1713. “Madame”, who
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had become her great friend, arrived on the day of the sitting and told her she was too
thin and changed for the worse. Mary of Modena was dressed as a widow; Agnes
Strickland saw the finished portrait in the nineteenth century in the collection of James
Smith Esq., of St. Germain, and she described it in minute detail, a textual portrait of a
painted image:

She is in her widow's dress, sitting by the urn which enshrines her husband's
heart; she points to it with a mournful air. A large black crape veil is thrown over
her head, according to the fashion of the royal widows of France, one corner
forming a point on the forehead, and the rest of the drapery falling like a mantle
over the shoulders nearly to the ground. Her robes are of some heavy mourning
stuff, with hanging sleeves, which are turned back with white lawn weepers, and
display the hands and arms a little above the wrist. She wears the round white
lawn tippet, which then formed part of the widow's costume, and about her throat
a single row of large round pearls, from which depends a cross. Her hair is
shown from beneath the veil; it has lost its jetty hue, so have her eyebrows; and
though decided vestiges of beauty may still be traced in the majestic outline of her
face, it is of a different character from that which Lely and Kneller painted, and
Waller, Dryden, and Granville, sang.

Since this was a rare portrait of her, copies were wanted by the Chaillot
community, as well as the Duke and Duchess of Lorraine and their sister-in-law the
Princesse de Vaudemont who had given her son James Francis Edward hospitality. It
is fortunate that this portrait was described in such detail by Strickland as the original was lost in the nineteenth century.

When she died after a week's illness on 7 May 1718, the cause of death was given as "inflammation of the lungs and the great abscess in her side left by her last illness". Letters cited by Martin Haile and Agnes Strickland show that for seventeen years she survived breast cancer, having found a lump in her breast in 1700, similar to that which James II’s first wife Anne Hyde had found. In 1702 it was confirmed as breast cancer and in 1705 a French surgeon performed an operation for a recurrence of the disease; in 1714 she had another long spell of illness which brought Louis XIV to her side.

It was only at her death that she finally got her greatest wish: her body was taken to Chaillot in the black habit of the order of the Visitation on 9 May. Her former "Versifying Maid of Honour", Anne Finch (née Kingsmill) who was with her in England until her marriage in 1684 marked the death of both James II and Mary of Modena with elegies. Loyal to the Jacobite cause, their lives disrupted by the Revolution, the Finches remained in Kent. Upon the Death of King James the Second (1701) is the poem of an insider who knew the court well; it voices regret, “Loyal Grief” and mourns their lost king in exile. In this poem, like Aphra Behn and Jane Barker’s poems which feature Mary of Modena, it is the eyes which show her status as queen:

*But draw the Vaile nor seek to paint that Grief*

*Which knows no Bounds nor meditates Relief*
Maria weeps with unexhausted Teares
No look that Beauteous Face but sorrow wears
And in those Eyes where Majesty was seen
To warn Admirers and Declare the Queen
Now only Reigns th’ incurable Distresse
Which Royal James they faithfull Consort shows
Who by Her different Grief, does too Confesse
That now alas She the Distinction Knows
‘Twixt Weeping for thy Losse or with Thee for thy Woes

(Lines 134-144)

The elegy for Mary of Modena On the Death of the Queen contains expression of Jacobite sympathies again, but also exudes nostalgia in a rare autobiographical reflection of Anne Finch’s days at court as the former Anne Kingsmill:

As thou hadst known her awfull without pride
As thou in Her Domestick train hadst stood
And seen her great and found her warmly good
duely maintaining her exalted place
Yet condescending with attractive grace

(Lines 33-37)

This begins as a pastoral dialogue between Ardelia and Lamira, with Ardelia comparing Mary of Modena yet again to Urania the muse of Astronomy and a type of
“ideal woman”. Mary of Modena’s death however is portrayed as both a personal loss, when she fled into exile:

>To seek the Court of many woes the source/Compleated by this last this sad
divorce (Lines 45-45)^655,

as well as a symbol of a passing of a way of life. Compared with the elegy on James, it is a sad and personal poem offering Anne Finch’s memories of nearly a quarter of a century ago of the young Duchess of York:

>Bles’t my attention was when drawing near
(My places claim) her crouded audience chair
I heard her by admiring States addrest
With embasies in different tongues exprest
To all that Europe sent she gave replies
In their own speech most eloquent and wise

(Lines 66-71)^656.

These are the personal memories of Anne Finch, but she had not seen Mary of Modena in the intervening years. A letter written from St. Cloud nearly three weeks after her death sums up Mary of Modena’s life in exile. It is perhaps the most poignant portrait or her, drawn by that biased yet spontaneous insider of the French court Elisabeth Charlotte, Duchess of Orléans, who as “Madame” knew Mary of Modena until her death:
I never drive past Chaillot without shuddering when I think of the virtuous and pleasant Queen of England lying dead up there in the nuns’ choir. It will be a long time before I get that out of my mind. The page who brought me the news so bluntly... didn’t know how fond I was of the Queen... The Queen was perfectly content to die. She thanked God for her deliverance from this life. I agree with you, dear Luise, he must be in heaven too, he suffered with such patience in this world. The Queen had great fortitude, and genuine royal qualities: nobility, generosity, politeness and a very agreeable mind. She used to tease me about my passion for the theatre, but admitted that she had been just the same. She never complained, and used to laugh about the time when she couldn’t go out any more because all her horses had died and she had no money to buy new ones. She laughed at her royal condition, how magnificent it was, and how all the splendour of the world was only vanity. She said it all so naturally and without complaint. I lost a pleasant companion in Her Majesty”.

The representation of Mary of Modena’s life and persona was not the life she herself lived, nor the person she actually was, but was constructed through letters, poems, satires, prints and visual portraits by others. We known that she was born in Italy in 1658, left reluctantly to marry James, Duke of York in 1673, that she was crowned as Queen Consort in 1685, exiled to France in 1688/9 and died there in 1718, but she remains elusive, documents, methodology and portraits notwithstanding. Tom Paulin’s lines “L’envie de commencement” from *The Liberty Tree* (1983) sums up the problem:
how simple it is in the beginning/for the historian to walk at dawn/seeing a pure narrative before him. Of course no narrative can remain pure, nor story uncomplicated once it has commenced. All history is contaminated by many voices and stories, and particularly by the interpretation of the writers, artists and historians themselves. So this thesis is a contaminated interpretation of the representation of Mary of Modena which was originally contaminated by the writers and artists who constructed her life and persona for her four hundred years ago.
NOTES

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

2 In Modena the baptism register records these as her given names.
4 Calendar of State Papers, ibid., 5 December 1673, p.44.
10 ibid., p.46.
11 In France the Roman Congregatio de propaganda fidei was a committee for the “propagation of the faith”, not for “propaganda” in the political sense of the term. The modern concept of propaganda goes back only so far as the late eighteenth century, when the techniques of persuasion used for example by supporters of the French Revolution were compared to Christian techniques of conversion.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 1


Anne Killigrew died of smallpox at the age of 25 on 16 June 1695. Remembered in these verses as a poet and painter, she was a Maid of Honour to Mary of Modena. See Chapter 5 for a discussion of her work, and note 399 for her status as Maid of Honour.

Charles II and the Duke of York had urged Dryden to write an heroic poem of recent events in England in which they were both heroes, but it came to nothing. The Works of John Dryden, ed. H.T. Swedenberg, et al, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-), vol. XII, p.5. In the poem Threnodia Augustalia written in 1685 on Charles II's death, Dryden portrayed a young, newly restored King Charles as a male "New-born Phoenix" attended by a "gay Harmonious Quire" of poetic muses.

From prefatory material to Annus Mirabilis, (1667) (Lines 1-57), in Dryden, Selected Poems, ibid., pp.35-37.


Anne Hyde was born 12 March 1637 and died 31 March 1671. Mary of Modena was born 5 October 1658 and died 7 May 1718.

The cause of Anne Hyde's death is stated in the Dictionary of National Biography, vide supra as breast cancer, but there is no source cited to substantiate this. However all accounts, e.g. John Miller, James II, 2nd ed., (New Haven & London, 2000), p.71 states: "Her almost incessant pregnancies had undermined her health and she suffered from cancer of the breasts." It is generally accepted it was cancer, although Allan Fea, James II and His Wives, (London, 1908) p.61 argued it was "attributed to appendicitis", while J.H. Jesse, Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of the Stuarts including the Protectorate, rev. ed, 3 vols, (London, 1855), vol.3 p.482 wrote that she "... was afflicted with a complication of diseases". It is most probable that she never recovered from her final pregnancy, with Catherine, who was born less than two months before Anne Hyde died, vide infra.

a) Anne's children:  
Charles 1660-1661  
Mary 1662-1694 – died of smallpox  
James 1663-1666  
Anne 1665-1714 – died of systemic lupus erythematosus  
Charles 1666-1667  
Edgar 1667-8 June 1671  
Henrietta 1668-1669  
Catherine 9 February 1671-6 December 1671.

b) Stuart papers relating chiefly to Queen Mary of Modena and the exiled Court of King James II. Printed from official copies of the originals ... under the superintendence of Falconer Madan ... for the Roxburghe Club, 2 vols., (London, 1889), vol.II, p.370.

b) Reresby, p.55. The Duke of York possessed some electoral patronage and Reresby drew himself to James's attention through his French speaking skills. James appointed him Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1666 and governor of Bridlington in 1678, a nominee postmaster of Doncaster and was instrumental in his election to Parliament. In turn Reresby defended James's interest in the Commons and was £200 better off.

21 The Shorter Pepys, edited Robert Latham, (Harmondsworth, 1987). Pepys diary entries for a) 16-17 November 1665 records that Anne "... is fallen in love with her new Maister of the Horse, one Harry Sidny (sic), and another Harry Savill – so that God knows what will be the end of it"; and Pepys gossips that b) 9 January 1666 - "... he was banished the Court, and the Duke for many days did not speak to the Duchesse at all".

c) According to Reresby who said they were in York from 5 August until 23 September 1665, Henry Sidney was appointed Groom of the Bedchamber to the Duke of York and Master of the Horse to Anne Hyde in 1665. William III created Sidney Earl of Romney in 1694.

22 a) Nicholas Hilliard, 1547-1619, *Queen Elizabeth I* ("The Phoenix Portrait"), c.1575-1576, oil on panel, 78.8 x 61cm, (31 x 24 ins), National Portrait Gallery, on long loan to Tate Britain since 1965.

b) Crispin van de Passe the Elder, Dutch, c.1565-1637, engraving of *Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I* 32.4 x 25.4cm, (12¼ x 10in), London, BM, Department of Prints and Drawings. The columns refer to the Pillars of Hercules believed to mark the limits of the Ancient World – both columns and ships are symbols of England’s maritime dominance.


*Go, Lovely Rose!*

*Go, lovely Rose!*
*Tell her that wastes her time and me*
*That now she knows,*
*When I resemble her to thee,*
*How sweet and fair she seems to be ...*

*Then die! that she*
*The common fate of all things rare*
*May read in thee;*
*How small a part of time they share*
*That are so wondrous sweet and fair!*

Edmund Spenser used the simile of the rose in *Faerie Queene*, BK2, 12, 74-75, Samuel Daniel in *Description of Beauty translated out of Marino*, and in *Sonnet to Delia*. Sir John Harington translated Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* (1591) and the simile is used in Book I, 42-43, and Robert
Herrick drew on the rose as symbol of youth and beauty innumerable times e.g. *A Meditation for His Mistresse, To the Virgins, to make much of Time*, as well as *To Violet* and most obviously *To the Rose*. Song:

Goe happy Rose, and enterwove  
With other Flowers, bind my Love ...


26 *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, edited Henry B. Wheatley, vol. II (London, 1899), entry for April 20 1661; "my Lady Chancellor" was Frances Hyde, Clarendon’s second wife Frances Ailesbury, daughter of Sir Thomas Ailesbury.


28 Pepys, ibid., 24 June 1667 "That the Duchesse is not only the proudest woman in the world, but the most expenseful; and that the Duke of York's marriage with her hath undone the kingdom by making the Chancellor so great above reach ....". *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714*, vol. I, 1660-1678, edited George de F. Lord, (London, 1963), p. 103.


30 This could have been painted about c.1665 as the features agree with the whole length seated painted by Lely c. 1665 in the Royal Collection.


32 Pepys, ibid., 24 March 1666.


Pepys, ibid., 27 July 1665.


Reresby, ibid., p.55, (August 5 1665).

Waller, ibid., vol.II, p.47, lines 1-3 and lines 10-12; p.207, footnote to p.47.


Waller, ibid., vol.II, p.74, lines 13-16.


Pepys, ibid., 30 October 1668.

*The Life of James the Second King of England, etc. collected out of Memoirs Writ of His Own Hand, together with the King’s Advice to His Son, and His Majesty’s Will Published from the original Stuart Manuscripts in Carlton – House*, by Rev. J.S. Clarke, 2 vols, (London, 1816), vol.I, pp.451-452. Ashley, ibid., p.93; Miller, ibid., pp.58-59.
51 A Complete History of England with the Lives of all the Kings and Queens Thereof, From the Earliest Account of Time, to the Death of His Late Majesty King William III., 3 vols., 2nd edition, (London, 1719), vol.3, chapter 3, pp.319-320. See Appendix A for a complete transcript of this paper.

52 Ollard, ibid., p.315; on the Hyde/Villiers friendship Pepys records that on 4 March 1669 he was at the Treasurer’s House in Deptford and there found the Duke and Duchess of York “with all the great ladies sitting upon a carpet on the ground, ..., playing at “I love my love with an A ...”; and some of them but particularly the Duchess herself and My Lady Castlemaine, were very witty”: Pepys, ibid., pp.994-995.


54 Clarke, ibid., pp.452-453.

55 Clarke, ibid., p.485.


57 Anne Hyde’s pencil entries in her girldhood “account book”, BL Add. Ms 15900. Cranborne Lodge was the residence of her grandfather, Thomas Ailesbury.


59 Bodleian Library, Clarendon Ms 45 f.367. Barbara Ailesbury, Aunt “Babs”, died young, according to Anne Hyde, at the age of 24 years.

60 Hamilton, ibid., p.185. Grammont claims c.60 pages earlier that although she had “a pretty good shape” she had “not much beauty”.

61 Margaret R. Toynbee “Adriaen Hanneman and the English Court in Exile”, Burlington Magazine, October 1951, xcii, pp.73-80, writes that Hanneman’s introduction to the English exiles must have been through the Orange-Stuart court: “… it appears that by 1645 Hanneman had attracted the patronage of the parents-in-law of Mary of Orange, Frederick Henry of Orange, and Amalia of Solms, for at Potsdam there is (or was) a signed painting of their second daughter, Albertina Agnes, as a girl, dated that year.” p.74; Onno ter Kuile, Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671: Een Haags portretschilder, (Alphen aan den Rijn, Amsterdam, 1976) (Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671: A Portrait Painter in the Hague).


Millar, Oliver, Sir Peter Lely 1618-80, Exhibition 1978-1979 at 15 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1, (National Portrait Gallery, 1978), p.48, catalogue no.24. Ellis Waterhouse, Painting in Britain 1530-1790, 5th edition, (Yale, 1994), pp.95-96 thinks it is "Metsu done over in terms of Van Dyck". It is known that Lely obtained a pass for travel to Holland on 29 May 1656 when he made contact with the exiled Court, so this portrait is probably not of Anne Hyde, because it is signed and dated 1654; although of course he could have travelled there in 1654, but there is no record of it.


Haile, ibid., p.44, (From Visitation Convent Archives Modena).

According to Clarendon's letter to Lady Stanhope he had tried to prevent Anne Hyde from accompanying the Princess of Orange on the visit to Henrietta Maria in Paris. Clarendon asserts that the Queen had treated the Princess with coldness since Anne had been in her service, and had shown such dislike for his daughter that he thought she should remain with friends in Breda during the visit. Clarendon State Papers, Cologne, July 16, 1659.

Any sort of exchange of promises before witnesses which was followed by cohabitation was regarded in law as a valid marriage before Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act was passed in 1753. From 1754 only a church wedding, not the verbal spousal was legally binding.

Pepys, ibid., 1661 preface, p.107.

Clarendon, ibid., p.391.

ibid., p.394.

Ollard, ibid., p.226.

Clarendon, ibid., p.389.

76 Clarendon, ibid., p.394.


78 Letter written from Oxford to Secretary Nicholas, Oxford 1665, Clarendon Ms 83 f.253 [Bodleian Library].

79 "On the Two Sisters", Bodleian Ms Firth, e.6, fo.3; also manuscript copies in the British Library, 2 dated 1690.


81 Boyer, Abel, The Life and Reign of Queen Anne, (London, 1735), vol.I, p.10; Historical Manuscripts Commission, Stuart, I, 114-17: "Rules for the Family of our dearest son, the Prince of Wales, 19 July 1696".

82 Gregg, Edward, Queen Anne, 2nd edition (London, 2001), p.6; Letter from Anne to Sarah Churchill, Fryday (sic) night [25 August 1693]. [Blenheim E17 (together with E18 and 19) are in the British Library and contain most of the letters sent by Queen Anne to Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough].

83 Waller, ibid, vol.II, p.51. Thetis brought a shield to Achilles while the Paphian Queen (Venus) did the same for Aeneas – they had armed their heroes and brought them works of art.

84 Margaret Brooke, Lady Denham was James, Duke of York's mistress from 1666. In The Second Advice ... she is "Madam l'Edificatresse" (line 340), and again in Third Advice (opening line). She died suddenly in January 1667, her death widely rumoured to have been from poison in her cocoa. With no evidence at all Marvell offers Anne Hyde as the culprit, but it is obviously based on rumours, since in Grammont’s Memoirs a note on p.219 states that "The slander of the times imputed her death to the jealousy of the Duchess of York"; Marvell, Andrew, "The Second Advice to a Painter", Poems on Affairs of State, ibid., p.39.

85 Marvell, Andrew, “The Last Instructions to a Painter”, Poems on Affairs of State, ibid., pp.102-103.

86 She was a member of the exiled émigré Royalist circle having escaped during the Civil War to France in 1644 – while in Paris she had married William Cavendish, then Marquess of Newcastle. She had known Anne Hyde and the Duke of York in Antwerp and became a determinedly prolific writer of biography, philosophy, fiction, essays, plays and poetry, when it was still not acknowledged that women had that ability.
87 "The Downfall of the Chancellor", Poems on Affairs of State, ibid., p.158.

88 Pepys, ibid., p.78; the entry for 13 September 1660 is: "This day the Duke of Gloucester dyed of the smallpox - by the great negligence of the Doctors."


90 Burlington Magazine, ibid., pp.73-80.

91 Gibbons, ibid., p.x. This portrait seems to have disappeared but another in a private collection is also by Lely, after Finch himself became Lord Chancellor on 19 December 1675.

92 Clarendon, Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of, Life ... in which is Included a Continuation of His History, (Oxford, 1857), vol.11, p.266.

93 Ollard, ibid., p.269.


96 MacLeod, see Diana Dethloff, ibid., p.75.

97 Hamilton, ibid., p.218.


100 Haile, ibid., pp.155-156.

101 Letters from Orinda to Poliarus, (London, 1705), letters 3 December 1662 and 3 May 1662.
ibid, 23 May, 1663. Pierre Corneille, *Pompey. A Tragedy. Acted with Great Applause*, (London, 1663), translated Katherine Philips; Paul Salzman, *Reading Early Modern Women's Writing*, p.188 writes that Philips was "... anxious that the rival translation, by Waller and other court wits, should not overshadow hers ". He argues that it was the printed text that was presented to Charles but that she instructed Cotterell "I have sent you a packet of printed Pompeys to dispose of as you think fit. Be pleas'd to get one bound and present it to the Dutchess ... ".

Pepys, ibid., 24 June 1667, p.798.

Hamilton, ibid., p.312.

Pepys, ibid., 15 October 1666, p.681.

Hamilton, ibid., p.312.


James, Duke of York's five principal mistresses were:
1. Goditha Price; Catherine of Braganza's Maid of Honour.
2. Margaret Brooke, Lady Denham; married a year before she became his mistress. Wife of poet and courtier Sir John Denham. She died early 1667.
3. Arabella Churchill; one of Anne Hyde's Maids of Honour; bore him 2 sons, James Fitzjames, the Duke of Berwick, Henry Fitzjames, the Duke of Albermarle and 2 daughters.
4. Anne Hamilton, Countess of Southesk, and Duchess of Hamilton in her own right.
5. Catherine Sedley, Countess of Dorchester; one of Mary of Modena's Maids of Honour; she had at least 3 children by him, probably 2 were daughters.

Belvoir Ms., 1668 Lady Chaworth to Lord Roos.


*Complete History*, ibid., p.307.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

114 The title of this chapter is taken from “To a Lady—”, The Poems of Edmund Waller, edited G. Thom Drury, (1901) vol.2, p.69, line 6. Strickland, Agnes, Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest; with Anecdotes of their Courts, 12 vols, (London, 1846), vol.9, pp.1-2. This is in effect a joint production by Agnes and her sister Elisabeth who refused to put her name in print; their books were based on extensive original research, the volume and a half devoted to Mary of Modena was written from archives in the Hôtel de Soubise, Dépôt des Archives, Paris in 1844. It was the first-ever published biography of her.

115 ibid. p.2.

116 Dibdin, T.F. Aedes Althorpianae: or an account of the mansion, books and pictures, at Althorp ... (London, 1822).

117 Millar, Oliver, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, Text Volume, (London, 1963), p.121 no.245.

118 Becket, R.B. Lely (1951), p.52.


124 Evelyn, John, The Diary of John Evelyn, edited Guy de la Bédoyère, (Woodbridge, 1995), pp.201-202. Full residence of the court at Windsor in the summer of 1674 was the first since the Restoration of 1660.


Strickland, (1846), p.2. The "Windsor Beauties" originally hung in the White Room at Whitehall: "Hung with White Sarsanett, and over it blew Mohair with silk fringe, ..." (Inventory of the Duke of York's possessions, Bodleian Mss 891, F.7v.), and then at Windsor Castle (hence their collective title) in the Princess's Dressing Room (Bathoe, James II (1111-1120). During Queen Anne's reign they were in the Queen's Waiting Room (Queen Anne, Windsor (61-71) and later in the Beauty Room (Queen's State Bed chamber) (Pyne, Vol.I, pp.116-29) where Hazlitt saw them in 1823. (Hazlitt, William "The Pictures at Windsor Castle" (1823), Works ed. A.R. Waller and A. Glover Vol.IX (1903), pp.38-9. "They were at Hampton Court by June 1835", (Millar, Oliver, The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, (London, 1963), p.124) where Strickland saw them. Another set of portraits the "Hampton Court Beauties" however are full length, refined and dignified and give an impression of a virtuous moral climate; these are by Kneller.

Fea, Allan "Portraits of Nell Gwyn, Moll Davis and Others", The Connoisseur, (March, 1943), pp.29-32, p.32.

Ripa, Cesare, Baroque and Rococo Pictorial Imagery: the 1758-60 Hertel edition of Ripa's "Iconologia" ..., ed. Edward A. Maser, (New York, 1971), no.139. "Constancy is armed with righteousness and unshakable faith in her beliefs. The column she embraces is an old symbol for firmness and stability".


Lely had formalised the designs or poses he used into a numbered series by 1670 and his executors' accounts list a series of numbered postures such as "whole length postures nos.8 and 1". The Executors' Account Book of Sir Peter Lely 1679-91, British Museum, Add. MSS 16174.


ibid, p.224, p.223, pp.237-238.

ibid, p.34.


ibid, p.34.


Campbell, Lorna, Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries, (New Haven and London, 1990); Cole, Alison, Art of the Italian Renaissance Courts:
Isabella was a d'Este name. Mary of Modena named her second daughter Isabella who was painted by Lely (Royal Collection Hampton Court), after her aunt the Duchess of Parma, and her great-grandmother the pious Isabella of Savoy, see Pedigree of the House of Este (II) faces p.510 in Haile, Martin, Queen Mary of Modena: Her Life and Letters, (London, 1905). Princess Isabella died in her fifth year in 1681.


ibid, vol.2, p.88. Clorinda was a pagan female warrior, Erminia was a princess of Antioch, and Sophronia a brave Christian maiden condemned to the stake; In Aubrey’s Brief Lives, edited Oliver Lawson Dick, (Harmondsworth, 1972) pp.467-471 Aubrey writes that “The Dutches of Yorke (...) very much delights in his [Edmund Waller] company, and hath layd her commands on him to write, which he hath dedicated to her Highnes.”


Dryden wrote that “Many besides myself have heard our famous Waller own, that he derived the harmony of his numbers from “Godfrey of Bulloign”, which was turned into English by Mr Fairfax”. Ker, W.P. ed., Essays of John Dryden, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1900) p.247. Fairfax’s translation of Gerusalemme liberata was published in 1600.


Alfonso d’Este had to commit Tasso to an asylum for attacking a servant with a knife – he returned to his sister Cornelia in Sorrento but returned to Ferrara where Alfonso had him committed to the St Ann Hospital for the mad for 7 years.

Chemaik, p.54.


British Museum Engraved British Portraits vol.3. A Blooteling was active 1673-1687. (O’Donaghe III, p.189, no.9).

H.H. Quiter was active 1678-1709 (O’Donaghe III p.189, no.10).

Raccolta di Memorie di Benedetto Gennari – entry number 25 (London 1674-1688). (Being a transcript of the mss. in M.S.B. 344 in Bibliotheca Communale dell’ Archiginnasio at Bologna).
Waller, vol.2, p.71 and 212. Thom Drury argues that the copy now in the British Museum was probably not presented to Mary of Modena until after the death of her baby Charles the Duke of Cambridge. Although he presented the 1668 edition of his poems to commemorate her arrival here in 1673 because there are lines also inscribed on the death of the Duke of Cambridge who was born November 7, 1677, and died at one month old, it was probably given to her after this date.


POEMS CITED IN CHAPTER II

EDMUND WALLER (1606-1687)


Volume I

On My Lady Dorothy Sidney's Picture, p.43

To Vandyck, pp.44-45

Volume II

To the Duchess, When He Presented This Book to Her Royal Highness, p.71.

These Verses Were Writ in the Tasso of Her Royal Highness, p.88.

GEORGE GRANVILLE, LORD LANSDOWNE


Volume I: In the Preface Granville writes that most of what is published in the three volumes of poetry, plays, comedies and tragedies published in 1736 is what he wanted preserved as his memorial. He saw the poems as seeing "... to begin where Mr Waller left off, tho' far unequal and short of so inimitable an Original".

To the Earl of Peterborough on his Happy Accomplishment of the Marriage between His Royal Highness and Princess Mary d'Este of Modena. Written several Years after in Imitation of the Style of Mr Waller, pp.1-4.

Spoken by the Author, being then not Twelve Years of Age, to her Royal Highness the Dutchess (sic) of York, at Trinity College in Cambridge, pp.5-6.

To the Author, on his foregoing Verses to the King. By Mr Edmund Waller, p.9.

The Progress of Beauty, pp.50-63.
"Spoken by the AUTHOR, being then not Twelve Years of Age, to her ROYAL HIGHNESS the Duchess of York, at Trinity-College in CAMBRIDGE".

ibid, p.6.

Miller, John, *James II*, (London, 2000), p.75; “Conway” was Edward, Viscount Conway, one of the leading men at court.

Mordaunt, Henry, Earl of Peterborough, *Succint Genealogies* (1685) and Haile, Martin, *Queen Mary of Modena* (London, 1905) pp.6-7. Peterborough records that he was introduced into the House of Conti by “a Scotch gentleman ...; one Mr Conn”, who also arranged a meeting with Abbe Ricchini (Rizzini) in Paris who negotiated “the interests of the House of Este”. Anne-Marie Martinozzi (b.1639-d.1672) married the hunchback, Armand Prince de Conti in 1654. Arranged by Anne-Marie and Laura Martinozzi’s uncle Cardinal Mazarin after the marriage Armand Prince de Conti was given the Governorship of Guienne and the command of an important army. Mazarin gave the couple a palace on the Quai Malaquais, rebuilt by him at great cost.

Haile, p.19. Peterborough published in 1685 a folio *Succint Genealogies of the noble and ancient houses of Mordaunt of Turvey etc*. The name of the author was given as Robert Halstead and dedicated to Peterborough. It was written by Peterborough who was helped by his chaplain, the Rector of Turvey, Richard Rands.

Letter from the Earl of Peterborough to Charles II, Modena 30 September 1673; Public Record Office, Italy N37 (Haile, p.24).

The Abbé Rizzini (the Modenese agent in Paris) told Pomponne, Louis XIV’s foreign minister in August 21 1673, that “… Four or five years ago, Madame the Duchess built a convent for the Sisters of the Visitation, next door to, and communicating with, the Castle of Modena; and through frequenting these nuns continually, the young Princess, (..), now wishes to become one herself ...”. Hopkirk, Mary, *Queen Over the Water: Mary Beatrice of Modena, Queen of James II*. (London, 1953), p.9.

These details are in Oman, Carola, *Mary of Modena*, (London, 1962), pp.xvii and 250. There is a photograph in Haile, facing page 113 of a miniature in the possession, in 1905, of the Visitation Convent at Modena.

Haile, p.12; Lord O’Brien to Williamson, November 17, 1673 “… thought Parliament will, among other marks of honour to Earl Peterborough, vote him a pair of spectacles, he having till now assured us our Duchess was very fair, who proves the contrary”, *Calendar of State Papers. Domestic Series, Charles II;* v.16, November 1 1673 to February 28 1675, edited F.H. Blackburne Daniell, (London, 1904) p.24.


Granville, (1736), pp.1-3.


Granville (1736), pp.50-63.

(a) Millar, (1978), p.69, no.54.
(b) Millar, (1963), p.121, no.244.

Law, (1881), p.21, no.65. In the 1876 catalogue this was attributed to Kneller and in the Hampton Court Catalogue compiled by C.H. Collins Baker (1929) it is still attributed to him. On Monday March 16 1925 a portrait identical to the Royal Collection portrait was put up for sale as Lot 522 together with the contents of Hampton Court, Herefordshire. It was 82x52ins in a carved frame and the entry was illustrated, plate XXII. The Witt Library at the Courtauld has a record of this portrait at the W.R. Hearst Coll. Hammer Gallns., New York in 1941. It appears to be in an identical frame to the one for sale in 1925. This appears to have come on the market again at Christies (NY) in their sale Important Paintings by Old Masters 6 June 1984 (43) illus. and bought for $5,500.


Challoner Smith, John. British Mezzotint Portraits; being a Descriptive Catalogue ..., 4 vols, (London 1878-1884), part IV, p.122 no.44. Plate I – bottom left “P. Lelly Eques pinxit”, to right “Sold by Alex Browne at the blew Balcony in little Queen Street” – Under “Serenissima Princes Maria Beatrix Ducissa Eloracensis etc.”. Plate II – curls are reduced and the inscription line erased and substituted with “Maria D.G. Angliae Scotiae Franciae & Hiberniae Regina. Cam Privilegio Regis. Plate III. The plate has been cut and retouched with a fallow deer introduced. The inscription reads “Maria D.G. Angliae, Scotiae, Franciae & Hiberniae Regina”. “P. Lelly Eques pinxit”. “Printed for and sold by Tho Bowles Print & Mapseller next ye chapter house St. Pauls Church Yard”.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3


Duchess Laura and Prince Rinaldo returned with their train of some 50 people. Remaining behind with Mary of Modena were: Countess Lucretia Pretonari Vezzani (lady in waiting), Dr James Ronchi (chaplain), Father Antonio Giudici (her confessor), four women of the bedchamber, one page, one footman, one maître d’hôtel and two cooks. Her English household is recorded in Angliae Notitia, published in London in 1676: Groom of the Stole: Countess of Peterborough, £400
Ladies of the Bedchamber: Countess Lucretia, an Italian lady, and Lady Ballasis, £200.

Four Maids of Honour: Mrs Jennings, £20, Mrs Trevor, £20, Mrs Clarke, £20, Mrs ...(?).

Mother of the Maids: Mrs Lucy Wise.

Six Bedchamber Women: Mrs Katherine Elliot, £200, Mrs Margaret Dawson, £150, Mrs Bromley, £150, Mrs Cornwallis, £150, Lady Apsley, £150, Italian lady (possibly this was Pellegrina Turini?).

Starcher: Mrs Mary Roche, £50.

Seamstress: Mrs Pierce, £50.

Laundress: Mrs Le Bodrey, £50.

Lace Mender - not recorded.

Secretary: Mr Coleman, £100.

Two Gentlemen Ushers: £80 each.

Four Gentlemen Waiters, and four Pages of the Backstairs: £40 each.

Master Cook: £40.

Necessary Woman: £40.

Eighteen Watermen: £2 each.

Master of the Horse to the Duchess is the Earl of Roscommon: £266 13s. 4d.

Two Escuyers: £100 each.

Eight Footmen: £39 each.

Four Coachmen: “each £78 for themselves”.

Postellions and Helpers, five Grooms: £32 5s each.

Two Chairmen: £39 each.

The party had left Calais for Dover on 1 December, but in England the Old Style of reckoning was still in use (and would be for another 80 years) so it was still only 21 November. Strickland, p.63 writes that the Duchess Laura returned on 30 December 1673, but it is usually acknowledged as “the New Year”.


Meres, Sir Thomas, MP for Lincoln, in *Debates of the House of Commons, From the Year 1667 to the Year 1694*, edited Anctitell Grey, 10 vols., (1763).

Better represented in the aristocracy and gentry, Catholics were prohibited from worshipping in public, excluded from university education, debarred from government office and forbidden entry to the royal presence without special licence; Tim Harris, *Revolution*, (2006), p.20 gives the figure of 1.2 per cent of the population who were of the Catholic faith and who remained vulnerable to penal laws passed since the Reformation; W.A. Speck, in *Reluctant Revolutionaires*, (Oxford, 1988), p.170 quotes *The Compton Census of 1676: A Critical Edition*, ed. A. Whiteman (1986) saying that Catholics “... represented at most a mere two per cent of the population, and that the results of the ‘census’ were well known to contemporaries; Marvell, Andrew. *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England...* (1677); Haley, K.H.D. *William of Orange and the English Opposition 1672-4*, (Oxford, 1953), pp.97-98, p.58 and p.166.

Louis XIV lent the first instalment of Mary of Modena’s portion, that became a contentious issue because it was not repaid. He insured a dowry of at least four hundred thousand crowns on her part and Charles II undertook to offer on behalf of James, Duke of York a jointure of 15,000 l. per annum. Carola Oman, *Mary of Modena*, (London, 1962), p.8 and *Dictionary of National Biography*, p.1251; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, Charles II, vol.16, November 1, 1673 to February 28, 1675, ed., F.H. Blackburne Daniell, (London, 1904), pp.128-132 “verbum sapierti” Nos.23 and 24; Janet Southorn, “Mary of Modena Queen Consort of James II & VII” in *Royal Stuart Papers XL* (Huntingdon, 1992), p.4, argues that the “Pope”, could be the Borgia Pope, Alexander VI, whose daughter Lucrezia married Mary’s ancestor, Alfonso I d’Este, Duke of
Ferrara although their descendants died out in 1598. Therefore the “English propagandist must therefore have had in mind Mary’s paternal grandmother, Maria Farnese of Parma, who was descended ultimately from Pope Paul III (1468-1549), whose summoning of the Council of Trent and approval of the foundation of the Society of Jesus had inaugurated the Counter-Reformation”. His children pre-dated his election as Pope by many decades.


195 Burnet, (Everyman: London, 1906), p. 130. Burnet (1643-1715) was appointed royal chaplain in 1673 and Chaplain of the Rolls Chapel in 1675. He published the History of the Reformation in England in 1679 during the crisis over the Popish Plot, which argued against the Catholic case, although he was also against persecution of Catholics. He was friendly with the Whig leaders involved in the Rye House Plot of 1683 and preached against Popery (1684). He was William of Orange’s close advisor in Holland from James, Duke of York’s accession in 1685 and returned with William in December 1688. Appointed Bishop of Salisbury in 1689.


198 Wroughton, John, The Stuart Age, 1603-1714, (London and New York, 1997), pp. 243-244; Evelyn, John, Diary of John Evelyn, edited Guy de la Bédoyère, (Woodbridge, 1995), January 19 1686: “I went to Lond: pass’d the Privie Seale amongst others, the Creation of Mrs. Sidly (concubine to ..) Countesse of Dorchester, which ’tis certaine the Queene tooke very grievously: so as for two dinners, standing neere her, she hardly eate one morsel, nor spake one word to the King, or to any about her, ..”.

199 When Mary of Modena was nine years old she had lost her governess who had entered the branch of the Salesian order, established by the Duchess Laura her mother, which adjoined the ducal palace. It was an educational religious order founded by St. François de Sales, the French Roman Catholic Bishop who died in 1622. Mary of Modena on her way to England to meet her new husband had written to her governess that in the Convent of the Visitation at Lyons she had seen
the reliquary containing the heart of St. François de Sales, as well as his writing desk, cushion, cassock and the mattress where he died. She records that a handkerchief used by the saint – "a thing most precious to me" – had been given to her by the Reverend Mother. A. Croxton Smith, "The Dog in History", in The Book of the Dog, edited Brian Vesey-Fitzgerald, (London, 1948), pp.21-48, p.31, quotes John Manwood's Treatise and Discourse of the Laws of the Forest (1598) and points out that Canute reduced the laws to legal form and coherence, that the "keeping of greyhounds and spaniels within a forest was prohibited entirely", and "spaniels ... and according to a statute of Queen Anne, among sporting dogs were then greyhounds, lurchers ..., none of which was to be kept by anyone not duly qualified by the extent of his estate".


Other examples of Lely’s inclusion of a lap dog are the Duchess of Somerset as a child, c.1669 (Duke of Buccleuch) (49½ x39¾)and Viscountess Weymouth c.1675, (Marquis of Bath) (43 x 38).

202 Cats, Jacob, Spiegel van denouden en nieuwen tijdt, (The Hague, 1632; Amsterdam, 1658), pt.3, no.12.


The Declaration of Indulgence of April 1687 stated that the execution of the penal laws against Catholics and Dissenters were to be suspended and that oaths and test were not to be tendered to his subjects admitted to office in the service of the King [James II], and all so admitted were to be granted dispensation; Poole, Mrs Reginald Lane, Catalogue of Portraits in the Possession of the University, Colleges, City, and County of Oxford, 2 vols., (Oxford, 1952), vol.I, pp.84-85, cat. no.211, and p.65; The Vice-Chancellor's accounts for 1720 (Heame's Collections, vii.146) records a gratuity of £2.2s to the “Bishop of Durham’s servants for bringing ye Pictures.”


Beckett refers to this as being by A. Blooteling (No.320), but it is probably not; Chaloner Smith, John. British Mezzotint Portraits, 4 vols, (London, 1878-84), vol.IV, p.1381. Jane Long was an actress and mistress to George Porter a friend of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. This is the second reworked version which has altered the face and hair entirely to accommodate later fashion. The attitude is still similar in reverse direction of Mary Modena fig.19 and closely resembles fig.19b. The publishers name has been partially erased.


Hopkirk, Mary, Queen Over the Water: Mary Beatrice of Modena, Queen of James II, (London, 1953), p.118.

Sotheby's British Paintings 1500-1850 10.11.1993 (lot 164) and 12.7.1995 (lot 21).

Whinney and Millar (1957), quoted p.174 that an unknown contemporary remarked on Lely's portraits that "he put something of Cleveland's face as her Lanquishing Eyes into every one Picture, so that all his pictures had an Air one of another, all Eyes were Sleepy alike. So that Mr Walker ye Painter swore Lily's Pictures was all Brothers & Sisters ".


Hamilton, (1911), p.116 (note) "In July, 1660 he was sent ambassador to the court of France. Sir John Reresby asserts that Lord St. Albans was married to Queen Henrietta."
Richard Talbot was a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Duke of York; he was afterwards Earl and then Duke of Tyrconnel. His older brother Peter was a close friend of York’s and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.

Before she arrived in England in 1673 it was thought that Mary of Modena had “red hair”, cf. reference to “golden locks" in line 41 which could date the poem to late 1673; Poems on Affairs of State, vol. I, pp.213-219. An attribution in B.M. Harl. 7315 points to Savile. The National Library of Scotland Advocate MS. 19.1.12 identifies the satirist as Andrew Marvell, the B.M. Add. MS. 34109 ascribes it to Rochester while the editor of Vol.I of Poems on Affairs of State considers it to be by John Ayloffe.

The “de” was omitted because the de La Porte de La Meilleraye family was not sufficiently noble.


It was purchased from Thomas, Lord Windsor, Catherine Pegg’s son by Charles II; he later became Earl of Plymouth.

Haile (1905), p.52 records that Countess Lucrezia Vezzani, the Italian Lady of the Bedchamber wrote to Prince Rinaldo d’Este in March 1675 that “I think we shall soon see the Duchess of (sic) Mazarin in England which greatly displeases Her Royal Highness, and the Duke also, I believe, but it is not to be prevented; some efforts have been made to hinder her, but she will come”. Later in June she wrote: “The Duchess of (sic) Mazarin has arrived, and now nothing is talked of in the Queen’s and the Duchess’s apartments but the beauty of that lady”.

It was purchased from Thomas, Lord Windsor, Catherine Pegg’s son by Charles II; he later became Earl of Plymouth.

Largillierre was sent to London for 20 months in 1665. He returned to Antwerp and became a master in the Guild of St. Luke in 1673-4. When in London in 1675 he carried out work for the Crown as restorer and assistant to the decorative painter Antonio Verrio then working at Windsor Castle.

Scott, C.H., Catalogue of the Pictures at Boughton House ..., (January, 1911), privately printed, p.45. Also formerly identified as Dorothy, Countess of Westland, or possibly Mary II in the 1954 Catalogue of the Boughton Collection, no.110.

Murdoch, (1992), p.34. Footnote 15 quotes “Examination of the witnesses before Thomas Pitt on behalf of Ralph, Earl of Montagu, Cha. St. Dennis of St. Evremont and other Creditors of the said Duchess of Mazarine”, mss at Boughton. The “other creditors” included the upholsterer Francis Lapiere. Haile, (1905), p.335 records that even during her exile Mary of Modena tried to act as mediator between Duchess Mazarin and her husband Armand-Charles, Duke Mazarin, in the hope that Hortense Mancini would return to France, but she remained in England Stuart Papers, Windsor, 14 August, 1698).


The Golden Legend, edited F.S. Ellis, 3 vols., 1892 (Temple Classics, 1900). Sources for this medieval manual of ecclesiastical lore, lives of saints, homilies for saints’ days etc, included the Latin Legenda Aurea by Jacobus de Voragine (1230-98), a Dominican friar and Archbishop of Genoa.


Campana di Cavelli, (1871), vol I, p.276 and p.309.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 4


258 ibid., p.143.


“I’ll begin with one sufficiently ridiculous, which is, our citizens are making of the Pope’s effigies and martyring him with great ceremony on every occasion of a bonfire, and, though often done before, yet at the Duchess’ arrival they did the same again, and it so pleases the vulgar that many country people come up purely out of curiosity to see a Pope, inquiring wherabouts lives a Popemaker, with such zeal that one would guess they would bind their children apprentices to the trade, and the foolery, it is said, has reached as far as Scotland, and made them half mad too ...”.


265 George, ibid., p.51.

266 Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, vol 38, 1673-1675, ed. Allen B. Hinds, (London, 1940), Dec.8, 1673 item 250, p.182.


269 Marston, Kyd, Chapman and Webster, Thomas Middleton and William Rowley all use the Machiavel character type, while Ben Johnson in Volpone mocks the type.

270 Gentillet, ibid., p.477.
271 Protestant immigrants were still subject to property and commercial restrictions unless they became naturalized by joining the Church of England (Act of 1609) or by applying as individuals to Parliament for an expensive naturalisation act. Duffy, ibid., p.16.


275 Evelyn, ibid., p.200.

276 Mabbett, ibid.

277 In the marriage contract it was stipulated she should have all the liberty in the exercise of her religion as Catherine of Braganza which included a public chapel, although Charles II allowed her only a private one, since he did not publicly acknowledge the intensely unpopular marriage until September 1674.


281 Price, Curtis A., “Political allegory in late-seventeenth century English opera”, in Music and Theatre: Essays in honour of Winton Dean, edited Nigel Fortune, (Cambridge, 1987), p.1-29. The English edition is entitled: “Ariadne, or, The Marriage of Bacchus, an Opera or a Vocal Representation; First Compos’d by Monsieur P.P. Now put into Musick by Monsieur Grabut, Master of His Majesties Musick. And Acted by the Royal Academy of Musick, At the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. ... In the Savoy. Printed by Tho. Newcom in 1674. The purpose of this text, since it was sung in French was to help the English audience follow the action.


283 Banister wrote the music for the semi-opera Circe which was produced in 1677.

The quotation is recorded in Richard Grahame, Viscount Preston's letter to James dated 22 September 1683, quoted by W. J. Lawrence in *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies [First Series]*, (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1912), p.149, and the phrase itself is quoted from correspondence between Lord Preston, Ambassador to France, and Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland (*Report of the Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, vii, i, p.288 and p.290). The complete music survives. The first production was cut short when the theatres closed at the outbreak of Monmouth's Rebellion in June 1685, but there is no evidence that the work was an artistic failure. Reference to "Wise Italians", Prologue Line 24.


Dryden originally planned the first act of the opera as a French-style prologue to the semi-opera *King Arthur*, his next major musical work finally produced in 1691.

Preface to *Albion and Albanius* in *Works*, vol.15, ibid., pp.3-13, p.10 and pp.8 and 9.

Correspondence with other contemporary figures are General George Monck (Duke of Albemarle) is Archon and Catherine of Braganza is Acacia/Innocence. The pride of the Exclusionists, the Duke of Monmouth is the only major figure not represented; *The London Stage 1660-1880: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment*, Part 1: 1660-1700, edited William van Lennep, (Illinois, 1965) p.337.


Borgman, Albert S., *Thomas Shadwell*, (New York, 1969), pp.55-58. Borgman writes that Shadwell's character and actions were discussed in news sheets e.g. *The Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence*.


According to Gugliemo Codebò Secretary to the Regent of Modena, Duchess Laura who chronicled the journey, after Mary of Modena was met at Dover by James, Duke of York they spent three days there and three days travelling through Canterbury and Rochester to Gravesend where Charles II met them on December 6, 1673. They embarked for Whitehall Stairs in the royal barge to take them up the Thames. Their barge met the King's off Greenwich and they transferred to it.

"My heart is inditing" is the last anthem in the third and last of Purcell's autograph scores, BL Music library MS. R.M. 20.h.8 folios 55v-56r is devoted to music only by Purcell and mainly in his own hand rather than an assistant. The symphony to the coronation anthem (Z.30) "is the first of Purcell's anthem symphonies to combine in its second section the dance-like character which had been the norm in earlier anthems, with the fugal writing and extended sequential patterning which was becoming the norm in the ode." See Martin Adams, *Henry Purcell: the origins and development of his musical style*, (Cambridge U.P., 1995), p.43.

Sandford, Francis, *The History of the Coronation of the Most High, Most Mighty, and Most Excellent Monarch, James II...*, (London, 1687) (BL 604. i.19. plate between pages 92 and 93.)

Adams, ibid., p. 55.


Roger North at the “revolution” of 1688 left public life and legal practice, declined the oath to William III and Mary II and remained by conviction a Jacobite.

*Roger North on Music*, ibid., p. 51.

ibid.


PRO T27/ii, p. 314.


Price, ibid., p. 10.


ibid., p. 121. Also recorded in Historical Manuscripts Commission, 12th Report, Rutland mss. Part V, 1889, p. 77.


ibid., p. 5.
According to the “Newdigate Newsletter” the play was not *Venice Preserv’d* but D’Urfey’s *The Royalists* (J.H. Wilson “Theatre Notes for the Newdigate Newsletter”, TN, xv, (1961, p.80). *Venice Preserv’d* first performed February 9 1682 with its conflict of Senate and conspirators is bound up with the political crisis of 1678-1681. Like Dryden’s *The Kind Keeper*, Otway’s play is an attack on the Earl of Shaftesbury who in 1681 has publicly urged Charles II to legitimate Monmouth. The motivations of Otway’s two conspirators were based not on political principles, or even lack of principle, but only on personal principle stemming from the heroic code of honour; the conspiracy is however crushed and the Senate is saved.

According to an annotation by Narcissus Luttrell on his copy of Dryden’s *Prologue* the performance date was 31 May and he acquired his copy the next day 1 June. Published as a single folio half-sheet by Tonson.


ibid., p.36.

ibid, p.36.


Nathaniel Lee also expressed the same sentiments as Otway in *To the Duke on his return, In the Year 1682*, (Tonson’s “Miscellany”, Part I, 3rd ed., 1702), “Heaven eccho’s Come, but come not Sir alone/ Bring the bright pregnant Blessing of the Throne J... With the expected Prince that loads her Womb./ Joy of this Age and Heir of that to come."


Haile, ibid., p.95.

*Libertine Plays of the Restoration*, ibid., p.416.

ibid; The House of Este had formed the character of their original “seat” of Ferrara. With the founding of the University in the fourteenth century and their patronage of the poets Tasso and Ariosto in the sixteenth they were responsible for the intellectual culture of Ferrara. Janet Southorn in *Power and Display: The arts and their patrons in Modena and Ferrara*, (Cambridge, 1988), p.3 writes that “Poetry, music (upon which Alfonso II spent 14,000 scudi a year, only a little less than the 15,000 allotted to the diplomatic service) and the theatre flourished under their protection”. Painting had lagged behind, but towards the end of the sixteenth century there had been a succession of very “individual” painters dependent on the Court.

VERSE
Spoken before the
Duke and Duchess of YORK,
AND
Lady ANN,
In Oxford Theatre, May the 21st. 1683
By the Ld. S .... and Mr. C ...

Ld. S....
Great Sir,
When last your Royal Brother blest this Place,
And all about did his kind Beams dispense;
A Joy Divine was seen in ev'ry Face,
Till Faction drove our Guardian Angel hence.

Mr. C....

5 Heav'n well did know how much our Frame cou'd bear;
Mingling our Rapture with some fit allay;
And that, for future Bliss, we might prepare:
Wisely reserv'd the Blessing of this day.

To the Duke.

p.182

10 We long'd to see those Charms which him o'recame,

To the Dutchess

You, Madam, was our only Joy and Pride,

To the Lady Ann.

Who represented half the Stuarts Name.

Ld. S ....

Wou'd you then know how much you're welcome here?
Think what a Joy in Loyal Breasts did flow,

To Oxford (we hope) will not displease your view,
Where York first learn'd the Rudiments of War;
Those early Vertues here in Blossom grew,
Which now in growth, and full Perfection, are.

To the Lady Ann.
Tho' here new Towers and Buildings daily rise;
And Arms thrown off, we wear the peaceful Gown:
Our Breasts admit no change, know no disguise;
Prepar'd with Swords and Pens t'assert the Crown.

Ld. S ....
This is the place, in which the Sacred Names
Of Kings and Heroes annually resound;
The Triumphs, War and Peace, of Charles and James,
From Age to Age, are with fresh Lawrels Crown'd.

Mr. C ....
As when a Prince's long expected Birth,
Glads every Heart, and each Muse tunes her Voice:
Or when the Captive Monarchs of the Earth
Beg to be Slaves, and in Your Chains rejoyce.

Ld. S ....
But why, in lasie Numbers, do we bind
Our thoughts? which shou'd in active Raptures fly;
As the Coelestial Circles unconfin'd,
And tun'd to their Eternal Harmony.

Musick's the Dialect of happy Souls,
When sever'd from the Earth's unwieldy Load;
The Universal Language of both Poles,
Of the vast distant Natives understood.

Let Instruments and Voices both combine
To Celebrate the Glories of this Day;
Let Art and Extasies their Forces joyn,
And in melodious Paths of Errour stray.

Here they sate down, and Musick play'd;
which being ended, they stood up again,
and spoke by way of Pastoral.

Ld. S .... Damon.
Mr. C .... Thyris.

Ah? Thyris, how shall humble Swains,
As thou and I, perform such strains?
Can we a fitting Present make
For us to give, or These to take?

Thyris.
The Garland, Chloris made, I'll bring,
When I threw Strephon from the Ring:

Though it shou'd Caesar's Birth-day Crown,
Fresh Roses will for that be blown.

Damon.
I have a Lamb as white as Snow,
Though half engag'd to Pan by Vow:
I'll sacrifice it here, for He
Pan, or son e greater God must be.

Thyris.
Why dost thou talk of Sacrifice,
These seem no angry Deities.
Wou'd cruel Sylvia were here,
She'd learn to think her self less fair,

An, in a Noble mixture, find
Humility with Beauty jayn'd.
Damon.

Then may it please the Royal Three
T'accept one hearty Wish from me:
By all true Swains be Daphnis fear'd:
And no Whig-Wolves come nigh his Herd.
Both together.
Then Yearly Hecatombs we'll pay,
If every Spring bring such a May.


ibid., p.81.


Dryden Works, vol.12, ibid., p.83.


Zwicker, ibid., p.156.

Dryden, Works, vol.12, p.82.


Castiglione, Baldesar, The Book of the Courtier, translated George Bull, (Harmondsworth, 1967), pp.208-223. In this section Gaspara Pallavicino argues that women are a mistake of nature while Giuliano de'Medici gives examples of female achievement including Cleopatra, Artemisia and Isabella d'Este, and claims that women can understand as much as men.

The refectory is now in what is known as the Accademia of Santa Cecilia, Via Vittoria, Rome.


Royal Stuart Papers XL, Southorn, Janet, Mary of Modena Queen Consort of James II and VII, (Royal Stuart Society, 1992).

Gian Francesco Barbieri (1633-1715), called Guercino because he was "squint-eyed" i.e. guercino. According to Walpole, Horace, Anecdotes of Painting, ed. Dallaway and Wornum, 6 vols, (London, 1845) "He imitated his uncle's extravagantly dark shades, caught the roundness of
his flesh, but with a disagreeable lividness, and possessed at least as much grace and dignity”, pp.518-519.


353 Mary of Modena’s brother, Francesco II died two years after Gennari’s return, on September 6 1694 in Sassuolo near Modena. Her uncle Cardinal Rinaldo d’Este, England’s representative in Rome, returned to Modena became Duke Rinaldo II and married Charlotte Félicité of Brunswick – Lüneburg (Carlotta Felicità).

354 No.5 in Gennari’s London register, Andromeda Salvata da Perseo: “Questo quadro l’ebbe il sig. Duca di Yorch Fratello del re”, (Private Collection, Bologna, oil on canvas, 208cm x 145cm, (1674-75).

No.18 in the register, Il genio della Poesia: “Un quadro figura intiera d’una Poesia per il sig. Duca ai Yorch e sta colocata nella sala de suo appartamento a Windsor”, (Hampton Court, inv. 1325, oil on canvas, 226.1cm x 135.9cm, (1676).

No.19 in the register “Un quadro compagno del sudetto d’una Bersabea che ad una fonte sta bagnandosi mentre Davide dalla finestra in lontanza sta mirandola e questo pure il Duca di Yorch”.

355 Raccolta di memorie del pittore Benedetto Gennari, Bologna, Biblioteca Communale dell’Archiginnasio, Cartaceo, Segnat. antica 344. 
Nota autografa di Benedetto Gennari dei quadri eseguiti a Londra dal 1674 al 1688.


357 Royal Stuart Papers XL, Southorn, pp.4-5.

358 Bagni, no.17, p.148 and no.68, p.154.

359 Bagni, no.28, p.150 records Gennari’s entry as Un quadro d’una Madallena figura intiera che adolorata con un Crocifisso alla mano piangie i suoi falli e nella parte di sopra una glorietta d’angeli e cherubini e questo l’ebbe la signora Duchessa di Yorch havendolo posto nella sua camera da letto a Windsor.

360 Bagni, nos.81 and 82, p.155.


362 Bagni, no.82, p.155, in his entry no.90 Gennari records that he copied the de Sales again for a lady-in-waiting to the Duchess of Modena (“from one that I had done for the Chapel of the Duchess of York”), p.156.

363 Bagni no.83, p.156, “Un altro quadro della stessa grandezza con dentro San Francesco Saverio e questi stam colocati nella medesima capella l’una a man destia del quadro grande e l’altro alla sinistra”.

365 Bagni, no.103, p.158; possibly intended for the high altar because of its size, 242 x 190cm; this found its way into the Earl of Pembroke's collection (1656-1732) at Wilton House, Wiltshire after its removal from the Queen's Chapel. It then went to Cardinal Joseph Fesch (1763-1839), afterwards Cardinal to Napoleon. Fesch took it to Rome – Fesch Collection inventory number 852-1-75.

366 Bagni, no.114, pp.158-159.

367 Bagni, no.118, p.159, i.e. "Un quadro figura intiera d’un San Giacomo ...".

368 Described by Gennari as "Un altro quadretto d'una Vergine compagno del sudetto per la medesima sagrestia". Measured only 59 x 45.5cm and sold at Sothebys, lot 85, December 6 1972.


371 The portrait Hortense Mancini, Duchess of Mazarin, c.1684, oil on canvas 90 x 70 ins, (228.6 x 177.8cm) by Benedetto Gennari is now in a private collection. It is a huge full length portrait, the sitter as Diana seated by a fountain in a white gown and blue robes, surrounded by hounds and slaves.

The portrait Lady Elizabeth Felton (née Howard) as Cleopatra, was painted by Gennari for James, Duke of Monmouth, c.1679-80, oil on canvas, 49¼ x 40½ ins., (123 x 101cm) now National Trust, (Kingston Lacy, Bankes Collection).

372 Miller, Dwight C., ibid., p.28.


377 Zanotti, ibid., p.174.

378 MacLeod, Catharine and Julia Maciari Alexander, Painted Ladies: Women at the Court of Charles II, (National Portrait Gallery, London, 2001), p.161. The versions primarily differ in the arrangement of the flowers to her right, or their substitution by a bronze statue, a plain rather than embroidered gown with lace sleeves.


381 Haile, ibid., p.106.


385 Although in *Painted Ladies* ibid, p.161 it is stated that the portrait's provenance is unknown, this portrait was photographed by the Ministry of Works 6/3/58 photo no.Y1332/1, collection of Ministry of Works, lent by Col H.J. Sutherland, with its location stated as Holy See-Rome. It was then sold at Sothebys 23/11/1977, lot 43. Before that it was in the St. Maur Sale, Christies July 10, 1925 and was bought by Leggatt, London for 150 guineas in 1927.


388 This pose type was used by Gascar for a portrait of Louise de Kéroualle with her son the 1st Duke of Richmond c.1675 (Brudenell Collection, Deene Park), and in a double portrait of Lady Anne Barrington and her sister, Lady Mary St. John (Private Collection).


390 My discussions with Kate Mitchell (Registrar, National Trust for Scotland) were inconclusive. Although traditionally this is by Netscher, in the List of Photographs taken at The Binns in December 1953 negative B/1503 it is listed under “artist unknown”.

391 Records in the Witt Photographic Archive, Courtauld Collection.

392 Isabella, Duchess of Parma, 1635-1666 was Mary of Modena’s father’s sister. She married in 1664 Ranunzio II, Duke of Parma. Another Isabella in the family was Isabella of Savoy, Mary of Modena’s great grandmother who married 1608 Alfonso III son of Cesare Duke of Ferrara 1597 and Duke of Modena 1597-1628.


NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

Edward Gregg in his biography of Anne, *Queen Anne*, (New Haven and London, new ed. 2001), p.11 based on the Blenheim Papers now in the British Library (Add. Mss 61, 101-61, 710 and Add. Ch. 76, 069-76, 142), writes that Mary and Anne's education stressed "domestic accomplishments to the exclusion of almost all literary endeavour: sewing, embroidery, and other domestic skills ..., little more than a smattering of history, geography, or constitutional and legal training. Neither ... ever fully came to grips with the grammatical intricacies of the English language — Although they could sometimes be extremely eloquent in writing, usually their sentences were less than grammatical and their spelling remained phonetic and uncertain ...". 

Anne Kingsmill was born in 1661. From royalist landed families on both sides, she was orphaned young and brought up by her grandmother and then her uncle in Northamptonshire. Met and married Heneage Finch at court who served the Yorks; he was arrested in 1690 when attempting to join James II in exile. Tried for treason but acquitted.

The Maids of Honour were Catherine Fraser, Anne Killigrew, Anne Kingsmill, Catharine Sedley, Frances Walsingham and Catherine Walters, according to Myra Reynolds (1903), see note 401. In BL Add. MSS 18958 and 38863 the establishments of the households of the Duke and Duchess of York between 1678-1684 confirm Anne Kingsmill as Maid of Honour between 1682-1694, but Anne Killigrew is not mentioned. Killigrew's *Poems* (1686) reflect court life and the claim that she was a Maid of Honour appears to derive from this; the introduction to the facsimile edition p. VI claims she "joined the household of the doleful Mary of Modena ...". I owe this point to Frances Harris (British Library: Modern Historical Manuscripts).


The pieces were: "Tho' we, of small Proportion see ...", "Then, by some Fountains flow'ry side" (Part of the Description of the Golden Age), and three pieces from the First Act of *Aminta*: Daphne's Answer to Sylvia and Amintor being ask'd by Thirsis who is the object of his Love?, and Thirsis persuades Amintor not to despair, pp.187-200, in, *Miscellany Poems, on Several Occasions. Written by a Lady.* (London, 1713).


*Poems (1686) by Mrs Anne Killigrew: A Facsimile Reproduction with an Introduction by Richard Morton*, (Gainesville, Florida, 1967). Killigrew is not listed in the account books of the Lord Chamberlain, so was not paid as a maid of honour; see also Frances Harris, ""The Honourable Sisterhood": Queen Anne's Maids of Honour", *British Library Journal*, 19:2, (1993), pp.181-198.

Dryden, John, “To the Pious Memory of the Accomplihsht Young Lady Mrs Anne Killigrew, Excellant in the two Sister-Arts of Poésie, and Painting”, in *Poems (1686)*, ibid.


Stanza 9, ibid.
409 BL Add. Mss. 23070.

410 Poems, (1686), ibid. pp.27-29.


412 Lionel Cust in Burlington Magazine, XXVIII, December 1915, p.112 wrote that while it had "been attributed for long to Sir Peter Lely" the style of painting did not suggest it.

413 The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, (2004) states that she was buried in the chancel of St John the Baptist's Chapel in the Savoy (entry in register) on 15 June 1685 while according to the copy of the inscription on her monument (destroyed by fire) she died only on 16 June 1685.

414 Carol Barash (1999) rather absurdly suggests that these figures on the urn are symbolic of the sexual aggression and the conflicting roles for women at court: "everything from the queen's symbolic power to the physical danger of ongoing sexual intrigues", p.159.

415 Poems, (1686), Stanza 7.


418 Barash, ibid, p.159.

419 This painting was sold (The Hague), 13 August 1764, lot 2 bought by Theodati. Oil on canvas, 97 x 129 cm (38¼ x 50¼ ins), signed in the left foreground JB [in monogram] oth, National Gallery, London (Richard Simmons Bequest 1847).


421 ibid., p.212.

422 ibid, p.214.

423 ibid., p.208.

424 ibid., p.231.

425 ibid., p.xiii.

426 Winchilsea/Reynolds (1903), p.xxiv.


428 Poems (1686), pp.28-29.

429 Winchilsea/Reynolds (1903), p.xxiv.

and London, 1998), p.80. She also refers to him in her Preface, the poems “All is Vanity” (lines 190-194) and “Ardelia’s Answer to Ephelia” (line 74).


432 Lines 29-31, ibid.


434 Winchilsea/Reynolds (1903), pp.81-84, Line 7.


436 ibid, pp.68-77, lines 158-167.

437 Barash, ibid., p.282.

438 Winchilsea/Reynolds (1903), pp.18-19.


441 ibid., pp.13-14, Lines 8-17.

442 Barash, ibid., p.32.

443 ibid., p.32.


445 ibid., p.21.

446 ibid., pp.18-19.

447 Barash, ibid., p.150.

448 Winchilsea/Reynolds (1903), pp.7-8.

449 Poems, (1686), pp.44-47.

450 ibid., p.47. Cassandra, the prophet was punished for refusing Apollo’s advances by never being believed.

451 Poems, (1686), Stanza 5.


Ibid., p.427.


Woolf, Virginia, A Room of One’s Own, (Harmondworth, 1928/1974), p.64. Woolf is here in Chapter 4 referring to, among others, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, Dorothy Osborne and Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea with whom she opens the chapter.


Bellamora in The Adventure of the Black Lady could be “black” in the seventeenth-century meaning of the term that she had dark eyes and black hair, but “Bellamora” could be a beautiful Moor or a beautiful love. Whatever Behn’s intention she was an outsider in that she was unmarried, pregnant and therefore different.

Hélène Cixous text “Where is she?” is from “Sorties” in La jeune née (Union Générale d’Editions, 10/18, 1975); in this extract she suggests ways of deconstructing classical and philosophical analytic thought e.g. she writes that “In philosophy, woman is always on the side of passivity”; Behn, Aphra, Oroonoko and Other Writings, edited Paul Salzman, (Oxford, 1994), p.11.

The debate appears to have been ignited by Ernest Bernbaum with “Mrs Behn’s Biography a Fiction”, PMLA, xxviii, (1913). This was continued through the twentieth century by for e.g. Wylie Sypher, “A Note on the Realism of Mrs Behn’s Oroonoko, MLQ, 3, (1942); J.A. Ramsaran, Oroonoko: A Study of the Factual Elements”, Notes and Queries, 205 (1960); Katherine M. Rogers “Fact and Fiction in Aphra Behn’s Oroonoko”, Studies in the Novel, 20, (1988), etc. etc.

A Pindaric Poem on the Happy Coronation of His Most Sacred Majesty James II and His Illustrious Consort Queen Mary, (London 1685); Congratulatory Poem to Her Most Sacred Majesty, on the Universal Hopes of All Loyal Persons for a Prince of Wales,(London, 1688). A Congratulatory Poem to the King’s Most Sacred Majesty, On the Happy Birth of the Prince of Wales, (London, 1688).
Oroonoko was listed in the Term Catalogues for July 1688 along with Behn's novels The Fair Jilt and Agnes de Castro; The Term Catalogues, edited Edward Arber, (London, 1905), vol.II, p.230. In her dedication of Oroonoko "To The Right Honourable, The Lord Maitland" she apologizes for her haste in writing the work: "'Twill be no commendation to the book to assure your Lordship I writ it in a few hours, ... I never rested my pen a moment for thought". Richard Maitland (1653-1695) was a supporter of the Stuarts, a Jacobite who declined to agree with the revolutionary settlement and went into exile. He was a recent convert to Catholicism. A copy of Oroonoko in the Bodleian Library is said to be the only one which has a passage confirming Behn's Catholicism: "where is it amongst all our Nobility we shall find so great a Champion for the Catholick Church?" A5v (Bodleian Library Vet. A.3.f.726), and quoted in Mary Ann O'Donnell, Aphra Behn: A Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources, 2nd ed., (Aldershot, 2004), p.130. In the Oxford English Dictionary examples are given, e.g. 1679 PENN Addr. Prot.II, vi, (1692) 126 Caeser, by which Word I understand the Civil Government engrosseth All. Todd, Janet M., The Secret Life of Aphra Behn, (London, 1996), pp.419-422.


Bosman, Willem, Description of the Coast of Guinea & c, done into Eng.,, 2nd ed., 1721 originally published Utrecht, 1704; first translated 1705.


The "pindaric" mode was a form of public praise popularized by Abraham Cowley in the late 1650s; his Pindaric Odes were published in 1656. The Pindaric ode was used for funerals, marriages, military victories and, in the English form of the Greek poet Pindar's odes, they were suitable for honouring the accomplishments of monarchs, aristocrats, generals and other poets presented as powerful individuals and symbols of national strength.

The Picture List in the Heinz Archive, National Portrait Gallery, from Painters' Hall was annotated by C.K. Adams former director of the NPG on 9 February 1938, which demonstrates that the query about the identity of the painter of the portrait listed as Number 54 has been running for some time: the identity was listed as "unknown", Lely, Kneller and now Greenhill. The List was taken from A Catalogue of the Pictures, Prints, Drawings etc. in the Possession of the Worshipful Company of Painter-Stainers at Painters Hall, (London, 1908).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

The work was a joint study by Agnes Strickland and her sister Elizabeth, but since it was published between the years 1840-1848 when women were still wary of putting their names into the public domain, Elizabeth refused to put her name in print so that the work was published under the name of Agnes Strickland only.


Strickland cites the personal influence of Mary of Modena on Louis XIV, the dauphin and the duke of Burgundy "that led to the infraction of the peace of Ryswick by the courts of France and Spain, through their recognition of her son's claims to an empty title", ibid. p.17.

ibid., p.xviii.


Scipio (Cornelius Scipio Africanus) was a great Roman statesman, and the conqueror of Hannibal. He was admired by Petrarch throughout his life, and Petrarch used him as the subject of Africa his Latin epic.

Sonnet 186, Lines 9-14, translated Robert Durling, ibid.

A protracted war between Padua and Venice, in which mercenary Turkish troops were involved, still raged not far from the town of Arquà where Petrarch lived. Even towards the end of his life he made diplomatic journeys to restore peace, and when he could no longer travel he sent advice by courier.


Simone Martini was called to serve the papal court in Avignon in 1339 by Pope Benedict XII. He illuminated a miniature portrait of Laura which Petrarch praises in Sonnet 77. Petrarch, Francesco, Petrarch: the Canzoniere or Rerum vulgarium fragmenta., trans. Mark Musa, (Bloomington, 1996).

James I (VI) and Anne of Denmark, the first coronation of a King of the Scots and the English, took place on 25 July 1603 in Westminster Abbey in a ceremony performed by John Whitgift.


Evelyn, ibid.


Sandford, Francis, *The History of the Coronation of the Most High, Most Mighty, and Most Excellent Monarch James II ... And of His Royal Consort Queen Mary: solemnized in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter in the City of Westminster, on Thursday the 23 of April, being the Festival of St. George, in the Year of Our Lord 1685. With an Exact Account of the Several Preparations in Order thereunto, Their Majesties most Splendid Procession, and Their Royal and Magnificent Feast in Westminster-Hall. The Whole Work Illustrated with Sculptures.* (In the Savoy: Printed by Thomas Newcomb, 1687), p.40, p.21.

The first and second crowns together with the rod and sceptre are in the Tower of London. The circlet/diadem is unaltered but the second with which she was crowned is enriched with parts of the third as the 2 were amalgamated for Mary of Modena's usurping step-daughter Mary of Orange, who at her own coronation required a crown equal to that of her husband as she was Queen Regnant. It is a small crown to be worn on top of the head.


*History of Huntingdon* by R.C. (R. Carruthers), (Huntingdon, 1824). This is a typescript extract lodged in the Notes on Collections section of the National Portrait Gallery, Heinz Archive. The original copy was lent by P.G.M. Dickinson in 1955.

In 1688 he abandoned James II at the revolution to join William of Orange, although he voted in parliament against the idea that James had abdicated, and voted for a regency rather than offering the crown to William and Mary.


Canzone 366, Line 46, translated Mark Musa, ibid., pp.510-517.

Cats, Jacob, *Houwelyck. Dat is de gansche gelegentheyt des echten staets*, (Middelburg, 1625).


Sandford, ibid.

"My Heart is Inditing" is termed a "symphony anthem" because it begins with a symphony.

20 boys made up from 8 boys from Westminster and 12 children from the Chapel Royal; the 48 men were 16 from Westminster and 32 from the Chapel Royal.


Sandford, ibid.


ibid., III, i, Lines 219-225, p.51.


Count Francesco Terresi was Tuscan envoy to London. Reports of proceedings are in Marchesa Campana di Cavelli, Les Derniers Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 2 vols, (1871), vol.2, pp.68-72.


The other two were 1686: "Ye tuneful Muses" and 1687: "Sound the trumpet, beat the drum". Purcell's first ode made a, literally, fresh start for instead of opening with a symphony it starts with a solo number to seize the attention of the audience.

Evelyn, ibid., entry for 15 October, 1685, p.294.

Purcell used this well-tried formula in many odes, including "Britain, thou now art great", with a ground bass, an alto solo and string ritornello.

Luttrell, Narcissus, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714, 6 vols., (Oxford, 1857), Vol.1, 1678-1689, p.359.

The English St. Cecilia celebrations are first documented in 1683; Purcell's "Welcome to all the pleasures" was published in a score by John Playford in 1684 as A Musical Entertainment Perform'd on November XXII – 1683, and his Latin ode "Laudate Ceciliam" is headed "A Latine Song made upon St. Cecilia, whos day is comm[em]erated yearly by all Musitians, made in the year 1683". Holman, ibid, p.425.

Holman ibid., p.426.


Haile, ibid., 14 September 1685.
Evelyn, ibid., entry for 19 January 1686.

Burnet, Gilbert, *Bishop Burnet’s History of his Own Time, from the Restoration of King Charles II ...*, 4 vols., (London, 1818), vol.II, pp.305-306. The King’s priests were led by Bonaventure Gifford.


Luttrell, ibid., entry for November 1686, p.386.

Evelyn, ibid., entry for March 2 1687, p.304.

Other notable “converts” in the poem were James Cecil (1666-93) 4th Earl of Salisbury (converted while on a diplomatic mission to Rome for James and became public April 1687); Robert Spencer (1640-1702) 2nd Earl of Sunderland; Sir Edward Hales (d.1695), titular Earl of Tenterden; John Drummond, Earl of Melfort (converted February, 1686) and James Drummond, Earl of Perth (converted autumn, 1685).


Published in February 1688, in, POAS, ibid., pp.191-214.


Evelyn, ibid., entry for 30 May, 1662, p.128.
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When pregnant with James Francis Edward, aged 29 she had been married nearly half her life and pregnant 9 times, not an unusual history for a seventeenth-century woman. She had miscarriages in May 1674, May 1675, October 1675, October 1683 and May 1684. Catherine Laura (1675), Charles (1677), and Charlotte (1682) all died in their first year, while Isabella born 1676 survived until 1681. The gap between the pregnancies 1677-1682 was during James’s affair when Duke of York, with Catherine Sedley; according to the manuscripts of Sir H. Verney, Bart, 7th Report of
the RCHM (1879) p.434 Kneller made the portrait of James Francis Edward when he was eleven days old.

550 Bishop Ken (Bath and Wells), White (Peterborough), Turner (Ely), Lloyd (St. Asaph), Trelawney (Bristol), and Lake (Chichester).

551 It was felt that James II was by implication asking the clergy of the Church of England to be "accomplices in the destruction of their Church". (Turner, F.C., James II, (London, 1948), p.396; the 1687 declaration of indulgence appears to provide an unambiguous statement of James II's attitude to toleration, i.e. that all citizens should be able to worship however and wherever they like. The Declaration of Indulgence, 1687 is reprinted in English Historical Documents Vol.6, 1660-1714, edited Andrew Browning, (London, 1996), pp.395-397, and the Declaration of Indulgence, 1688 is also in this volume pp.399-400.

552 POAS: 4, ibid., pp.220-222.


554 Bod. MS. Firth c.16 Astrea's Booke for Songs & Satyrs, 1686 [corr.] 1688, an anthology with late additions dating from 1738; formerly in the collection of William Busby, later in that of Sir Charles Firth, p.259.


561 Evelyn, John, Diary, edited Guy de la Bédoyère, (Woodbridge, 1995), p.308. The royal proclamation was authorized at a Privy Council meeting, Whitehall, 23 December 1687 (PRO Privy Council [Register] 2/72, pp.560, 564). It appointed a period of prayer and public thanksgiving and came out in the new year (R. Steele, A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns, (Oxford, 1910), p.466). A Form or Order of Thanksgiving, and Prayer ... was issued to be used in London on Sunday 15 January and two weeks later in the rest of the country. [A Form, or Order of Thanksgiving, and Prayer ... in Behay'of the King, the Queen, and the Royal Family, upon Occasion of the Queen's being with Child. (London, Printed by Charles Bill, Henry Hills, and Thomas Newcomb, Printers to the King's most Excellent Majesty, 1687)].

562 Burnet, Gilbert, History of His Own Time, edited J.M. Routh, 6 vols., (Oxford, 1833), vol.III, p.241. Whig hagiography calls the seven religious and political appealers for help the "Immortal Seven"; they were the Earl of Danby, the Earl of Devonshire, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Lumley, Bishop Compton, Edward Russell and Henry Sidney. See Calendar of State Papers,
563 Burnet, Ill, pp.246-263.


566 The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne, edited Beatrice Curtis Brown, London, 1935), p.34; Sir John Dalrymple, Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland ..., new edition, 3 vols., (Edinburgh, 1790), vol.2, pp.167-184 prints Anne's letters to her sister, and includes the questions sent by Mary of Orange on 21 July 1688 about the birth to Anne, and Anne's answers (pp.177-184).

567 ibid., p.31; PRO31/3/165 Bonrepaux to Seignelay 28 March 1686 NS reported that it was widely known that Anne hated Mary of Modena and denigrated her when talking to confidantes.

568 ibid., p.35.

569 The Revolution of 1688-1689: changing perspectives, edited Lois G. Schwoerer, (Cambridge, 1992), p.77; Great Britain's Just Complaint, (London, 1692), p.21, [James Montgomery]; Edward Gregg, Queen Anne, (London, 1984), pp.53-58; Gregg's conclusion was used by Lois G. Schwoerer in her article "Women and the Glorious Revolution", Albion, vol.18, no.2, (Summer, 1986) pp.195-218, where she writes that "with great skill Anne employed gossip and rumor (sic), the only weapons available to her to discredit her father and step-brother. So successful was her strategy that the rumor (sic) was picked up by others during the summer of 1688 and developed into a full scale press campaign of demonstrable effectiveness". (p.211); Howard Nenner, "The Traces of Shame in England's Glorious Revolution", History, vol.73, no.238, (June, 1988), pp.238-247, p.245.

570 "The Female Parricide" (1689). POAS:5; ibid., p.157.


572 King Lear, edited Harold Bloom, (New York, 1992), pp.21-24. Shakespeare, rather than Tate radically altered and reworked the story of King Lear since in The True Chronicle Historie (probably 1594) Lear and Cordelia are reunited and reclaim their kingdom. The first production of Shakespeare's version since Tate's held sway was at Covent Garden 25 January 1838 produced by William Charles Macready.


574 Browning, Andrew, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds, 1632-1712, 3 vols., (Glasgow, 1944-51), vol.II, Letters, p.120. This is reprinted in Dalrymple, pp.92-93, but dated 27 March 1688.

575 With Charles II's death power returned to James II's "in-laws", the Clarendons, the Protestant first marriage faction. But this faction became increasingly threatened by the Catholic second marriage faction. The leaders of this were Sunderland an admitted partisan of France and inclined to
Catholicism, the Secretary of State; Godolphin who was Mary of Modena's Chamberlain, and Lord Chief Justice Jeffreys who assumed some of the political functions of the Lord Chancellor.


579 ibid., number 85; John Baber's poem was *To the King upon the Queen's Being Deliver'd of a Son*, (1688).


581 Wood, ibid., pp.264-5, entry Sunday 10 June 1688.

582 Reresby, ibid., p.502.


586 *POAS*: 4, ibid., pp.256-257.


588 John Evelyn records the name as Cooper in *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 vols (Oxford, 1955), vol.IV, p.597; *The Ellis Correspondence: Letters Written During the Years 1686, 1687, 1688 and addressed to John Ellis Esq.*, edited George Agar Ellis, 2 vols., (London, 1829), vol.II, p.32, p.98, p.99, p.105, p.107, p.108, pp.114-115; the Catholic midwife who had allegedly brought the child and the warming pan into Mary of Modena's presence was called Elizabeth Cellier. She too fled to France but shortly after returned to England and obscurity.

589 *POAS*:4, ibid., pp.257-259.

590 *Depositions made in council on Monday 22 October 1688, concerning the birth of the Prince of Wales*; in his unpublished Ph.D thesis *The Impact of King James II on the Departments of the Royal Household*, (Cambridge, 1993) p.174, Andrew Barclay discusses the senior members of the royal household who would have known that the baby was not spurious, and who were on duty at the birth and subsequently confirmed the official version.

591 William of Orange and 15,000 troops sailed for England on 28 October 1688 and landed at Torbay on 5 November. *The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, by the Grace of God Prince of Orange, Etc of the Reasons Inducing him to Appear in Armes in the Kingdom of England for Preserving the Protestant Religion and for Restoring the Lawes and Liberties of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. (The Hague, Arnout Leers, 1688). Dated 30 September 1688, but was
printed with a postscript 24 October 1688. Thomas Osborne, 1st Earl of Danby had written the first draft of what was to become William’s “Declaration”. It was redrafted by William’s spokesman Grand Pensionary Caspar Fagel, William’s envoy Everard van Weede van Dijkvelt and William’s closest friend and confidant Hans Willem Bentinck (Earl of Portland); the first version was ready on 10 October.

A number of poems and satires from this period are also in the BM. MSS Harl. 7319 pp.608-761, (ff. 305*-82*).


ibid., pp.31-36.

POAS:4, ibid., pp.330-333. Mary of Modena was called the Pope’s eldest daughter when she first came to England; she was, in fact, the niece of Cardinal Rinaldo d’Este.


The Abdicated Prince; or, The Adventures of Four Years. A Tragi-Comedy, As it was Lately Acted at the Court at Alba Regalis. (London, Printed for John Carterson, 1690).

BM. Add. MSS 34195, (ff.100-102) [Anonymous Newsletter], n.d. but Summer 1690(?) (Account of Queen Mary’s [II] Activities Summer of 1690).


The Late Revolution; or, The Happy Change. A Tragi-Comedy, as it was Acted throughout the English Dominions In the Year 1688. Written by a Person of Quality. (London, Printed, and are to be Sold by Richard Baldwin in the Old Baily. 1690). This was entered in the Term Catalogues May 1690 and announced in the London Gazette 24-28 April 1690.


POAS: 5, ibid., pp.76-82.

Reresby, ibid., p.536.
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*Stuart Papers*, edited Falconer Madan, 2 vols., (Roxburghe Club, 1889), vol.II.


*Letters of Madame de Sévigné to her Daughter and her Friends*, Selected Richard Aldington, 3 vols., (London, 1927), vol.II, Letter CLXXVI, December 24, 1688, p.132; M. de Lauzun was Comte de Antonin Nompar de Caumont Lauzun, who had arrived in London in October and offered his services to James II.


ibid., Letter CLXXX, January 17, 1689, pp.142-143.


ibid., p.305, line 69.

ibid., p.xxviii.

"To His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, on His birth day 1689: or 99: The author having presented him a Calvary set in a vinyard", ibid., p.292-294; *A Collection of Poems Refering to the times, since the Kings accession to the Crown*, British Library Add. MS21, 621.


"To Her Majesty the Queen, on the Kings going to Callis this carnival 1696", *The Galesia Trilogy and Selected Manuscript Poems*, ed. Wilson, pp.295-297, lines 41-43.

ibid., lines 47-56.

With an eye to patronage she praised only James II's daughter in "A Congratulatory Poem to her Sacred Majesty Queen Mary, upon her Arrival in England", (1689); Behn, Aphra, *Selected Poems*, ed. Malcolm Hicks, (Manchester, 1993), pp.91-95.
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Opening line of the prologue to Amphitryon (1690).

Written for a revival of John Fletcher’s The Pilgrim (1621) revised by Sir John Vanbrugh: **Within this month there will be played for my profit, an old play of Fletchers, call'd the Pilgrim, corrected by my good friend Mr Vanbrook; to which I have added A New Masque, & am to write a New Prologue & Epilogue**. The Letters of John Dryden, ed. Charles E. Ward, (Durham, 1942), p.136 Letter 11 April 1700 to his cousin Mrs Steward. Dryden died on 1 May.


Francesco Riva, Benedetto Gennari’s brother’s brother-in-law had accompanied him to England in the reign of Charles II and on James II’s accession had been appointed Wardrobe Keeper. He produced two accounts of her flight; one in French in the Imperial Archives Paris/Chaillot and one in Italian in the Este Archives/Modena. Marchesa Emily Campana di Cavelli’s Les Derniers Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye 2 vols., (1871), vol II, pp.370-372 prints the French translation.

Taken from the transcript of manuscript Ms.B.344, in Biblioteca Comunale dell’ Archiginnasio, Bologna: Raccolta di Memorie di Benedetto Gennari; no.8.

Elisabeth Charlotte, Duchesse d’Orléans (1652-1722), known in Germany as Liselotte von der Pfalz and in France as “Madame” or La Palatine, married at 19 “Monsieur”, (Philippe d’Orléans), Louis XIV’s only brother. She spent 50 years at the French court and wrote c.40 letters a week.


Largillierre painted a portrait bust that was engraved by Pierre van Schuppen in 1692 and by Gerard Edelinck in 1692 (Sortais, Da 58 vol III); Antony Griffiths, The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689, (London, 1998).


The compositional sketches are in the Louvre département des Arts graphiques, Inv. nos. 31 020, 31 021, and 31 022. Referred to in La cour des Stuarts à Saint-Germain-en-Laye au temps de Louis XIV. 13 février – 27 avril 1992 (1992), p.111. The Modello is in the Royal Collection, Windsor and the large painting in a private collection. Martin Haile (1905) in an appendix, p.514 writes that a “portrait of Mary Beatrice by Mignard”, is recorded in the Inventory dated 14 November 1790 “Tableux et objets précieux du monastère de Sainte-Marie de Chaillot” at the suppression of the religious orders. This could be the same portrait; the date would therefore be c.1694.
Madame de Sévigné, “Madame” and the Duc de St. Simon had plenty to say on this score; Mark Kishlansky, A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714, (Harmondsworth, 1997), p.267.
ibid.
Letters from Liselotte, p.71, (Letter 11 December, 1695).
Corp, (2001), p.34.
Strickland, Agnes, Lives of the Queens of England from the Norman Conquest with Anecdotes of their Courts; vol.9, (1846), p.332.
She was acclaimed by Turgot, Bishop of St. Andrews (d. 1115) for making “the king himself very readily inclined to words of justice, mercy, alms and other virtues”. It was said that she fed 9 orphans every morning and provided food from the royal household for 300 poor.
John Callow, King in Exile, (Stroud, 2004), p.310, writes that after 1709 she began to fall behind with the rent, but had previously made gifts of plate, vestments and religious sculptures as well as paintings; Stuart Papers (1889), vol.II, pp.505-510.
ibid. pp.514-535.
Dixon, Graham, “Purcell’s Italianate Circle”, The Purcell Companion, ed., Michael Burden, (London, 1995), pp.46-47. Fede had been both in the papal choir and had sung in the Accademia di Musica commissioned by Queen Christina of Sweden for the Roman celebration of the accession of James II.
Stuart Papers, ibid., vol.II, p.441.
ibid., vol.VI, pp.413, 416-420.
Haile, (1905), pp.452.

ibid.


APPENDIX A (TO CHAPTER 1)

ANNE HYDE'S PAPER ON CATHOLICISM WRITTEN AUGUST 1670

REPRINTED IN:


"As to the state of Religion, it has already appeared, that the dangers of Popery were visible to all who had their Eyes open. And it did not a little contribute to the common Fears and Jealousie, that the Dutchess (sic) of York, who had been bred and had long lived a firm and zealous Member of the Church of England, was in the time of her Weakness and Sickness importun’d and over-power’d to declare herself a Roman Catholick; and she had some time before betray’d her Inclinations, had left this Copy of a Paper written by her some few Months before her Death.

"It is so reasonable to expect, that a Person always bred up in the Church of England, and as well instructed in the Doctrine of it (as the best Divines and her Capacity could make her) should be liable to many Censures for leaving that, and making herself a Member of the Roman Catholic Church, to which I confess I was one of the greatest Enemies it ever had; That I rather chose to satisfy my Friends by reading this Paper, than to have the
trouble to answer all the Questions that may daily be asked me. And first, I do protest in
the presence of Almighty God, that no Person, Man or Woman, directly nor indirectly,
ever said any thing to me since I came into England, or used the least endeavour to make
change my Religion; It is a Blessing I wholly owe to Almighty God, and I hope the
hearing of a Prayer I daily made him, ever since I was in France and Flanders; where,
seeing much of the Devotion of the Catholicks, (tho' I had very little myself) I made it
my continual Request to Almighty God, that if I were not, I might before I died, be in the
ture Religion. I did not in the least doubt but that I was so, and never had any scruple till
November last, when reading a Book called *The History of the Reformation*, by Dr
Heylin, which I had heard very much commended, and have been told, if ever I had any
doubt of my Religion that would settle me: Instead of which I found it the description of
the horridest Sacrileges in the World, and could find no reason why we left the Church,
but for three the most abominable ones that were ever heard of among Christians. First,
Henry VIII renounced the Pope's Authority, because he would not give him leave to part
with his Wife, and marry another in her life-time. Secondly, Edward VI. was a Child,
and govern'd by his Uncle, who made his Estate out of Church Lands; and then Queen
Elizabeth, who being no lawful Heiress to the Crown, could have no way to keep it but
by renouncing a Church that could never suffer so unlawful a thing to be done by one of
her Children. I confess, I cannot think the Holy Ghost could ever be in such Councils;
And it is very strange, that if the Bishops had no design, but (as they say) the restoring us
to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, they could never think upon it till Henry VIII.
made the breach upon so unlawful a Pretence. These Scruples being rais'd, I began to
consider of the difference between the Catholicks and us, and examin'd them as well as I
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could by Holy Scripture, which, tho' I do not pretend to be able to understand, yet there are some things I found so easy, that I cannot but wonder I had been so long without finding them out: *As the real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, the Infallibility of the Church, Confession and Praying for the Dead.* After this I spoke severally to two of the Bishops we have in England, who both told me there were many things in the Romish Church which (it were very much to be wish'd) we had kept; as Confession, which was no doubt commanded by God: That praying for the Dead was one of the ancient things in Christianity: That for their parts, they did it daily, tho' they would not own it. And afterwards pressing one of them very much upon the other Points, he told me, *That if he had been bred a Catholick he would not change his Religion; but that being of another Church (wherin he was sure were all things necessary to Salvation) he thought it very ill to give that scandal, as to leave that Church wherin he received his Baptism.* All these Discourses did but add more to the desire I had to be a Catholick, and gave me the most terrible Agonies in the World within myself; for all this, fearing to be rash in a matter of that weight, I did all I could to satisfy my self, made it my daily Prayer to God, to settle me in the night, and so went on Christmas-day to receive in the King's Chapel: After which I was more troubled than ever, and could never be at quiet till I had told my Design to a Catholick, who brought a Priest to me, and that was the first I ever did converse with upon my Word. The more I spoke to him the more I was confirm'd in my Design: And as it is impossible for me to doubt of the Words of our Blessed Blessed Saviour, who says, *The Holy Sacrament is his Body and Blood,* so I cannot believe that he who is the Author of all Truth, and has promised to be with his Church to the end of
the World, would permit them to give that Holy Mystery to the Laity but in one Kind, if it were not lawful to do.

I am not able, or if I were, would I enter into Disputes with any Body: I only in short, say this for the changing of my Religion, which I take God to witness I would never have done if I had thought it possible to save my Soul otherwise. I think I need not say, it is any Interest in this World leads me to it: It will be plain enough to every Body, that I must lose all the Friends and Credit I have here by it; and have very well weigh’d which I could best part with, my share in this World or the next: I thank God I found no difficulty in the choice.

My only Prayer is That the poor Catholicks of this Nation may not suffer for my being of their Religion; that God would but give me Patience to bear them, and then send me any Afflictions in this world, so I may enjoy a blessed Eternity hereafter.

St. James’s Aug. 20. 1670.

This Paper seems to be written with as much Partiality and Prejudice as a new Convert would be taught to have ... etc. Her change of Religion must be imputed to the Zeal of his Royal Highness, who tho’d he did not yet openly profess that Religion, yet he was unhappily perverted to it in the Court of France: Where, upon the Artifices of his Royal Mother and her Confessor Mr. Mountague, his Brother King Charles wrote this memorable Letter to him ...
(i.e. the letter was from Cologne Nov. 10. 1654 which accused the Duke of York of being influenced by his mother and Mr Mountague to change his religion, but of course White Kennet in his turn charges the Duke of York with Anne’s decision to convert since at that time it was considered that women were unable to think for themselves.)
APPENDIX B (TO CHAPTER 2)

TO THE DUCHESS,

WHEN HE PRESENTED THIS BOOK TO HER ROYAL HIGHNESS

Madam! I here present you with the rage,
And with the beauties, of a former age;
Wishing you may with as great pleasure view
This, as we take in gazing upon you.
Thus we writ then: your brighter eyes inspire
A nobler flame, and raise our genius higher.
While we your wit and early knowledge fear,
To our productions we become severe;
Your matchless beauty gives our fancy wing,
Your judgement makes us careful how we sing.
Lines not composed, as heretofore, in haste,
Polished like marble, shall like marble last,
And make you through as many ages shine,
As Tasso has the heroes of your line.

Though other names our wary writers use,
You are the subject of the British muse;
Dilating mischief to yourself unknown,
Men write, and die, of wounds they dare not own.
So the bright sun burns all our grass away,
While it means nothing but to give us day.
Version B

Signior Dildo

You Ladies all of merry England
Who have been to kiss the Dutchess's Hand;
Pray, did you lately observe in the Show
A Noble Italian, call'd Signior Dildo?

2
This Signior was one of her Highness's Train,
And helpt to conduct her over the Main;
But now she cries out, to the Duke I will go,
I have no more need of Signior Dildo.

3
At the Sign of the Cross, in Saint James's Street,
When next you goe thither, to make your selves sweet,
By buying of Pouder, Gloves, Essence or so,
You may chance get a sight of Signior Dildo.

4
You'll take him at first for no person of Note,
Because he appears in a plain Leather Coat;
But when you his Virtuous Abilities know,
You'll fall down and worship Signior Dildo.

5

The Lady Southesk, Heav'ns prosper her for't!
First Cloath'd him in Satin, then sent him to Court;
But his Head in the Circle he scarcely durst show,
So modest a Youth was Signior Dildo.

6

My good Lady Suffolk, thinking no harm,
Had got this poor Stranger hid under her Arm;
Lady Betty by chance came the Secret to know,
And from her own Mother stole Seignior Dildo.

7

The Countess of Falmouth, of whom People tell
Her Footmen wear Shirts of a Guiny an Ell;
Might save the Expence, if she did but know
How Lusty a Swinger is Signior Dildo.
By the help of this Gallant, the Countess of Rafe,
Against the fierce Harrys, preserv'd her self safe;  B30
She stifled him almost beneath her Pillow,
So closely She embraced Signior Dildo.

Our dainty fine Dutchesses have got a Trick,
To doat on a Fool, for the sake of his Prick:
The Fops were undone, did their Graces but know  B35
The Discretion and Vigor of Signior Dildo.

That Pattern of Virtue, her Grace of Cleaveland,
Has swallow'd more Pricks, then the Ocean has sand;
But by Rubbing and Scrubbing, so large it does grow,
It is fit for just nothing but Signior Dildo.  B40

The Dutchess of Modena, thô she looks high,
With such a Gallant is contended to lye:
And, for fear the English her Secrets shou'd know
For a Gentleman-Usher took Signior Dildo.
The Countess o’th Cockpitt, who knows not her name?

She’s famous in Story for a killing Dame:

When all her old Lovers forsake her, I trow,

She’ll then be contented with her Doughty Dildo.

Red Howard, red Sheldon, and Temple so tall,

Complain of his absence so long from Whitehall:

Signior Bernard has promis’d a Journey to go,

And bring back his Countryman Signior Dildo.

Dol Howard no longer with his Higness must Range;

And therefore is proffer’d this Civil exchange;

Her Teeth being rotten, she smells best below,

And needs must be fittest for Signior Dildo.

Saint Albans, with Wrincles and Smiles in his Face,

Whose kindness to strangers becomes his High Place,

With his Coach and Six Horses is gone to Pergo,

To take the fresh Air with Signior Dildo.
Were this Seignior but known to the Citizen Fops,
He'd keep their fine Wives from their Foremen of Shops;
But the Rascalls deserve their Horns shou'd still grow,
For burning the Pope, and his Nephew *Dildo*. 
Tom Killigrew’s Wife, North Hollands fine Flower,
At the Sight of this Signior did Fart and Belch Sower,
And then her Dutch Breeding farther to Show
Says, Welcome to England myn Hier Van Dildo.

He civilly came to the Cockpit one Night,
And proffer’d his Service to fair Madam Knight:
Quoth She, I Intreague with Captain Cazzo,
Your Nose in mine Arse good Seignior Dildo.

This Signior is sound, safe, Ready, and Dumb,
As ever was Candle, Carret, or Thumb:
Then away with these nasty devices, and show
How you rate the just merits of Signior Dildo.

Count Cazzo, who carries his nose very high,
In Passion he swore his Rival shou’d dye:
Then shut up himself, to let the World know
Flesh and Blood cou’d not bear it from Signior Dildo.
21

A Rabble of Pricks, who were welcome before,
Now finding the Porter deny'd 'em the Door;
Mischeviously waited his coming below,
And Inhumanly fell upon Signior Dildo.

22

Nigh wearied out, the poor Stranger did fly,
And along the Pall-mall they follow'd full Cry:
The Women concern'd, from every Window,
Cry'd, Oh, for Heav'ns Sake, save Signior Dildo!

23

The good Lady Sands burst into a Laughter,
To see how the Bollox came wabling after;
And had not their weight retarded the Foe
Indeed, 't had gone hard with Signior Dildo.

Finis
Version A:

To the Tune of Pegg's gone to Sea with a Souldier

O! all yee young Ladyes of merry England,
That have been to kisse the Duchesse's hand,
I pray you, enquire, the next tyme you doe goe,
For a noble Italian call'd Seigneur Dildoe.

This Seigneur Dildoe was the chiefe of the Trayne,
That came, to conduct her safe over the Maine;
I could not in Conscience, but let you all know
The happy arrivall of Seigneur Dildoe.

Att the Signe of the Crosse in Saint James's Streete,
When next you endeavour, to make your selfe sweete,
By buying of Powder, Gloves, Essence, or soe,
You may chance gett a sight of this Seigneur Dildoe.

You will take him at first for noe Person of Note
Because hee'le appeare in a plaine Leather-Coate,
But when you his virtuous Abilityes know,
You'll fall downe, and worship this Seigneur Dildoe.

This Seigneur once dwelt with the Countesse of Rafe,
And from all the feirce Harryes preserved her safe:
She had smother'd him almost under her Pillow:
'Tis a barbarous Nation, quoth Seigneur Dildoe.

My Lady Southeske (Heav'n prosper her for't)
First cloath'd him in Satten, and brought him to Court,
When scarce in the Circle his face he durst show;
Soo modest a youth was this Seigneur Dildoe.

My good Lady Suffolke thinking noe harme,
Had his this poore Stranger under her Arme;
Lady Betty by chance came the Secret to know,
And from her owne Mother stole Seigneur Dildoe.

Her undutiful Daughter, whom dearely she lov'd,
With teares in her Eyes severely reprov'd:
Lamentably, Betty, why would you doe soe?
I charge you of my blessing, restore the Dildoe.

Pray, pardon mee, Madam, said Lady Betty;
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I am not such a Foole, as you take mee to bee:
For all you are my Mother, I'le have you to know,
Either give mee a Prick, or I'le keepe the Dildoe.

Saint Albans with wrinckles, and smiles in his face,
Whose kindnesse to strangers becomes his high place,
In a Coach, and Six Horses is gone to Pergoe,
To take a fresh Ayre with this Seigneur Dildoe.

Red Howard, Red Sheldon, and Temple soe tall
Complaine of his absence thus long from Whitehall;
But Sir Bernard hath promised, a journey to goe,
And bring backe his Countreyman Seigneur Dildoe.

Doll Howard noe more with his Highnesse can range,
Wee'll proffer her therefore this civill exchange,
Her Teeth being rotten, the Smell's best below,
And needes must bee fitter for Seigneur Dildoe.

This Seigneur is sounde, safe, and ready, and dumbe,
As ever was Candle, Finger, or Thumbe;
Then away with these nasty devices, to show,
How you rate the merritts of Seigneur Dildoe.
If he were but well us'd by the Cittizen Fops,
Hee'd keepe their fine Wives from the Foremen o' th' Shops;
But the Rascalls deserve, that their Hornes should still grow,
For burning the Pope, and his Nephew Dildoe.

Additions to Seigneur Dildoe

Our dainty fine Dutchess's have gott a Trick,
To doate on a Foole for love of his Prick
But their hopes were undone, did their Graces but know,
The discretion, and Vigour of Seignior Dildoe.

The Maydens of Honour went to the Sea-side
In comely manner, to meete the Dukes Bride;
They tooke not much notice of Prince Rinaldo,
But all made their Court to Seignior Dildoe.

The Countesse of Falmouth, of whom people tell,
That her Footemen weare shirts of a Guinny an Ell,
May save that expence, if she did but know
How lusty a young Swinger is Seignior Dildoe.
Great Sir, I pray, what doe you intend,
To fumble soe long att the Galleryes end?
If you Fuck mee noe better, I'le have you to know,
I'le lay you aside for Seignior Dildoe.

Good Lady Bedford, suspected by none,
To pimpe for her Daughter, and lye with her Sonne,
Sent Robert, to visit his Aunt of Bristow,
Whil'st she pray'd in her Closett with Seignior Dildoe.

Young Lady Varney came up to the doore,
Said, Madam, you know, I have pray'd heretofore
With Manton, and Owen, it must not passe soe,
I'le change my Religion, but I'le have Dildoe.

Mrs Knight with a Cunt as thinne, as a Groat,
Who sings like a Larke, and Swives like a Stoate;
This Knight cry'd, God damme mee, give mee a Flamboe,
I care not a Figge for small Seignior Dildoe.

An old Sunderlands fancy, I could not, but smile,
She hath parted with her Brethren boeth Sidney, and L’isle,
And shaved her selfe close boeth above, and below,
To make a pair of whiskers for Seignior Dildoe.

Drunken Price, who is sure to bee in att all sport,
Is oft'ner in prison, then wayting att Court,
Hath left her old Gallant limping Will Francho,
And is now in the fashion with Seignior Dildoe.

Lord Almoner Howard a Togate of Rome
Doeth Usher in all the young Ladys, that come,
And if that Italian, they desire, for to know,
He interprets betweene them, and Seignior Dildoe.

He hath many preferements in Church, and State,
He governs the Conscience of gracious Queene Kate,
And though in the Pulpitt his parts he ne'ere show,
Hee's Father Confessour to Seignior Dildoe.

A number of Pricks, who were welcome before,
Now'r snub'd by the Porter, and kept out of doore,
Maliciously wayted his comming below,
And inhumanely sett upon Seignior Dildoe.

From this barbarous Rabble this Stranger did fly,
All along the Pall-Mall they followed him nigh,
The Women concern'd out of every Window
Cry'd, Oh! For Gods sake save Seignior Dildoe.

And my good Lady Sands burst out in a laughter,
When she saw, how the Ballocks came wabling after,
And had not their weight overladed the Foe,
It had gone very hard with Seignior Dildoe.

Into Yorke-House at last for protection he fled,
He knew himselfe safe with a Nation well bred,
And the Count de Grammont by the Marques d'Ansou
To his Countesse att Paris sent Seignior Dildoe.

Tom Killegrews Wife the fine Flowre of Dort,
Att the sight of this Seigneur did Belch, Fart, and Snort,
And more of her Civill Dutch-breeding to show,
Cryes, wellcome tote England myn-Here-Van Dildoe.

This Seignior went to the Cockepitt one night,
And offer'd his Service to sweete Mrs Knight,
Quoth she, I have intrigued it with Captaine Cazzo,
Your Nose in my Arse, good Seignior Dildo.
The Dutchesse of Modena, who look't soe high,
Is well contented with this Seignior to lye,
And because that the English nothing of it should know,
For her Gentleman-Usher tooke Seignior Dildo.

That Patterne of Virtue call'd Dutchesse Cleveland
Hath swallowed Pricks as numberlesse, as th'ocean hath Sand
But with rubbing, and scrubbing is now grown soe low,
That shee is fitt for nothing, but Seignior Dildo.

That stiffe-stalking Lord, with his long timber'd Pricek,
Hath shutt himselfe up, and pretends, to bee sicke,
'Cause Cleveland intends, that the King shall bestow
Her Son Ewstons blew Garter on Seignior Dildo.
Other plays that are not discussed in the text, but are known to have been seen by Mary of Modena, either at Court or at the public theatre, based on The London Stage 1660-1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces ...

6 December 1673 – The Empress of Morocco by Elkanah Settle at the Duke’s Theatre – Probably her first public theatre outing.

29 October 1674 – The Goldsmiths Jubilee; or, London’s Triumph: Containing, A Description of the several Pageants: On which are Represented, Emblematical Figures, Artful Pieces of Architecture, and Rural Dancing: With the Speeches Spoken on each Pageant

3 September 1675 – Bartholomew Fair by Ben Jonson. According to the HMC, (12th Report, Part V, Rutland Papers, II, 27), Mary of Modena attended this play incognito several times because she "likes Bartholomew Faire so well".

30 October 1676 – London’s Triumphs.

3 October 1678 – The Man of Mode by George Etheredge. An amateur revival in Brussels while in exile. Mary of Modena left Brussels on 7 October 1679. (Dedicated to her it was also performed at Court 30 November 1685.)
AFTER MARY OF MODENA'S ACCESSION AS QUEEN CONSORT.

28 April 1685 – *Rollo, Duke of Normandy*, by John Fletcher. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden. (This was also performed at Court on 26 January 1687.)

11 May 1685 – *Sir Courtly Nice*, by John Crowne. At Drury Lane. (This was also performed at Court on 9 November 1685 and again on 3 November 1686.)

30 May 1685 – *Othello*, by William Shakespeare. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden. (This was also performed at Court on 24 November 1685 and again on 10 November 1686.) The United Company played regularly at Court since James II and Mary of Modena commanded weekly performances until the start of Lent.

20 October 1685 – *King and No King*, by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden. (This was also performed at Court on 9 December 1686.)

29 October 1685 – *The Rover*, by Aphra Behn. At Court. (Also performed at Court again on 19 January 1687.)

4 November 1685 – *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, by John Fletcher. At Court.

16 November 1685 – *The City Politiques*, by John Crowne. At Court.
14 December 1685 – *The Plain Dealer*, by William Wycherley. At Court.

30 December 1685 – *The Committee*, by Sir Robert Howard. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden.

13 January 1686 – *The Duchess of Malfi*, by John Webster. At Court.

20 January 1686 – *All for Love; or The World Well Lost*, by John Dryden. At Court.


3 February 1686 – *The Scornful Lady*, by Frances Beaumont and John Fletcher. At Court.

4 February 1686 – *Mithridates*, by Nathaniel Lee. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden.

8 February 1686 – *Macbeth*, by William Shakespeare. At Dorset Garden or Drury Lane.

10 February 1686 – *The Humorous Lieutenant*, by John Fletcher. At Court. (This was also performed again at Court on 24 November 1686 and 27 February 1688).
11 February 1686 – *Cadmus et Hermione*, French opera by Quinault and Lully at Drury Lane or Dorset Garden.

16 February 1686 – *An Evening’s Love; or, The Mock Astrologer*, by John Dryden. At Court. (Mary of Modena also went to see it at Drury Lane on 13 October 1686.)

8 April 1686 – *The Committee*, by Sir Robert Howard. (Again she went to see it at Drury Lane or Dorset Garden and it was performed at Court on 17 November 1686).

30 April 1686 – *Hamlet*, by William Shakespeare. At Court.

6 May 1686 – *The Rehearsal*, by George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden. (She also saw it again on 20 January 1687.)

10 May 1686 – *Sir Courtly Nice*, by John Crowne. Not at Court as in 1685 but at Drury Lane or Dorset Garden. (This was also performed at Court on 3 November 1686.)

6 October 1686 – *Mustapha*, by Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery. At Drury Lane or Dorset Garden.

20 October 1686 – *Sir Martin Marall; or, The Feign’d Innocence*, by John Dryden. At Court.
27 October 1686 – The Rival Queens; or, Alexander the Great, by Nathaniel Lee. At Court.

1 December 1686 – The Beggars Bush, by John Fletcher. At Court. (This was also performed at Court on 13 February 1688.)

15 December 1686 – Secret Love; or, The Maiden Queen, by John Dryden. At Court.

3 January 1687 – A Fond Husband; or, The Plotting Sisters, by Thomas D’Urfey. At Court.

11 April 1687 – The Spanish Curate, by John Fletcher and Philip Massinger. At Court.


25 April 1687 – The Island Princess, adapted from John Fletcher by Natum Tate. At Court.

16 May 1687 – Valentinian, adapted from John Fletcher by John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. At Court.

20 December 1687 (probable date) – The Emperour (sic) of the Moon, by Aphra Behn. At Dorset Garden or Drury Lane.
31 January 1688 – *The Villian*, by Thomas Porter. At Court.

6 February 1688 – *The Double Marriage*, by John Fletcher and Philip Massinger. At Court.

18 June 1688 In Luttrell’s *Brief Historicall Relation*, … Vol.I, p.445 he records a concert “... upon the water before Whitehall, in a great barge was performed an exercise of musick, vocal and instrumental, by the Kings musick”. Not known whether Mary of Modena was present; unlikely as this was only one week after the birth of James Francis Edward. Reresby records that she appeared in public for the first time on 9 July 1688; see Chapter 7.
APPENDIX F (TO CHAPTER 5)

TO THE PIOUS MEMORY OF THE
ACCOMPLISHED YOUNG LADY MRS
ANNE KILLIGREW, EXCELLENT IN
THE TWO SISTER ARTS OF POESY
AND PAINTING. AN ODE

I

Thou youngest virgin-daughter of the skies,
Made in the last promotion of the blest,
Whose palms, new plucked from paradise,
In spreading branches more sublimely rise,

Rich with immortal green, above the rest,
Whether, adopted to some neighbouring star,
Thou roll'st above us in thy wand'ring race,
Or, in procession fixed and regular,

Moved with the heavens' majestic pace,
Or, called to more superior bliss,
Thou tread'st with seraphims the vast abyss.
Whatever happy region is thy place,

Cease thy celestial song a little space
(Thou wilt have time enough for hymns divine,
Since heav'n's eternal year is thine);
Hear then a mortal muse thy praise rehearse
In no ignoble verse,

But such as they own voice did practise here
When they first fruits of poesy were giv'n

To make thyself a welcome inmate there,
While yet a young probationer
And candidate of heav'n.

II

If by traduction came they mind,
Our wonder is the less to find

A soul so charming from a stock so good;
Thy father was transfused into they blood,
So wert thou born into the tuneful strain
(An early, rich, and inexhausted vein).

But if thy pre-existing soul
Was formed at first with myriads more,
It did through all the mighty poets roll
Who Greek or Latin laurels wore,
And was that Sappho last which once it was before.
If so, then cease thy flight, O heav'n-born mind!
Thou hast no dross to purge from thy rich ore,
Nor can thy soul a fairer mansion find
Than was the beauteous frame she left behind;
Return, to fill or mend the choir of thy celestial kind.

III

May we presume to say that at thy birth
New joy was sprung in heav'n as well as here on earth.
For sure the milder planets did combine
On thy auspicious horoscope to shine,
And ev'n the most malicious were in trine.
Thy brother-angels at thy birth
Strung each his lyre and tuned it high,
That all the people of the sky
Might know a poetess was born on earth.
And then, if ever, mortal ears
Had heard the music of the spheres!
And if no clust'ring swarm of bees
On thy sweet mouth distilled their golden dew,
'Twas that such vulgar miracles
Heav'n had not leisure to renew,
For all the blest fraternity of love

Solemnized there thy birth and kept thy holiday above.

IV

O gracious God! How far have we
Profaned thy heav'nly gift of poesy?
Made prostitute and profligate the muse,
Debased to each obscene and impious use,
Whose harmony was first ordained above
For tongues of angels and for hymns of love?
O wretched we! why were we hurried down
This lubric and adult'rate age
(Nay, added fat pollutions of our own)
T'increase the steaming ordures of the stage?
What can we say t' excuse our Second Fall?
Let this thy vestal, heav'n, atone for all!
Her Arethusian stream remains unsoiled,
Unmixed with foreign filth and undefiled;

Her wit was more than man, her innocence a child!
V

Art she had none, yet wanted none,
For nature did that want supply;
So rich in treasures of her own,
She might our boasted stores defy;

75 Such noble vigour did her verse adorn
That it seemed borrowed where 'twas only born.
Her morals too were in her bosom bred,
By great examples daily fed,

What in the best of books, her father's life, she read.

80 And to be read herself she need not fear;
Each test and every light her muse will bear,
Though Epictetus with his lamp were there.

Ev'n love (for love sometimes her muse expressed)

Was but a lambent flame which played about her breast,

85 Light as the vapours of a morning dream;
So cold herself whilst she such warmth expressed,
'Twas Cupid bathing in Diana's stream.

VI

Born to the spacious empire of the Nine,
One would have thought she should have been content
To manage well that mighty government;
But what can young, ambitious souls confine?

90 To the next realm she stretched her sway,
For painture near adjoining lay,
A plenteous province and alluring prey.

95 A Chamber of Dependencies was framed
(As conquerors will never want pretence,
When armed, to justify the offence),
And the whole fief in right of poetry she claimed.

The country open lay without defence,
For poets frequent inroads there had made,

100 And perfectly could represent
The shape, the face, with every lineament;
And all the large domains which the dumb-sister swayed,
All bowed beneath her government,

105 Received in triumph wheresoe'er she went.
Her pencil drew whate'er her soul designed,
And oft the happy draught surpassed the image in her mind.

The sylvan scenes of herds and flocks,
And fruitful plains and barren rocks,

110 Of shallow brooks that flowed so clear,
The bottom did the top appear,
Of deeper too and ampler floods,
Which as in mirrors showed the woods,
Of lofty trees with sacred shades
And perspectives of pleasant glades,
Where nymphs of brightest form appear,
And shaggy satyrs standing near,
Which them at once admire and fear.
The ruins too of some majestic piece,
Boasting the pow'r of ancient Rome or Greece,
Whose statues, friezes, columns broken lie,
And, though defaced, the wonder of the eye,
What nature, art, bold fiction e'er durst frame,
Her forming hand gave feature to the name.
So strange a concourse ne'er was seen before
But when the peopled ark the whole creation bore.

VII
The scene then changed, with bold erected look
Our martial king the sight with reverence strook,
For not content t' express his outward part,
Her hand called out the image of his heart,
His warlike mind, his soul devoid of fear,
His high-designing thoughts were figured there,
As when, by magic, ghosts are made appear.
Our phoenix queen was portrayed too so bright,
Beauty alone could beauty take so right;
Her dress, her shape, her matchless grace
Were all observed, as well as heav'nly face.
With such a peerless majesty she stnds
As in that day she took the crown from sacred hands
Before a train of heroines was seen,
In beauty foremost, as in rank the queen!
Thus nothing to her genius was denied,
But like a ball of fire, the further thrown,
Still with a greater blaze she shone,
And her bright soul broke out on every side.
What next she had designed, heaven only knows,
To such immod'rate growth her conquest rose,
That fate alone its progress could oppose.

VIII
Now all those charms, that blooming grace,
The well-proportioned shape and beauteous face,
Shall never more be seen by mortal eyes;
In earth the much lamented virgin lies!
Not wit nor piety could fate prevent;
Nor was the cruel destiny content
To finish all the murder at a blow,
To sweep at once her life and beauty too,
But, like a hardened felon, took a pride
To work more mischievously slow,
And plundered first and then destroyed.

O double sacrilege on things divine,
To rob the relic and deface the shrine!
But thus Orinda died:
Heav'n, by the same disease, did both translate,
As equal were their souls, so equal was their fate.

IX
Meantime her warlike brother on the seas
His waving streamers to the winds displays,
And vows for his return, with vain devotion, pays.
Ah, generous youth, that wish forbear,
The winds too soon will waft thee here!

Slack all thy sails and fear to come;
Alas, thou know'st not, thou art wrecked at home!
No more shalt thou behold thy sister's face;
Thou hast already had her last embrace.
But look aloft, and if thou keen'st from far
Among the Pleiads a new-kindled star,
If any sparkles than the rest more bright,
'Tis she that shines in that propitious light.

X
When in mid-air the golden trump shall sound
To raise the nations under ground,
When in the valley of Jehosaphat
The judging God shall close the book of fate,
And there the last assizes keep
For those who wake and those who sleep
When rattling bones together fly

From the four corners of the sky,
When sinews o'er the skeletons are spread,
Those clothed with flesh, and life inspires the dead,
The sacred poets first shall hear the sound,
And foremost from the tomb shall bound,
For they are covered with the lightest ground,
And straight, with inborn vigour, on the wing,
Like mounting larks, to the new morning sing.
There thou, sweet saint, before the choir shalt go,
As harbinger of heav'n, the way to show,
195 The way which thou so well hast learned below.
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