Dynastic Politics, International Protestantism and Royal Rebellion: Prince George of Denmark and the Glorious Revolution

On 18 November 1688, King James II and Prince George of Denmark left Windsor and travelled west to confront William of Orange and his Anglo-Dutch army. By 24 November Prince George and members of a group close to the Prince and Princess of Denmark, known as the 'Cockpit circle', had deserted the king and transferred their allegiance to Prince William. This group included, Lord Cornbury, master of the horse to Prince George and the first major defector from the royal side, Henry Fitzroy, 1st duke of Grafton, James Butler, 2nd duke of Ormonde, Lord John Churchill and Colonel John Berkeley, master of the horse to Princess Anne of Denmark.[1] A few days later Anne retreated from the court in London and made her way towards the Midlands. The desertion of the highest ranking Protestant members of the royal family, then resident in England, inflicted serious political injuries on James II, and foreshadowed the collapse of his regime. This statement may seem improbable, but a royal defection on such a scale had tremendous symbolic power. In the opening stages of the Glorious Revolution, through their involvement in ceremonies in urban communities, George and Anne used this power to demonstrate their support for the Williamite cause. These performances are largely neglected – especially the ones enacted by George - but our understanding of the Glorious Revolution is incomplete without incorporating the evidence of ephemeral events that at the time, were considered important. It is clear that Princess Anne of Denmark played a significant role in the Revolution, and she will be mentioned at various points in what follows, but this article will concentrate on the part played by Prince George. To understand fully the political significance of Prince George's participation in the Glorious

* I would like to thank Toby Barnard, Gabriel Glickman, David Hayton, Grant Tapsell, Martin Conway and the two anonymous reviewers of this journal for their insightful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this article. The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art generously funded my research in Denmark.

[1] E. Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia: or the Present State of England compleat, together with divers reflections upon the ancient state thereof. The sixteenth edition* (London, 1687), pp. 215-7; for a recent rendition of the desertion of Prince George and members of the Cockpit circle such as Cornbury, see T. Harris, *Revolution: the Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2006), p.284.

Revolution, we have to trace his activities from 1683 onwards. A detailed assessment of George of Denmark's politico-religious activities in 1688, and in the years before and after the Revolution, indicates he was valuable to both James II and William. But to fathom why Prince George became a traitor, we need to place him in the world of early modern geo-politics when foreign policy and international relations were inextricably linked with dynastic politics, and many were concerned about the future wellbeing of Protestantism. In response to this politico-religious environment George and Anne could develop a Stuart-Oldenburg interest with the potential to help family members and their allies in continental Europe. There was also the possibility of George promoting Protestantism in England and beyond the British Isles. The religious component is crucial as the evidence strongly suggests that George felt he belonged to a 'Protestant International', not defined by membership of a particular nation.[2] By drawing attention to the poly-centric nature of the Stuart court in the 1680s, the workings of dynastic politics in the international arena that involved secret political manoeuvrings in the run up to the invasion, then detailing the way George behaved following William's arrival, this article will argue that Prince George played a crucial role in the Glorious Revolution. In so doing it will add to a growing body of scholarship, as exemplified by the work of scholars such as Jonathan Israel, that emphasises the international dimension to the events of 1688-9, and argues that the Glorious Revolution was partly imposed by forces outside England.[3] A subsidiary theme of this article will be the continuing significance of progresses, and the ceremonies those entailed, to the political culture of early modern Britain. Kevin Sharpe argued that although progresses were still undertaken in the

[2] For ideas on the formulation of a Protestant, supranational identity in this period, see T. Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge, 2007); P. Ihalainen, *Protestant Nations Redefined: Changing Perceptions of National Identity in the Rhetoric of the English, Dutch and Swedish Public Churches, 1685-1772* (Brill, 2005); David Onnekink considers the complexities and difficulties of the term when applied to a Protestant diaspora in 'Models of an Imagined Community: Huguenot Discourse on Identity and Foreign Policy', in D.J.B. Trim ed., *The Huguenots: History and Memory in Transnational Context* (Leiden, Boston, MA, 2011), pp. 193-216.

[3] J. Israel, 'The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution', in J. Israel ed., *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* (paperback edition, Oxford, 2003), pp. 105-62. See also Israel's introduction to the same volume.

post-Restoration period, their political importance had declined since the early seventeenth-century, with monarchs concentrating their ceremonial efforts on being seen in London.[4] This article will demonstrate that the progress format, while altered from its Elizabethan prototype, remained a potent political tool in the 1680s.[5]

Despite the efforts of W.A. Speck, Prince George is generally characterised by most modern-day scholars as a cipher; disregarded as a political actor, his contribution to the Glorious Revolution overlooked.[6] Numerous studies exist on the involvement of William and James in the Revolution and occasionally attention has turned to Princess Anne.[7] Historians have also studied individual members of the nobility such as Lord Churchill and the Earl of Devonshire.[8] This scholarly neglect accords with the best known reaction of James II to Prince George's betrayal. In his memoirs, James played down his son-in-law's defection, claiming it was less important than the loss of a good trooper.[9] Yet James responded rather differently on the morning of 25 November 1688, when he discovered that George had left his camp. Frederick Gersdorff, the new Danish envoy in London, who accompanied the royal party and told James that George had deserted, reported to Christian V 'Your Majesty can not

[4] K. Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: the Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, CT, and London, 2013), pp.192, 630-1

[5] Post Restoration progresses are the subject of my current research project.

[6] Charles II famously said of George, 'I have tried him drunk, and I have tried him sober and there is nothing in him'. This judgement has dogged George ever since, and it still colours the way scholars view him. See for example E. Gregg, *Queen Anne*, (London, 1980), p. 35; T. Bowers, *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680-1760* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 53; for an alternative view, see W.A. Speck, 'George, prince of Denmark and duke of Cumberland (1653-1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed 16 August 2014, at http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10543 .

[7] The historiography on the Glorious Revolution is vast, but recent works include: Harris, *Revolution*; T. Harris and S. Taylor eds., *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013); S. Pincus, *1688: the First Modern Revolution* (New Haven and London, 2009). Historians who have paid attention to the ramifications of Anne's activities in the Glorious Revolution include D. Hosford, 'The Rising in Nottingham', *Albion*, iv, (1972), pp. 147-78; W. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988); E. Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution: 1688 – Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London, 2006). Vallance argues that Anne's journey northwards 'began to take on the character of a royal progress', see p. 139.

[8] D. Hosford, *Nottingham, Nobles and the North* (Hamden, CT., 1967); S. Saunders Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered* (New York, 1995); for general coverage of the nobility, see: J.P. Kenyon, *The Nobility in the Revolution of 1688* (Hull, 1963).

[9] J. S. Clarke, *The Life of James the Second etc., collected out of memoirs writ of his own hand…* (II vols., London, 1816), ii, 225; Gregg, *Anne*, p. 64.

imagine the King of England's consternation at this news'.[10] Shifts in dynastic allegiances in royal families caused major political difficulties in the early-modern period, and his initial reaction suggests that James immediately recognised the damage caused by his son-in-law's defection. Royal advisors familiar with the workings of dynastic politics, such as John Sheffield, 3rd Earl Mulgrave, Lord Chamberlain to James II, later concluded that the desertion of army officers such as Churchill meant little compared to the flight of the princess and the unity of purpose between the Protestant heirs to the throne.[11] Given the diffuse nature of the Stuart court during this period Prince George of Denmark should be included in this group. To fully comprehend how George was able to exercise a considerable level of power and influence in 1688, we need to understand the way court society functioned in the 1680s.

(New Section)

The traditional 'monolithic absolutist model' of the court, with power simply 'radiat[ing] from the person of the monarch', has been replaced over the last twenty years by a more nuanced understanding of courtly power relations.[12] Rather than seeing the Court as a centralised institution, revisionist historians have suggested that influence and political authority often emanated from subsidiary courts formed by junior members of a royal family.[13] If we apply this line of thinking to George and Anne, we can see that once they were married a new dynasty was formed and a separate Stuart-Oldenburg court began to evolve that was distinctly Protestant in outlook.[14] James, duke of York maintained his own household so the Stuart-Oldenburg court existed alongside the ducal court of the Yorks.[15]

---

[10] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 64.
[11] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 66.
[12] J. Adamson, 'The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court', 1500-1700' in J. Adamson ed., *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime* (paperback edition, London, 2000), pp. 7-43; quotes from p. 17.
[13] Ibid.
[14] The Stuart-Oldenburg dynasty had first been created in 1589 at the marriage of James VI and I to Anne of Denmark.
[15] For a detailed assessment of the household of James, duke of York as king see: A. Barclay, 'The Impact of King James II on the Departments of the Royal Household' (Univ. of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1994).

The first Duke of Ormonde certainly viewed court dynamics in those terms. In a letter, outlining a planned visit to the court 'at Winchester' during the 1683 progress, Ormonde identified 'three courts…the King's and Queen's, the Duke's and the Prince of Denmark's'.[16] The architectural setting for the Denmarks court – a suite of apartments in Whitehall Palace known as the Cockpit – gave George and Anne some independence, in terms of freedom of association and political action, though the king could limit this if he chose too. Political activity in a satellite court such as this one generally complemented the power of the monarch, but could also compete with it, as the monarch was rarely the sole arbiter of political business.[17] The Prince and Princess of Denmark were able to develop their own clienteles, utilising their political patronage to create supplementary 'foyers of power'.[18] Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that rather than simply following others, George and Anne, along with their courtiers, were in fact at the centre of aristocratic and ecclesiastical opposition to James II, with men such as Lord Cornbury, Lord Churchill and Henry Compton, Bishop of London, secretly acting on the Denmarks' behalf, pursuing policies that ultimately were perceived to be of mutual benefit.[19] Equally, if they chose to - and initially George and Anne did support James - they could augment the power and authority of the king. Viewed from these dual perspectives George immediately becomes more important.

As the second son of Frederick III, and brother to Christian V, the reigning monarch in Denmark at the time, Prince George brought considerable 'dynastic capital' to the Restoration court.[20] Cultivated and well-travelled, George had been immersed in Danish court culture since his birth and his earlier experiences, along with his princely credentials

[16] *HMC Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde N.S.* (VIII vols. London, 1902-20), vii, 103, letter from Ormonde to Sir John Temple, 9 August, 1683.
[17] Adamson, 'Making of the Ancien-Regime Court', pp. 7-43.
[18] Ibid; quote from p. 17.
[19] Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 35-6. The OED definition of a courtier is 'a person who attends or frequents a royal court'.
[20] C. Campbell Orr, 'Introduction', in C. Campbell Orr ed., *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: the Role of the Consort* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 1-15.

and gender, ensured that he played a prominent role at the Stuart court following his marriage to Lady Anne on 28 July 1683.[21] One of the key features of the Denmarks' marriage treaty was that George became a prince of the 'Blood Royal': the dynastic equivalent of George becoming James II's son or brother.[22] This heightened George's status at the Stuart court, which in the absence of any other royal males increased further once James II became king. The fact George was a Protestant also proved useful. The Protestant marriage alliances made for the York's daughters were welcomed in England, especially the marriage of Anne and George. The Denmarks' nuptials took place in the wake of the exclusion crisis, and although there were anxieties about drawing closer to France, the Stuart-Oldenburg match appealed to moderate Protestant opinion, as it settled the succession issue and the future security of the Church of England.[23] But religious anxieties lingered and re-emerged at the succession. While many of James II's subjects were hopeful for the new reign, concerns over his Catholicism were still evident and James looked to both George and Anne to continue supporting him once he became king. James had relied on Anne for politico-religious support since at least 1681 when Anne and members of her household joined her father in Scotland.[24] Similarly, once he returned to England, Anne often accompanied James on important public outings, such as his visit to Oxford in June 1683, prior to her marriage.[25] When James became king, Anne continued to support her father in this fashion. Prince George offered similar political capital, and soon after his arrival had a public profile beyond the palace setting. He was regularly involved in ceremonial events away from royal buildings, including

[21] Ibid.
[22] Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia*, pp. 119, 215; *HMC Ormonde N.S.* vii, 22, letter from Ormonde to the Earl of Arran, 8 May 1683.
[23] For a sense of the relief at Charles II making Protestant marriage alliances for Anne and Mary, see p. 891, n. 198 in R.A. Beddard, 'Tory Oxford', in N. Tyacke ed., *The History of the University of Oxford* (8 vols. Oxford, 1997), iv, 863-906.
[24] .J. Winn, *Queen Anne: Patroness of the Arts* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 81-4; H. Ouston, 'From Thames to Tweed Departed': the Court of James duke of York in Scotland, 1679-82', in E. Cruickshanks ed., *The Stuart Courts* (Stroud, 2000), pp. 266-79.
[25] A. Clark, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, described by himself* (IV vols. London, 1894), iii, 48-54; Beddard, 'Tory Oxford', pp. 863-906.

the 1683 progress, and although it was largely a symbolic act, within days of becoming king, James appointed George to the Privy Council.[26] Moreover, George continued to play a prominent ceremonial role in the secular aspects of court culture, receiving ambassadors, accompanying James on important civic events in London, grand visits to the country estates of the nobility, and in 1686, a short royal progress to the West Country.[27] The Stuart-Oldenburg court, comprising separate household establishments for prince and princess, also had a distinct military flavour. These arrangements mirrored the household arrangements of George as a soldier-prince in Denmark and once James became king, he assigned the prince his own regiment. Aside from Lord Cornbury, notable members of the combined households, who also served as army officers, included the Earl of Scarsdale, Charles Churchill and John Berkeley.[28] On a social level, the Stuart-Oldenburg court also encompassed military men such as John and George Churchill, the Dukes of Grafton and Ormonde, and the Earl of Drumlanrig.[29] Needless to say, all members of the Stuart-Oldenburg court were Protestant.

It should be remembered that despite blending into life at the Stuart court, George remained a Danish prince with dynastic connections throughout much of northern Europe, many of them

---

[26] S. Clarke, *The Historian's Guide, or, Britain's Remembrancer Being a Summary of all Actions, Exploits, Sieges, Battels, Designs, Attempts, Preferments, Honours, Changes, &c and Whatever Else is Worthy Notice that Hath Happened in His Majesty's Dominions, from 1600 to 1688,* (London, 1688), p. 164; C. Beem, 'I am Her Majesty's Subject": Prince George of Denmark and the Transformation of the English Male Consort', *Canadian Journal of History*, 39 (2004), pp. 458-87.

[27] Examples of James and George attending events together, either as Charles II's representatives or with the king, include: *London Gazette*, 8 Nov. 1683: 1876; *London Gazette*, 26 June 1684: 1942; *London Gazette*, 27 Oct. 1684:1977; *London Gazette*, 1 Dec. 1684:1987; *HMC Ormonde N.S. vii*, 203-4, 263-6; Chippenham, W[iltshire] and S[windon] A[rchives], City Ledgers, D, 1640-1723, fo. 264 verso; Account Rolls, G23/1/47, an entry in the section for 1683-4 notes the 'extraordinary payment' for 'treating' the royal party; WSA, Corporation Minutes, 1683-1708, G23/1/17 (unpaginated), the entry for 2 August 1684, mentions the visit by James and George; Clarke, *The Historian's Guide*, pp. 155; Beem, 'I Am Her Majesties Subject', pp. 458-87. Once James became king: *London Gazette*, 23-26 Aug. to 30-2 Sept. 1686:2167-9; the Duke of Albemarle entertained James, George and 'a great part of the court' in May 1686 at New Hall in Essex, see: A. Browning ed., *The Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (2nd edition, London, 1991), p.423; S. Seyer, *Memoirs Historical and Topographical of Bristol and its Neighbourhood* (II volumes, Bristol, 1823), ii, 532-3; WSA, City Ledgers, D, 1640-1723, fo. 276 verso; Account Rolls, G23/1/47, an entry in the section covering 1685-6 notes the monetary gift made to James during his 1686 visit; WSA, Corporation Minutes, 1683-1708, G23/1/17 (unpaginated), an entry for 2 August 1686 covers James II's visit;Clarke, *The Historian's Guide*, p. 190; Harris, *Revolution*, p. 208; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p. 301.

[28] Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia*, pp. 213-4.

[29] Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 35-6.

in the German principalities.[30] Equally he remained a devout Lutheran, with a world view of united Protestantism, and these socio-political and religious beliefs informed the way he behaved in England.[31] George retained his Lutheran court chaplain from Denmark, John Mecken, and employed the Pietist ecumenical traveller, Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf as 'Secretary of Foreign Affairs', in addition to Edward Griffiths who served as 'Secretary'.[32] As a royal male in a subsidiary position within the Oldenburg dynasty, George was used to representing the political needs of his family, as evidenced by the Danish attempt to have George elected as the King of Poland in 1674, and his marriage to Anne.[33] The Anglo-Danish negotiations for the match were conducted in London under the sponsorship of Louis XIV. At the time Denmark and France were allies and Louis wanted to effect a naval alliance against the Dutch.[34] But the fact Denmark and France were allies should not be taken to mean that George was pro-French, or even if he was at the time of his marriage, that he remained so in later years. His position as the brother of a king made independent action difficult for George. As events would later prove, his position at the Oldenburg court, with its need for caution and discretion, prepared George very well for his marriage to Lady Anne. In line with contemporary European royal practice, this would involve promoting the interests of their dynasty, and when possible, their related houses in Europe. Although George was a Lutheran and Anne a member of the Church of England their devotion to Protestantism more broadly,

[30] In terms of the Glorious Revolution, the most noteworthy family connection came through his mother, Sophie Amalie of Brunswick-Lüneberg. This was her brother, Ernst August, duke of Brunswick-Lüneberg who knew George well and in 1688 offered valuable military and financial support to William.
[31] Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 64-5.
[32] Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia*, p. 214; F. Hatje, 'Revivalists Abroad: Encounters and Transfers between German Pietism and English Evangelism in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries', in S. Manz, M. Schulte Beerbühl, J.R. Davis eds., *Migration and Transfer from Germany to Britain, 1660-1914* (Düsseldorf, 2007), pp. 65-80.
[33] W.A. Speck, 'George, prince of Denmark and duke of Cumberland (1653-1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed 16 Aug. 2014, at http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:22204/view/article/10543
[34] Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 32-3.

strengthened the bond between the royal couple and sharpened their political outlook.[35] All these elements would be crucial in formulating the Denmark's response to Catholic kingship.

(New Section)

James had come to power on a tidal wave of public approval and support, but his open Catholicism, allied with his uncompromising domestic policies, aroused suspicion. Despite his reassurances, many came to believe that ultimately Roman Catholicism would be returned as the state religion. The Denmarks were deeply concerned by this prospect and their anxieties were compounded by James attempting to convert Anne and her sister Mary to Rome; as she lived in England, James put greater pressure on Anne.[36] Partly driven by a genuine desire to evangelise, these attempts were also politically motivated, as James hoped to further his religious policies and secure a Catholic succession.[37] Regardless of these efforts, Anne and George continued to support the king. The weakening of the Test Act, however, in July 1686, marks a significant turning point in contemporary attitudes. Immediately James appointed four Roman Catholics to the Privy Council and by January 1687 the dismissal of 'white-staff-officers and others…for adhering to their [Protestant] religion' was causing 'much discourse'.[38] These moves allied with James issuing a Declaration of Indulgence in Scotland on 12 February, convinced Anne that her father and his government wanted 'to bring in popery'.[39] When writing to her sister a few weeks later Anne declared that soon '…no Protestant will be able to live here'.[40] On 4 April James issued a Declaration of Indulgence in England and around this time Anne made a number of high

[35] When talking about her anxieties over religion with her sister, Anne tended to use the phrase Protestant rather than the Church of England, see n. 40.
[36] J.R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (London, 1972), p. 85-6.
[37] Jones, *Revolution of 1688*, pp. 85-6; Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 43-4.
[38] J. Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn*, E. De Beer ed., (6 vols. Oxford, 1955), iv, 536; Gregg, *Anne*, p. 45; Harris, *Revolution*, p. 195.
[39] B. Curtis Brown, *The Letters of Queen Anne* (London, 1968), Anne to the Princess of Orange, 31 Jan. 1687, pp. 23-4; Gregg, *Anne*, p. 45; Harris, *Revolution*, p. 211.
[40] Curtis Brown, *Letters of Queen Anne*, Anne to the Princess of Orange, 13 Mar. 1687, pp. 24-7; Gregg, *Queen Anne*, p. 48.

profile appearances at the Protestant Chapel Royal in Whitehall Palace and at churches in London, in order to indicate her dislike of royal policy and show her support for the Church of England.[41] Edward Gregg has characterised Anne's activities during this period as 'militant Protestantism' and her attendance at Church of England services drew large crowds.[42]

An additional cause of anxiety for the Denmarks, especially for George who could now exercise some independence, was the situation on the continent. Like other Protestant princes in Europe, such as William of Orange and also the Electors of Brandenburg and of Brunswick-Lüneburg (closely related to the Oldenburg dynasty), George grew 'strongly opposed' to the power of France.[43] All were concerned by the growing threat of Louis XIV's expansionist foreign policy as it endangered the balance of power in Europe, and the security of their own territories or those of their families.[44] These fears were heightened by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in October 1685. Louis XIV's decision to revoke the edict, which followed a period of rapid territorial expansion in the western Rhineland, had politico-religious ramifications across northern Europe, and allegiances began to shift, most notably in the German principalities.[45] The revocation also heightened uncertainties as to the long-term motives of King James II in England.[46] Although James attempted to keep his foreign policy independent of France, this was obscured by his absolutist domestic policies and his favouritism towards his co-religionists.[47] An Anglo-French alliance caused great concern, as it opened up the possibility of Louis helping James to impose his policies on a reluctant

[41] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 49; Harris, *Revolution*, p. 211.
[42] Gregg, *Anne*, quote p. 59.
[43] A. Somerset, *Queen Anne: the Politics of Passion* (London, 2012), p. 42; see n. 29 for details of the dynastic links.
[44] Harris, *Revolution*, p.185.
[45] W. Troost, 'William III, Brandenburg, and the Construction of the Anti-French Coalition, 1672-88', in J. Israel, ed., *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 299-334; M. Hughes, *Early Modern Germany, 1477-1806* (Philadelphia, PA, 1992); S.P.Oakley, *War and Peace in the Baltic, 1560-1790* (London, 1993), p. 99.
[46] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 41.
[47] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 42.

population. [48] As James already had a standing army, an Anglo-French alliance would also strengthen Louis XIV's military capability in Europe.

While George and Anne clearly had anxieties about the politico-religious situation in England and Europe, an equally worrying prospect was the birth of a Catholic successor. Historians habitually comment on Anne's frequent pregnancies, as she endeavoured to secure a Protestant succession, but James was also mindful of dynasticism, and he married Mary of Modena on 23 November 1673 in the hope of providing a male heir and a future Catholic king. The births of five York children between 1675 and 1682, including Charles, duke of Cambridge, who died prematurely, is testament to their dynastic ambition. Once James became king, and in view of Mary of Modena's relatively young age – 27 at the time of James's accession - a Catholic heir remained a strong possibility. The aim of the new Stuart-Oldenburg dynasty, as with all European royal houses, was to strengthen its own family interests; the future of the Stuart dynasty and the rights of Stuart-Oldenburg children being of paramount importance. Equally important for George were his dynastic connections in Europe – Denmark, and also the German principalities. Any analysis of the Denmarks' involvement in the Revolution must take all these dynastic perspectives into account.

George of Denmark held a position that allowed him to act. Being a prince of royal blood conferred George with political agency that could be mobilised in both England and on the continent. His marriage and move to England also gave George political manoeuvrability. He regularly corresponded with his brother, Christian V; George also wrote to his trusted confidante and secretary in Denmark, Christian Siegfried von Plessen.[49] Originally from

[48] S. Pincus, *1688: the First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT, and London, 2009), p. 333-4.

[49] Copenhagen, D[anish N[ational] A[rchive], 86724, Kongehuset Christian 5: Regnskabsoversigter (1670-1699) 4: this box contains 110 letters from Prince George of Denmark to his brother King Christian V, written between 1683 and 1699; DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3: Prins Jørgen: Forskelligt (1665-1710) 20: this box contains, amongst other things, 49 letters from George to von Plessen, written between 1684-1693, and 15 letters from Christian to George, from the period 1684-1699.

Germany, von Plessen remained close to Prince George and managed Prince George's country estate at Vordingborg, along with his other affairs in Denmark.[50] In the 1690s von Plessen would obtain a place on the King of Denmark's Council but in the 1680s he worked as a diplomat and served as an informal advisor to Christian V on foreign policy.[51] The full extent of the political relationship between George and von Plessen remains unclear, but these correspondence networks and von Plessen's occasional visits to England - once in 1685, following the death of George of Denmark's mother, and again in 1689 - highlight two important aspects.[52] First, by virtue of his birth and marriage, George possessed political capital that could be used for the benefit of himself and others. Second, once married and living in England, his political outlook was never likely to be simply parochial. Indeed in the letter he sent to James II explaining why he defected to the Orange cause George described himself as one of the 'Protestant Prince[s] of Christendom'.[53] In public, Anne held the most prominent position but in private it is likely that George and Anne functioned as a political unit, assessing the domestic and European political contexts before making decisions that were deemed beneficial to the Stuart-Oldenburgs and their children. They also worked for the benefit of their associated dynastic houses in Europe. Although historians such as Geoffrey Holmes have characterised George as an 'amiable but bone-headed gentleman', those who knew him well when acting as Prince Consort, and ambassadors who met George when he

[50] Christian Siegfried v. Plessen (1646-1723) *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon* (3rd edition, Copenhagen, 1979-84), Svend Cedergreen ed., accessed 28 October 2011, at http://www.denstoredanske.dk/Dansk_Biografisk_Leksikon/Samfund_jura_og_politik/myndigheder_og_politisk_styre/Diplomat/Christian_Siegfried_v._plessen . Many thanks to Gitte Hansen Sims for translating von Plessen's entry from Danish into English.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] *Prince George's Letter to the King* (London, 1688); Tony Claydon has argued that the term Christendom provided a means of expressing religious ideals removed from a specific confessional identity, and could be used to stress the 'breadth of William's alliances'. Conversely, Stephen Pincus has suggested the term was used as a rhetorical alternative to Europe, so it was devoid of the religious connotations the word usually implies. For details of these debates, see T. Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697', in E. Mijers and D. Onnekink eds., *Redefining William III: the Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (2007), pp. 125-142.

was younger thought otherwise.[54] A shy, self-effacing man, George possessed 'a good, sound understanding, but [was] modest in showing it'.[55] He was more than capable of making independent political judgements, especially when his own politico-religious interests were likely to be affected. To suggest, as some historians have done, that George and Anne joined the Revolution simply as minions of the Churchill's is to deny the reality of seventeenth-century dynastic politics.[56] At a time when personal monarchy was the predominant political system, dynastic networks were fundamental to the way European politics worked and royal consorts, male or female, played a part in the political process, although men generally played a more public role than women.[57] Foreign members of the Stuart dynasty, such as Prince Rupert, were politically active and maintained their connections to the international realm of the reformed religion. During the later stages of his career, when he displayed a 'zeal for the Protestant religion', opposed France and supported the Whigs, Rupert embodied and promoted Britain's commitment to European Protestantism, helping to fend off aspersions of 'popery' under Charles II.[58] Although his background was very different, in the

---

[54] G. Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, (revised edition, ,London, 1987), p. 212; *A Selection From the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont in the Possession of the Right Honourable Sir George Henry Rose* (III vols. London, 1831), iii, 348-9, letter from Patrick, Earl of Marchmont to Queen Anne, 1 March 1709; *HMC, 10th Report, Appendix: Part V. The Manuscripts of the Earl of Westmoreland* (London, 1885), pp. 49-50; Following the example of the French ambassador, Piero Mocenigo, the Venetian ambassador when George made his first visit to England in 1669, made a point of visiting the Prince to discuss the Siege of Candia. For details, see A. Hinds, (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice* (38 volumes, London, 1864-1947), xxxvi, 90; German princes related to George had provided military support to the Venetians to help repel the Turkish invaders and they continued with their support. For details, see: J. Black, *The Cambridge Illustrated Atlas of Warfare* (Cambridge, 1996), p.72; A. Flick, 'The Court at Celle…is Completely French: Huguenot Soldiers in the Duchy of Brunswig-Lüneburg', in M. Glozier and D. Onnekink eds., *War, Religion and Service: Huguenot Soldering, 1685-1713* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2007), pp.195-212.

[55] J. Macky, *Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, Esq.…from his Original Manuscript as Attested by his Son Spring Macky* (London, 1733), p. 33.

[56] For an extreme example of this tendency see: Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup*, pp. 77-124.

[57] For an overview of the importance of dynasticism in European politics, see C. Campbell Orr, 'Dynasticism and the World of the Court', in P. Wilson, ed., *A Companion to Eighteenth-century Europe* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 435-450; for details on the part played by female consorts in European politics of the period see the essays in: C. Campbell Orr ed., *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics* (Manchester, 2002); Campbell Orr, *Queenship in Europe.*

[58] L. C. O'Malley, 'The Whig Prince: Prince Rupert and the Court vs. Country Factions during the Reign of Charles II, *Albion*, 8 (1976), pp. 333-50; I. Roy, 'Rupert, prince and count palatine of the Rhine and duke of Cumberland (1619-1682)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed 26 August 2014, at http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2204/view/article/24281

1680s George quietly functioned in a similar manner, although by the end of the decade he also played a significant role in European affairs.

France was clearly pursuing an aggressive foreign policy that aimed to establish secure borders as far east as possible, and curb the influence of the emperor and the Protestant princes of central and northern Europe.[59] The United Provinces were among the front-line Protestant territories that suffered most from the onslaughts of Louis XIV's armies, and to survive they relied heavily on their ability to form coalitions.[60] Although the precise requirements and political motivations of each individual monarch and prince were different, Denmark and the German principalities were also dependent on coalitions and these men began to turn against France.[61] Christian V was considering various foreign policy options during this period. Siegfried von Plessen, one of the 'foremost representatives of anti-French politics' at the Danish court in the 1680s, strove to improve Anglo-Dutch relations in opposition to the pro-French party.[62] A letter written by Prince George to von Plessen in January 1689 indicates that he believed the German principalities were united in their desire to humiliate France.[63] In light of these broader, European dimensions, we need to reconsider the implications of George's journey to Denmark in the summer of 1687.

---

[59] K. Galster, *Danish Troops in the Williamite Army in Ireland, 1689-91* (Dublin, 2012), p.21.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Galster, *Danish Troops*, p. 22; Troost, ''William III, Brandenburg, and the Construction of the anti-French coalition, 1672-88', pp. 299-334; J. Israel, 'The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution', in Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch Moment*, pp. 105-62.
[62] Christian Siegfried v. Plessen (1646-1723) *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon* (3rd edition, Copenhagen, 1979-84), Svend Cedergreen ed., accessed 28 October 2011, at http://www.denstoredanske.dk/Dansk_Biografisk_Leksikon/Samfund_jura-og-politik/myndigheder_og_politisk_styre/Diplomat/Christian_Siegfried_v._plessen?high ; P. Lindström and S. Norrheim, *Flattering Alliances: Scandinavia, Diplomacy and the Austrian-French Balance of Power, 1648-1740* (Lund, Sweden, 2013), p. 108; my thanks also to Dr Søren Mentz (Frederiksborg Castle, Copenhagen) for additional information on von Plessen's activities during this period.
[63] DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3: Prins Jørgen: Forskelligt (1665-1683) 20: letter from Prince George to von Plessen, dated 11 January 1689 [NS] alluding to the fate of France, George wrote, 'I am completely of the opinion that her arrogance will be humiliated in the end…as all Protestant princes and all of Germany are currently of one opinion and one conscience'. I would like to thank Alina Khatib for translating this letter from German into English.

The idea of a trip to Denmark had first been broached in the autumn of 1686, and because Anne was pregnant, quietly dropped. It was resurrected in 1687 and in April George procured a formal request from Christian V to James II, seeking permission for the Prince and Princess to visit Copenhagen.[64] By the time the letter arrived Anne was pregnant again, but James agreed to Prince George travelling to his home country. Accompanied by Lord Cornbury and Lord Scarsdale, along with a small retinue from the Stuart-Oldenburg household, George left England on 17 June 1687.[65] Cornbury had served George ever since the prince had first arrived from Denmark: they had developed a close relationship and Cornbury knew von Plessen from the meetings that were held in 1683 to negotiate the terms and conditions of the Denmark household.[66] Although Roger Morrice puzzled over why Prince George had 'a desire to go to Denmark suddenly', ostensibly the trip was for the benefit of his health.[67] But soon after George had arrived in Copenhagen the Danish court staged a series of festivities. The wedding by proxy of Maria Sophie of Neuburg, daughter of the Elector Palatine, to King Pedro II of Portugal, was held in Heidelberg on 2 July.[68] Maria Sophie had been living at the Danish court as the guest of her aunt, the Queen Consort, Charlotte Amelia of Hesse-Cassel and while George was staying in Denmark, lavish celebrations were held in honour of Maria Sophie's marriage.[69]

It is reasonable to assume that, during this time, discussions took place between members of the Oldenburg family, von Plessen and other courtiers on the state of European affairs. Visits from overseas courts often occasioned verbal 'councils of war' to exchange opinions on

---

[64] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 51.
[65] Evelyn, *Diary*, iv, 558-9, 558 n. 7; N. Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, from September 1678-April 1714* (6 vols. Oxford, 1857), i, 407; Gregg, *Anne*, p. 51.
[66] Windsor, Royal Archive, RA EB/EB/56, Establishment Book, 1683-1691: Prince George of Denmark, pp. 2-10.
[67] S. Taylor ed., *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice* (VI vols. Woodbridge, 2007), iv, 72.
[68] G. A. Ellis ed., *The Ellis Correspondence: Letters Written during the Years 1686, 1687, 1688 and addressed to John Ellis*, (2 vols. London, 1829), ii, see the note on 327-8; Israel, *Conflicts of Empire*, p. 194.
[69] Copenhagen, The Royal Library, Christian V. En paa Tysk ført Dagbog over Christian V's Liv i Aarene, 1681-1699, udarbejdet en kongelig kammertjener. 204 S Rostgaard 62 fol. p. 10, see entries from 17 June until 3 August, 1687; *Ellis Correspondence*, ii, 320-32 also the notes on 327-8; *London Gazette*, 1687, issues: 2252, 2256, 2260, 2268, 2269 provide an overview of George of Denmark's travels.

military matters, and the Oldenburgs were related to a number of German princes affected by French aggression.[70] Diplomatic representatives from other courts usually attended royal weddings, in Scandinavia as elsewhere.[71] Given the deteriorating situation in Europe it seems likely that envoys from some of the German courts spoke to George about their concerns. The German princes were nervous about escalating French belligerence, and the possibility of a new Anglo-French alliance loomed on the horizon.[72] As Christian V wanted to move away from France, if only in the short term, he was increasingly open to new coalition partners.[73] When formulating his foreign policy Christian relied on a number of influential advisors and *de facto* ministers, who largely worked in secret.[74] It is likely that von Plessen was passing information to courtiers in this group, although it is difficult to be completely sure, as, in keeping with Christian's desire for secrecy, detailed written records on foreign policy were not maintained in Denmark at this time.[75] Informal politicking, however, was a vital part of early modern courtly politics, and often the most important information in military and diplomatic affairs was communicated by word-of-mouth.[76] Verbal exchanges that occurred in Denmark, between George, his family and close advisors, along with conversations in England and correspondence received and sent by George, much of it now lost, almost certainly affected the Denmarks decision to defect.

---

[70] *HMC Seventh Report* (London, 1879), p. 365, letter from O. Wynne to the Lord President 19 July 1683. Commenting on the time John Churchill spent in Denmark in 1683, Wynne notes 'there were several councils of war during my L, Churchill's stay in the court of Denmark', especially on the 'surprising news that came from Vienna'. Churchill had been sent to Denmark to accompany George over to England, and during his time abroad the Ottoman army besieged Vienna.

[71] M. R. Wade, 'Politics and Performance: Saxon-Danish Court Festivals 1548-1709', in M.C. Canova-Green ed., *Musical Entertainments and the Politics of Performance: a Festschrift in honour of Hanne Castein* (London, 2001), pp. 41-57.

[72] W. Troost, *William III, the Stadholder King: a Political Biography* (Aldershot, Burlington, VT, 2005), pp. 181-6.

[73] Galster, *Danish Troops*, pp. 22-3.

[74] Galster, *Danish Troops*, pp. 33-4

[75] Lindström and Norrheim, *Flattering Alliances*, pp. 129-30.

[76] B. Dooley, 'News and doubt in early modern culture: or, are we having a public sphere yet?', in B. Dooley and S. Baron eds., *Politics of Information in Early Modern Europe* (London, 2001), pp. 275-97; for details on the importance of oral communication in the dissemination of news, see S. Davies and P. Fletcher, 'Introduction', in S. Davies and P. Fletcher eds., *News in Early Modern Europe: Currents and Connections* (Leiden, 2014), pp. 1-18.

While few would doubt the Denmarks' devotion to the Protestant cause and their concern about domestic policies in Britain, the most pressing reasons for joining forces with William and Mary in November 1688 was the birth of a son to James II and Mary of Modena on 10 June 1688, and the situation in Europe. A male heir ensured a Catholic succession. Princess Anne and her heirs would be in the line of succession, even if behind Mary, Princess of Orange. But after eighteen years of marriage William and Mary were childless, while Anne was fertile, so Protestant dynastic hopes rested with the Stuart-Oldenburgs. The evidence strongly suggests that George shared William's concerns regarding the international situation and by November 1688 he was prepared to act. For George, the most compelling reason to join forces with William and Mary was the French invasion of the Rhineland on 24 September 1688.[77] In response to this aggression, a number of German princes formed a defensive alliance in October 1688, called the 'Magdeburg Concert'. This association was formed to defend the Rhine and the signatories also provided the Prince of Orange with military support.[78] It was members of this group who made secret treaties and hired out troops to the States General, to replace Dutch troops being drawn off for the 'invasion armada'.[79] Two of the signatories to the Concert were related to George and he knew both of them well: his uncle Ernst August, duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg and his brother-in-law John George III, elector of Saxony. It may well be that George considered himself, and was thought of by others, as an informal member of this group.[80] In terms of dealing with France, George believed that 'Protestant princes and all of Germany are currently of one opinion and

[77] W. Young, *International Politics and Warfare in the Age of Louis XIV and Peter the Great* (Lincoln, NE, 2004), p. 222.
[78] H. Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany:1648-1840* (3 vols. Princeton, NJ, 1982), ii, 94; D. Detwiler, *Germany: A Short History* (3rd edition, Carbonade, IL, 1999), p. 90; Troost, *William III, the Stadholder King*, p. 198; P. Wilson, *German Armies: War and German Society, 1648-1806* (London, 2002), pp. 89, 98, 183-4.
[79] Israel, 'The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution', pp. 105-62.
[80] J. Childs, *The Nine Years' War and the British Army, 1688-1697: The Operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester, 1991), p. 22.

one conscience', echoing the language he used in his letter to King James II.[81] The religious element was certainly a key motivating factor for George, as he perceived Protestantism as being under attack; in England and continental Europe. But George was a military man, and his political outlook was undoubtedly informed by his background as a soldier and his sense of *realpolitik.* Although in his published letter to King James the Prince stated that he was simply defending the Protestant religion and not threatening the position of James as king, in reality his actions following the invasion undermined James completely. Even if Parliament were to be recalled there were no guarantees that James would agree to support William militarily in Europe, and with this in mind George decided to go against him. There is no evidence to suggest that George's behaviour was influenced by his brother; quite the opposite in fact.[82] Nonetheless having William as king would benefit Christian and the German princes. A change in leadership would also protect and advance international Protestantism, a cause George wholeheartedly supported. To halt French aggression in Europe William needed parliamentary backing in England. In fulfilling this ambition, he benefited from the active support of George; a man who understood the Dutch position completely.

Jonathan Israel has convincingly argued that the States General supported William's invasion as they needed financial help in their struggle against Louis XIV. By 1688 the Dutch believed that war with France was inevitable. If the Republic remained in a defensive position there was a strong possibility that an Anglo-French alliance would be formed and their combined

[81] DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3: Prins Jørgen: Forskelligt (1665-1683) 20: letter from Prince George to von Plessen, dated 11 January 1689 [NS]; Contemporary correspondence in England refers to a 'League of Princes' allying themselves to William of Orange to 'protect the Protestant religion' see Northampton Record Office, IS. 1429, Letter to Sr. Justinian Isham, 18 November, 1688; London, B[ritish] L[ibrary], Mackintosh Collections, ADD MSS 34, 487 fo. 35, newsletter to the Countess of Suffolk, 13 November 1688 here the correspondent speaks of William of Orange and 'a league with some of ye princes…of ye Protestant religion'.
[82] *HMC. Seventh Report,* p.422. See the correspondence between the British Representative in Denmark, Sir Gabriel de Sylvius, to various correspondents in London expressing 'the good will of the Danish court to King James', although they [the Danish court] 'refrain from expressing an opinion on the conduct of Prince George until they hear the exact truth about it'.

military forces would overwhelm the Republic.[83] As Israel has demonstrated the States General and States of Holland voted to support the invasion in order to crush late Stuart absolutism, turn England into a parliamentary monarchy, and in so doing, transform Britain into 'an effective counter-weight' to the 'over mighty power of France'.[84] The way William behaved once he entered London in December 1688 suggests a fierce determination on his part to secure support for his struggle against France.[85] Correspondence uncovered in Denmark, between George and Christian V and also between George and von Plessen strongly suggests that George was well-disposed to William's overall aims. While no monarch of the early modern period would openly condone overthrowing another prince, there is evidence to suggest that for strategic reasons, Christian was not unsympathetic to his brother's position. This is confirmed in a letter George sent to Christian V on 21 December 1688 explaining why he joined the Revolution.[86] George believed that James II's advisers had been set on the downfall of 'religion and [the] country' and feared that he would be 'enveloped in their ruin.'[87] The emphasis on religion accords with the letter George sent to James II, where he speaks of his concern for 'the Protestant religion in Europe.'[88] Alluding to his defection George went onto say to his brother that both 'my conscience and my interest demanded this behaviour on my part'.[89] Again this relates to the Protestant religion, and 'my interest' refers to his dynastic concerns in England, and arguably, in the German principalities and Denmark. More importantly, it is clear from the letter that George was fully conversant with William's intentions. George goes on to say that once Parliament was called '…and [had] brought the local confused situation in hand, measures will be taken against

[83] Israel, 'The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution', pp. 105-62.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid.
[86] DNA, 86724, Kongehuset Christian 5 (1677-1699), Regnskabsoversigter 4: letter from George to Christian V, 21 December 1688 [NS]. I would like to thank Professor Sebastian Olden-Jørgensen, University of Copenhagen, for telling me of the existence of this letter.
[87] Ibid.
[88] *Prince George's Letter to the King* (London, 1688)
[89] DNA, 86724, Kongehuset Christian 5 (1677-1699), Regnskabsoversigter 4: letter from George to Christian V, 21 December, 1688 [NS].

France, whereby the Prince of Orange will acquire money and manpower', without a struggle.[90] These comments indicate William's intention to draw England into the war against France. Clearly George had access to information that most politicians in England were not privy to in December 1688. When writing to von Plessen, on 21 December 1688, and again on 11 January 1689 [NS], George was more forthright about his concerns and his intentions.[91] A postscript to the first letter expressed his anxiety over the security of Protestantism in Ireland and his concern that the activities associated with the Irish rebellion of 1641 might be repeated.[92] Large numbers of Protestants were supposedly slaughtered in 1641, and almost fifty years later, the rebellion retained a powerful hold on contemporary imaginations.[93] In the second letter George was awaiting the arrival of an unnamed person from Denmark and he stated that 'it will be a great satisfaction for me to hear at his arrival that the king is out of the alliance with France…for otherwise all the Protestant princes are now united'.[94] During this period William was trying to persuade Denmark and Sweden to join the Grand Alliance.[95] In the years following the Scanian War (1675-9) Christian had become disillusioned with France and was seemingly open to forming new coalitions, but only if he could continue to retain a powerful military presence in Scandinavia.[96] His priority early in 1689 was finding ways of off-loading the costs of maintaining one of the largest armies in Europe.[97] At the time William's strategic interests were compatible with Christian's policies and ambitions. Armed with the information George gave him, Christian initiated

[90] Ibid.
[91] DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3, Prins Jørgen 1665-1710 (20): George to von Plessen, 21 December, 1688 [NS]; George to von Plessen, 11 January 1689 [NS].
[92] DNA, 6741, George to von Plessen, 21 December 1688 [NS].
[93] E. Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Woodbridge, 2013); for the impact that memories of the rebellion had on later generations see the essays by Toby Barnard and Michael Perceval-Maxwell in: M.Ó,Siochrú, (ed.), *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s; essays in honour of Donal Cregan* (Dublin, 2001), pp. 20-43; 229-47.
[94] DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3, Prins Jørgen 1665-1710 (20) George to von Plessen, 11 January 1689 [NS].
[95] Young, *International Politics and Warfare*, p. 447; for a full assessment of William's diplomatic manoeuvring in Scandinavia, see S. Oakley, *William III and the Northern Crowns during the Nine Years War, 1689-97* (New York and London, 1987).
[96] Galster, *Danish Troops*, pp. 20-3.
[97] Galster, *Danish Troops*, pp. 76-7.

negotiations to hire out a large portion of his military to William and Mary.[98] Clearly George approved of these efforts and presumably with William's knowledge, sent information secretly to Christian and von Plessen in an attempt to secure the desired shift in allegiances. Those attempts would eventually fail, but the military negotiations, although tortuous, were successful, and 7,000 Danish troops strengthened Anglo-Dutch forces during the Irish campaign the following year. When von Plessen came to London in the spring of 1689 as envoy extraordinary, George played a part in facilitating the negotiations; a few months later, at considerable financial cost to himself, he helped William to settle the Treaty of Altona between Denmark and Sweden, thereby furthering William's plans for Scandinavia.[99] George also played a vital role in the Revolution itself. By participating with William, in what effectively was a short royal progress, running from 24 November until 11 December, when he left the Prince of Orange to travel to Oxford, George made his allegiances clear.

(New Section)

Ephemeral events such as royal and civic ceremonies, processions and entries, conveyed important non-verbal, socio-political messages on the location of power.[100] Ceremonies staged in urban communities, involving the monarch or members of their family, were especially potent. When a royal person participated in this form of activity, he or she communicated with their courtiers and the wider public through a visual language of gesture,

---

[98] Galster, *Danish Troops*, pp. 23, 77.

[99] Galster, *Danish Troops*, p. 81; R. Paley, 'George, Prince of Denmark', in R. Paley ed., *The History of Parliament: the House of Lords, 1660-1715* (Cambridge, 2016). I would like to thank Dr Paul Seaward, Director of the History of Parliament Trust, for allowing me to read the entry on George prior to publication; for details of the Treaty of Altona, see Young, *International Politics and Warfare*, pp. 447-8; Paley covers the financial cost to George.

[100] For an overview of royal ceremonies held in the palace setting see, Adamson, 'The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court, 1500-1700', pp. 7-42; for the use of ceremony by the later Stuarts see, Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*; for the importance of public ceremonies – with or without royals - in urban communities, see: P. Borsay, 'All the town's a stage': Urban Ritual and Ceremony, 1660-1800', in P. Clark ed., *The Transformation of English Towns, 1600-1800* (London, 1984), pp. 228-53; for a slightly later period, see the essays by Frank O'Gorman and Rosemary Sweet in J. Neuheiser and M. Schaich eds., *Political Rituals in Great Britain, 1700-2000* (Augsburg, 2006); for a detailed discussion of royal entries in the early modern period, see R. Malcom Smuts, 'Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: the English Royal Entry in London, 1485-1642', in A.L. Beier, D. Cannadine, J. Rosenheim eds., *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 65-93.

readily understood by contemporary audiences.[101] The king's body remained the most important component in royal ceremonial culture as this was 'the master symbol of the office', but in the absence of the monarch, junior members of the dynasty acted as the king's representative and functioned in the same manner.[102] Ceremonies involving members of a royal family were generally designed to enhance the authority of the monarch. Nonetheless, as the non-verbal messages transmitted in the performance of royal ceremony can shift, depending on where and how the event is staged and the conduct of the participants, progresses and the ceremonial that went with them, could be used for subversive purposes.[103] Political opposition is most obviously demonstrated through oral communication and printed texts, but dissent can also be expressed silently through the visual language of gesture. In the weeks following the invasion, ceremonies that involved royalty played an important role in undermining James, and validating William. During the first phase of the Revolution the Denmarks clearly demonstrated their opposition to the king to sizable audiences outside London, and through oral transmission and printed and written texts, their movements were publicised beyond the areas where they were politically active. To a certain extent Anne's involvement in the Revolution has already been noted by scholars, but in demonstrating dissent, George was equally vigorous.

---

[101] Adamson, 'The Making of the Ancien-Regime Court', pp. 7-43;for references to the importance of gesture see, pp. 27-28, 30, 33, 34; T. Vallance, 'The Captivity of James II: Gestures of Loyalty and Disloyalty in Seventeenth Century England', *Journal of British Studies* 48 (October 2009), pp. 848-58; J. Peacey, 'Disorderly Debates: Noise and Gesture in the 17th-Century House of Commons', *Parliamentary History* 32 (2013), pp. 60-78.

[102] D. Starkey, 'Representation through Intimacy: a Study in the Symbolism of Monarchy and Court Office in Early Modern England', in L. Lewis, ed., *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross Cultural Studies in Symbolism* (London, 1977), pp. 187-224; quote p. 189; K. Thomas, 'Introduction', in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg eds., *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 1-14; Vallance, 'Captivity of James II' pp. 848-58.

[103] M.J. Braddick, 'Introduction: The Politics of Gesture', in 'The Politics of Gesture: Historical Perspectives', *Past & Present Supplement 4* (2009), pp. 7-36; the most obvious examples of subversive progresses in the early modern period were those undertaken by James, duke of Monmouth, such as the one he embarked on in July 1680, to garner support as a potential heir to the throne. For details see, H. Clark, *His Grace the Duke of Monmouth Honoured in his Progress in the West of England…* (London, 1680); *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey into the West in a letter from an eye-witness thereof, to his correspondent in London* (London, 1680); T. Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (London, 2005), p. 188. Harris called Monmouth's journey a 'quasi –royal progress' but contemporary accounts of Monmouth's behaviour during his progress, and the way spectators describe his performances, suggests it was viewed as a royal progress.

William landed in Torbay on 5 November, 1688 and from the moment he arrived in England the Prince of Orange took great care over how he presented himself to spectators. When he made his unofficial entry into Exeter on 9 November, William rode into the city in a grand procession, designed to impress onlookers and project Orange power.[104] To further publicise the event a description of the Exeter entry was published soon afterwards.[105] But in many ways his entry into Exeter had been a disappointment. Royal entries were concerned with the enactment of authority, and despite the 'great acclamation of the people…no gentlemen, clergy or the mayor of the city' had joined him for his entry into Exeter.[106] The normal precedent when royal persons entered a city formally was for the mayor and aldermen to greet them dressed in their robes of office, bearing the city regalia. When Lord Mordaunt and Gilbert Burnet visited the mayor of Exeter, ahead of the royal party, they asked if he would meet William in the normal manner and 'govern the city under' the Prince of Orange.[107] Sir Thomas Jefford, who was then the mayor of Exeter, and an ardent supporter of James II, declined saying he had taken an oath to the king.[108] But aldermen such as Christopher Bale, who would later support William, also refused to recognise the authority of the Prince of Orange over Exeter.[109] Hans William Bentinck, later to be earl of Portland and the main organiser of the Dutch invasion, attributed this declaration of loyalty to James by Jefford and others, to anxiety over the consequences of Monmouth's failed rebellion in 1685, as on that occasion royal retribution had been swift and brutal. Bentinck referred to this problem in a letter to Admiral Herbert, noting that 'fear of the scaffold [was having] more affect on their

[104] *A True and Exact Relation of the Prince of Orange His Publick Entrance into Exeter* (December, 1688)
[105] Ibid.
[106] Pincus, *1688*, pp. 242, 557, n.55. Quote is on p. 242.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] E. Cruickshanks, S. Handley, D.W. Hayton eds., *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1690-1715* (5 vols. Cambridge, 2002), iii, 124.

spirits than zeal for religion'.[110] It was only on the 15 November, that men of political consequence in the south west began to come over to the Orange side. When they did so, William told them that he had no need of their 'military assistance', only their 'countenance and presence' to justify his expedition and actions.[111]

Concern over the events of 1685 almost certainly played a part in the reluctance of the city authorities to acknowledge William when he came to Exeter. Nonetheless, swearing oaths was taken very seriously during this period, and whatever James II's policies, the mayor and aldermen were likely to remain loyal to the king. To strengthen his political position William needed to emphasise the consensual nature of his actions and encourage those in authority to transfer their allegiance to him. The presence of members of the English nobility and gentry such as the Earl of Shrewsbury in the Orange entourage helped, but in a hierarchical and deeply deferential society, it would be much easier to persuade people with political power and authority in the provinces, to join William, if he attracted royal support. Early demonstrations of dynastic unity were essential if William were to maintain political credibility and further undermine James. The defection of Prince George to the Orange-Stuart side was crucial in that respect, and from the moment he deserted James, George gave William his 'countenance and presence'. Arguably, his presence proved to be the most powerful of those travelling with William through Dorset and Wiltshire.

As the first royal defector in England, George of Denmark's desertion was of overriding importance. George was a prince of the blood, he exercised authority in his own right, and when he made ceremonial appearances in the provinces on his own in later years, 'the Prince'

---

[110] Letter from Bentinck to Herbert, 22 November 1688, cited by D. Onnekink, *The Anglo Dutch Favourite: the Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649-1709)*, (Aldershot, Burlington, VT, 2007), p. 56 n. 147.

[111] *The Speech of the Prince of Orange to some Principal Gentlemen of Somersetshire and Dorsetshire, on their coming to join His Highness at Exeter the 15th of November 1688* (London, 1688); Israel, 'the Dutch role in the Glorious Revolution', pp. 105-62.

attracted huge audiences.[112] These responses suggest George of Denmark was well-liked, and his popularity almost certainly helped William. But Prince George was also in a political partnership with Anne, and her input was crucial. Contemporary conventions regarding female behaviour and power relations within a marriage meant it would be difficult for Anne to act unless she operated in tandem with George. Indeed in the letter Anne left for Mary of Modena, explaining why she had left her father's court, Anne made it clear she was 'following' her husband, and subsequently this correspondence was published.[113] It was vital for Anne's reputation that she followed gender norms within a marriage, especially when she was going against her father. James II certainly understood the political and social implications of his son-in-law leaving his orbit, as did William. The day following George of Denmark's defection, James returned to London to reorder his court and discovered his daughter had absconded.[114] Meanwhile the Orange camp quickly advertised the defection of Prince George and members of the nobility through a printed broadside.[115] News of his defection also spread through correspondence networks and newsletters.[116] George played a part in publicising his defection, but to a broader, European audience. It was important for his personal reputation and the honour of the Oldenburg dynasty that he should clarify his reasons for joining William. George accordingly wrote to his brother explaining why he had defected.[117] A justificatory letter, seemingly written by George, had also been left for James

[112] See for instance the visit George made to Portsmouth in June 1702 when he first became Lord High Admiral: *London Gazette*, 1-4 June 1702:3815, 2-8 June 1702:3816; *Flying Post or the Post Master* 30 May-2 June 1702: 1103, 2-4 June 1702:1104; *Post Boy (1695*), 30 May-2 June 1702:1099; *Daily Courant*, 2 June 1702:38; *Post Boy* 4-6 June 1702: 1101; *English Post with News Foreign and Domestick*, 1-3 June 1702: 257, 5-8 June 1702: 259.
[113] *The Princess Anne of Denmark's Letter to the Queen* (London, 1688).
[114] Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 64-6.
[115] *A Catalogue of the Nobility and principal Gentry (said to be) in Arms with the Prince of Orange, and in several other parts of the country* (London, 1688).
[116] BL. ADD MSS 34487 (Mackintosh Collections), Newsletters, fo. 38, 40; BL. ADD MSS 4194 (Ellis Correspondence), Newsletters, f.428; BL. 29563 (Hatton Finch Papers: General Correspondence, 1688-89), fo. 340, letter from J. Smithsby to Christopher, Lord Viscount Hatton, 27 November, 1688; *Ellis Correspondence*, i, 336-341.
[117] DNA, 86724, Kongehuset Christian 5 (1677-1699), Regnskabsoversigter (4) George to Christian V, 21 December 1688 [NS].

and this was published in England.[118] Framed in terms of his commitment to international Protestantism the letter was a powerful piece of propaganda for the Williamite cause. Prince George arranged for this letter to be translated into German and he sent a copy to Denmark.[119] The letter was soon published in German and Dutch, although the impression from the correspondence on this issue is that publication was initiated in England rather than Denmark.[120] George's presence in the Orange entourage was further emphasised visually. William and George travelled together; riding side by side, and when they stayed overnight anywhere, would occasionally be seen entering buildings together, even if they were sleeping in separate quarters.[121] Demonstrating unity was especially important when the Orange party entered Salisbury on 4 December as this was the largest town they had entered, since William had left Exeter.

According to James Whittle, a chaplain in William's army, 'the manner of [William's] entrance into [Salisbury] was far more glorious than that of Exeter'.[122] This was due to the fact that unlike Exeter, the Mayor and Aldermen of Salisbury, dressed 'in all their formalities' and accompanied by large crowds, welcomed William and George at the Bishop's Palace.[123] The next day the royal party dined in public.[124] Although the numbers of the gentry and nobility that were following William had undoubtedly increased since the Orange party had left Exeter, it is likely the mayor and alderman decided to greet William

[118] *Prince George's Letter to the King* (London, 1688); DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3: Prins Jørgen 1665-1710 (20), letter from George to von Plessen, 21 December, 1688 [NS].
[119] Ibid.
[120] DNA, 86741, Kongehuset Frederik 3, Prins Jørgen 1665-1710 (20), letter from George to von Plessen, 21 December 1688; *Brieff des Printz Georg an den Köning [Etiliche Englishe Schiften]* (place of publication unknown, 1689); *Twee brieven aan den Koning van England, de eene van Prince George, ende andere van den Lord Churchill, en een brief van de Princesse Anna…* [translated from the English] (Amsterdam, 1688).
[121] J. Whittle, *An Exact Diary of the Late Expedition of His Illustrious Highness, the Prince of Orange…* (London, 1689), pp. 42, 45-6.
[122] Whittle, *Diary*, p. 46.
[123] Whittle, *Diary*, p. 46; S. Singer, ed., *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon…with the Diary of Lord Clarendon* (2 vols. London, 1828), ii, 215*;* Pincus, *1688*, p. 244.
[124] C. Huygens Jr, *Journaal van Constantijin Huygens, den Zoon: van October 1688 tot 2 Sept. 1696*, (4 vols., Utrecht, 1867), i , see entries for 14-16 December, 1688, 36-7, accessed April 2011, at http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/huyg007jour02_01/ . I would like to thank Marlous Hembrecht for translating Huygens entries into English; Whittle, *Diary*, p. 46.

and George formally, in deference to George being there rather than William. As the son and brother of hereditary monarchs, Prince George was of higher status than William.[125] More importantly, James II and his family had a long standing association with Salisbury and since Prince George was an established member of the Stuart court in England, the city aldermen already knew him. He had visited the city with Anne in 1683 while accompanying Charles II on a progress in the West Country.[126] In 1684 and 1686, as part of two other royal progresses, George had accompanied James on visits to Salisbury, which included formal entries into the city.[127] During the 1684 visit, James and George had been 'pleased to favour' Salisbury 'by attesting their freedoms of [the] city'; the royal duo also accepted a 'treate of sweetmeats and wyne' at the 'Councell House and they were regaled with poetry at the Bishop's Palace.[128] Ceremonial precedent would normally dictate that in the absence of the king the most senior royal representative present should occupy the central position during an entry. Custom would normally demand this should be George. All those participating in the procession, on 4 December 1688 along with those witnessing it, would have known the ceremonial precedent for a royal entry, especially as James – possibly with George - had entered the city formally a few weeks earlier.[129] On this occasion, however, William adopted the principal position; George rode on his right hand side, the Duke of Ormonde on his left, so they acted as William's supporters.[130] The Prince of Orange had taken the king's place.

---

[125] Gregg, *Anne*, p. 37.
[126] WSA, G23/1/235, Calendars of Mayors and Brief Notes of Memorable Events [seven parts], part 4, one of the entries for 1683; Somerset, *Queen Anne*, p. 44.
[127] See below.
[128] WSA, G23/1/17, Corporation Minutes, 1683-1708 (unpaginated), see the entries for 2 August and 15 September, 1684 and the entry for 2 August, 1686; WSA, G 23/1/4 City Ledgers D 1640-1723, fo. 264 v; WSA, G 23/1/47, Account Rolls, 1683-1712, see the entries for 1683-4 and the extraordinary payment for 'treating the royal party; *A Copy of verses presented to His Royal Highness at the Lord Bishop of Salisbury's on Monday the 15th of this instant September, 1684: to the illustrious and high born prince, James Duke of York, and George, Prince of Denmarke* (London, 1684).
[129] WSA, G23/1/235, part 2, entry for 19 November, 1688; *London Gazette*, 19-22 November 1688: 2402.
[130] Whittle, *Diary*, p. 46.

Those familiar with the etiquette of royal ceremony in the localities, certainly the mayor and the aldermen in Salisbury who turned out in their official robes and chains of office and greeted William and George on their arrival, but many in the crowd too, would have understood the significance of this processional arrangement. In early modern Europe processions were the most important display of powerful individuals in public space, and were the external manifestation of their authority.[131] Royal entries into towns and cities initiated civic pageantry that expressed both the independence of the city and their loyalty to the ruling prince.[132] These processions also articulated the hierarchical structure of elite society and were taken very seriously by those taking part.[133] To make an entry in the manner described above meant that all the participants, and many of those watching the procession on the streets of Salisbury, recognised William's authority, albeit temporarily, over and above that of the king's. This was an important and powerful shift. The ceremonies that took place in Salisbury added weight to the Orange cause and helped to legitimise William's activities.[134] We can only speculate on the effect it had on James but for a man who regularly went on progresses and trusted in the loyalty and support of his people, it was almost certainly a major blow.[135] From his comments following his entry into Exeter this was exactly the sort of political approbation William wanted. Unsurprisingly, the event was immediately publicised in a broadside entitled *Great News from Salisbury.*[136] This made no mention of George, but his absence from this publication should not be taken to mean he was unimportant, only that the representational focus had to be centred on William, and because

[131] M. Pollak, *Cities at War in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2010), p.235.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Smuts, 'Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma', pp. 65-93; the choreography of processions could cause friction, as exampled by the row between the Earl of Argyll and the Earl of Tullibardine on 16 November 1697, over precedence, while officers of arms were marshalling horses and carriages into line in Greenwich Park ready for William's formal entry into London. In the end William settled the dispute. For details of the 1697 incident, see London, C[ollege] o[f] A[rms] MSS, M.3bis (Ceremonial), f. 27.
[134] The mayor and aldermen welcomed William and George, but there is no evidence to suggest that the mayor presented his mace to the royal princes.
[135] Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p. 301
[136] *Great News from Salisbury, the Sixth of December, 1688* (London, 1688)

of her ranking in the royal family, Princess Anne. Anne was progressing in the Midlands at the same time as George was travelling with William and her activities were publicised in a similar manner. At James's moment of greatest political need, instead of remaining with him and demonstrating dynastic unity and political strength, his family had given their support to William of Orange. It can be no coincidence that a week after newspaper reports and broadsides advertising their defections were published, James II went into exile. Without uttering a recorded word in public against the king, George and Anne had aided the collapse of their father's regime.

Prince George had played a secret role in the run up to William's invasion. Now his allegiances were in the open he played a vital part in legitimising the Revolution by continually demonstrating dynastic unity with William. Almost a week after the entry in to Salisbury George travelled to Oxford to be reunited with his wife. The University of Oxford had a powerful position within the realm of national ecclesiastical affairs and in the late 1680s became the main battle-ground for religious conflicts, most especially the struggle over the imposition of Catholics on Oxford Colleges. Originally a dynastic gathering had been planned at the University, with Anne, George and William appearing together to demonstrate their unanimity and reassure clergymen.[137] In the event, James fled to France and was apprehended in Faversham, and William pressed onto London. Meanwhile Anne and George, travelling separately made their way to Oxford as planned. Anne was greeted there as a heroine and sizeable amounts were spent by the university, in entertaining Anne and George during the few days they were in residence.[138] Once the Revolution Settlement had been signed and the joint monarchy arranged, George and Anne continued to display family unanimity. This was important as until Mary arrived from the United Provinces, George and

[137] Oxford, Bodleian, MSS English History C6, fo. 124L letter from Oxford, 12 December 1688.
[138] University of Oxford Archives, Compvtvs Vice-Con: AD 1666-AD1697, WP B 21, Entry for the year 1687-1688 'entertainment for the Prince and Princess of Denmarke at Christ Church £327.3s.2d'. Gregg claims that the university spent £1,000 but there is no evidence to support that claim, see Gregg, *Anne*, p. 68.

Anne remained the highest ranking members of the royal family resident in England. Even after Mary's arrival, it was important that George and Anne continued to cooperate, to project a powerful vision of dynastic harmony and help consolidate the new regime. Although the Denmarks were a potent political partnership, George wielded power in his own right and he continued to strengthen William's and Mary's position in England and the continent.

George was handsomely rewarded for his support during the Revolution. Just before the Coronation William made George Duke of Cumberland, and to ensure he could vote in the House of Lords, a Naturalisation Act was rushed through Parliament.[139] A dukedom gave George tangible political power, and the fact he was introduced into the House so quickly – on 20 April, nine days after the coronation - suggests that William saw his brother-in-law as an important ally in his attempts at securing parliamentary support for military action. During the Restoration Parliaments the Duke of York had represented Charles II's interests, and perhaps William thought George would function in a similar manner.[140] Certainly in the early years of William's reign, George attended Parliament frequently, was appointed to the committees for privileges and petitions and three select committees, and although we lack information on how he voted on many key issues, it seems likely that he supported bills that advanced the war effort.[141] However, the political relationship between William and George was different from the one James and Charles had enjoyed. The king could not entirely depend on George for political support, as evidenced by him consistently voting in favour of the bill 'touching free and impartial Proceedings in Parliament' (otherwise known as the Place Bill) during the 1692-3 session, and on 3 January 1693, heading a group that registered

[139] The Act received the royal assent on 6 April 1689.
[140] A. Swatland, *The House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II* (1996), p. 94.
[141] For George of Denmark's attendance in Parliament during William's reign, see: *Journal of the House of Lords* (62 vols. London, 1767-1830), xiv, 1689: 185-327, 1690: 458-604, 1691:625-628; xv, 1692:226, 1693:330-389, 1694:508, 1695:629 -691, 1696:731; xvi, 1698:385, 1699:494, 1700:616; R. Paley, 'George, Prince of Denmark', in R. Paley ed., *The History of Parliament: the House of Lords, 1660-1715* (Cambridge, 2016). Aside from a drop in attendance in early 1690, Ruth Paley has estimated that from 1689-94, George attended between seventy five and eighty five per cent of sitting days.

their protest at the bill's rejection.[142] Anne and George had their own political agenda, and at a time when the Denmarks were increasingly hostile to the court, this form of opposition to William's interests can be construed as George acting on Anne's behalf in Parliament; a pattern of political behaviour that is certainly discernible once Anne had acceded to the throne and George became Prince Consort.[143] Nonetheless, whether in opposition to the king or not, the needs of dynasticism, allied with long-standing customs, affected the presentation of the monarch and their family when attending Parliament. The way royals were seated in the House of Lords meant that George sat next to the king if they were present in the chamber together; a positioning that further emphasised dynastic unity. A contemporary Dutch print showing William and George sitting together in the House of Lords, with a key that made their placement clear to viewers, suggests these elements were significant in Europe too, at least in the United Provinces where political support for William and the invasion was contingent on restoring parliamentary monarchy.[144] The promotion of a fledging Protestant monarchy involved all members of the royal family resident in England, and George of Denmark also helped to strengthen its religious standing.

Following the passing of the Act of Toleration, 1688 George continued to worship as a Lutheran; mostly in his private apartments at St James Palace, although following its consecration in 1696, occasionally at the Danish Church in Wellclose Square where George

---

[142] E. Cruickshanks, D. Hayton, D. Jones, 'Divisions in the House of Lords on the Transfer of the Crown and Other Issues, 1689-94: Ten New Lists', in C. Jones and D.L. Jones eds., *Peers, Politics and Power: in the House of Lords, 1603- 1911* (London, 1986), pp. 79-110; Paley, 'George, Prince of Denmark', in R. Paley, ed., *The History of Parliament: the House of Lords, 1660-1715* (Cambridge, 2016).

[143] For examples of George acting as Anne's informal proxy once he was Consort, see C. Jones and G. Holmes eds., *The London Diaries of William Nicholson Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-118* (1985), p. 138 and n. 142; Gregg, *Anne*, p. 163, for his vote on the Occasional Conformity Bill, 1702; G.M. Ditchfield, D Hayton, C. Jones eds., *British Parliamentary Lists, 1660-1800: a Register* (1995) p. 91, 6 December 1705, 'vote on whether the church was in danger'. George headed a group of 86 peers that voted 'it was not'; absence was also a useful political tactic in Parliament. For details on the way George acted over the vote on the second Occasional Conformity Bill, 1703, see: J. Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (2000), p. 290.

[144] London, British Museum, 1871, 0812.5241, Albeelding Vant Hooger Huys des Parlements van Engelant, etching with engraved details, by Jacob Gole c. 1689; Windsor, the Royal Collection, RCIN 702259.

had donated the pulpit and kept a private pew.[145] In 1699, as a reward for his continuing politico-religious support, William gave permission for George to open a Lutheran chapel at St James's Palace.[146] The move to a formal chapel benefited George on a personal level, but also had representational value for the new regime. By worshipping openly as a Lutheran within the palace, Prince George further endorsed the policy of religious toleration advocated by the new regime; a policy that chimed with his own religious beliefs. Indeed the promotion of Protestantism was the cornerstone of George's patronage. Henrich Ludolf had been Secretary of Foreign Affairs for George, but following his resignation from that post in 1692 until George's death in 1708, George continued to pay Ludolf a sizable annual stipend, thereby quietly supporting many of his missionary efforts such as those in Russia and the eastern Mediterranean.[147] George was certainly useful to the new king, religiously and politically, especially at the beginning of the reign when William needed to bolster his authority, as evidenced by the Prince accompanying William on an important visit to Cambridge in November 1689.[148] But in terms of consolidating the new regime, George played a role of far greater significance when he accompanied William to Ireland to face their father-in-law in battle.

In military terms the campaign in Ireland was relatively minor, but dynastically it was very important. As historians tend to down play dynastic politics in accounts of the Irish Wars, and have misinterpreted certain elements such as the seemingly odd travel arrangements for

[145] BL, ADD MSS 37232 fo. 100 'Accompts for the building etc. of the Danish Church in Well Close Square, London, 1696'; A. Spicer, 'Introduction: Lutheran Churches and Confessional Identity', in A. Spicer, ed., *Lutheran Churches in Early Modern Europe* (2012), pp. 1-16.
[146] D. Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England: Anthony William Boehm and the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge*, (Göttingen, 1988), pp. 49-50.
[147] M. Fundaminski. 'The Communications Networks of Halle Pietists in Russia', in P. Holtrop and H. Slechte eds., *Foreign Churches in St Petersburg and their Archives* (Leiden, Boston, MA, 2007), pp. 115-128; George of Denmark's activities as Consort will be the subject of a separate article.
[148] University of Cambridge, CU, U.Ac.1/6,ff.53-4, (Cambridge University Accounts: Vouchers), fos.53-4, rest is unpaginated; *London Gazette*, 10-14 October 1689:2496; C.H. Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge (*v vols. Cambridge, 1852), iv, 9-10.

William and George as they journeyed to war, the vital role Prince George played in Ireland has been lost.[149] Relying on the evidence provided by Sarah, duchess of Marlborough, written years after the events concerned, from her own rather jaundiced perspective, can create a false impression. Scholars often use the sort of personal elements described by Sarah as evidence of George being redundant on the Irish campaign. Yet there is no reason to think William and George liked each other particularly, and at least one military historian has characterised George as a 'senior commander' during the time he participated in the campaign in Ireland.[150] Political pragmatism, allied with their experience of active combat, ensured William and George worked together effectively. When William decided to take command of allied forces in Ireland he was far from being secure as king. The Revolutionary settlement was barely a year old, politics remained fractious and difficult in Britain, and Jacobites repeatedly reminded audiences that William had led a rebellion against 'the rightful and virtuous king'.[151] Dynastic anxiety was also felt on the continent. William's position as king was contested by several European powers and this had a bearing on the way he operated as a monarch, even in the field.[152] Supported by his illegitimate sons, and an impressive array of high ranking French and Irish army officers, James II had made a direct attack on William's authority as monarch, where James commanded his highest levels of support.[153] Politically, William was in the weaker position, and in a battle that pitted one part of a royal family against another, he needed dynastic reinforcement from George. That is not to say that William *wanted* George there, as he preferred to operate independently, but as the

[149] Gregg, *Anne*, pp. 79-80; Winn, *Queen Anne* p. 142; in Europe when setting off on military campaigns it was not unusual for royal commanders to travel with officers from their regiments, rather than other princes. At other times George travelled in the same coach as William; for example during William's entry into London in 1697.
[150] J. Childs, *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1689-1691* (New York, London, 2007), p. 206.
[151] C. Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999), p.28.
[152] J. Farguson, 'Art, Ceremony and the British Monarchy, 1689-1714', (Univ. of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2013), chapter 2.
[153] BL ADD MSS 38146, Letter book of Robert Southwell, 1690, fos.90-91 Southwell wrote in a letter to Nottingham, dated 22 June 1690, that the Duke of Berwick, two French Lieutenant Generals and the Duke of Tyrconnel were with James; M. Glozier, *The Huguenot Soldiers of William of Orange and the Glorious Revolution of 1688: the Lions of Judah* (Brighton, 2008) see chapter 7 for details of the campaign in Ireland; Harris, *Revolution*, pp. 422-476.

only other male member of the family, his presence was necessary. The dynastic element was also important for Denmark. As already mentioned, Christian V provided thousands of troops for the Irish campaign, and the expectation in the seventeenth-century was that the ruling prince would be a visible presence on the battlefield; whether they actually fought or not was largely irrelevant. Ferdinand Wilhelm, duke of Württemberg-Neustadt had overall command of Danish troops in Ireland, but in representational terms George acted as Christian's proxy.[154] In keeping with royal residential arrangements when at home in England, George had separate quarters from William, but at times the two men patrolled enemy lines together to ensure the opposing side could see they were acting in unison; the *London Gazette* also made it known that William and George fought side-by-side at the Battle of the Boyne.[155] The presence of Prince George of Denmark on the battlefield ensured Danish troops could see their Prince before they engaged in combat; an important means of rallying soldiers prior to battle. The Danish component of the confederate army included George's own regiment from Denmark, commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel von Øretzen.[156] While George was in Ireland he wrote to his brother, from Belfast and Dublin, with news of the campaign, including a full account of the Battle of the Boyne.[157] At this key moment promoting dynastic unity was of paramount importance, and while George assisted William and Christian V in Ireland, Anne moved in to Whitehall Palace to be with Mary, and in a show of dynastic unison, while their husbands were away, they attended a military review together at Blackheath.[158] Behind the scenes, however, cracks in the personal relationship between Mary and Anne were starting to appear.

---

[154] P. Wilson, *War, State and Society in Württemberg, 1677-1793* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 113. Ferdinand's brother - Carl Rudolph - also played a part in the Irish campaign.
[155] *London Gazette*, 7-10 July 1690: 2573; K.H. Galster, *Danish Troops in the Williamite Army, 1689-91: For King and Coffers* (2012), p. 122.
[156] Galster, *Danish Troops*, pp. 227-32.
[157] DNA, 86724, Kongehuset, Christian 5: Regnskabsoversigter (1670-1699) 4: letter from George to Christian, dated 8 July 1690; the 'Relation' of the Battle is undated, but sits with the previous letters in this box; BL ADD MSS 38146, Letter book of Sir Robert Southwell, 690 fos. 93b-95b. The letter from Belfast appears to be lost.
[158] Winn, *Queen Anne*, pp. 171-2.

The relationship between Anne and Mary broke down completely in the autumn of 1692 and in October of that year, Luttrell noted the Denmarks were not invited to an important event in the city of London that in previous years the whole royal family had attended.[159] Despite these tensions, George maintained cordial relations with all his extended family and occasionally 'the Queene and the Prince of Denmark' went to the theatre together, William granted him audiences at Whitehall and throughout this period both men were closely involved in the Chapter meetings and ceremonies associated with the Order of the Garter.[160] After Mary's death in December 1694, William needed dynastic support from the Denmarks and once again George and Anne were involved in William's court. For George this meant attending meetings of the Privy Council, and the two men joined forces to review troops in Hyde Park; there was even talk of George joining William on his summer campaign in Flanders.[161] Family relationships were undoubtedly fraught and difficult from 1692 onwards, but as far as possible the public persona of the post-Revolution monarchy had to be one of unity. Crucially, in February 1696, following the discovery of a Jacobite plot to assassinate William, George publically endorsed his brother-in-law by signing the Association, acknowledging him as the 'right and lawful king'.[162] After the plot had been uncovered, hundreds of suspected Jacobites were rounded up, and eight were convicted of treason and executed. A ninth, Sir John Fenwick, was attainted by parliament and beheaded in January 1697.[163] Again, in an important show of dynastic unity George voted in favour of Fenwick's

[159] Luttrell, ii, 603, the event Luttrell refers to is the grand dinner held at Guildhall at the end of Lord Mayor's day, 1692. Previously when William and Mary attended this event Anne and George were also invited, and travelled with the royal party in a spectacular water-borne cavalcade from Parliament to the city. For full details see *London Gazette*, 28-31 October 1689: 2501

[160] COA, O/G (C) 2, Garter Registers, Volume II, 1666-1790, pp. 3,4,6,7,8,9; COA, O/G (C) 53 Garter Ceremonies, pp. 2,3,9,12-13,15-17; Luttrell, ii, 600; Goldie ed., *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice* (VI vols. Woodbridge, 2007), v, 314; J. Winn, *Queen Anne*, p. 164.

[161] Farguson, Art, Ceremony and the British Monarchy, p. 127.

[162] R. Paley, 'George, Prince of Denmark', in R. Paley ed., *The History of Parliament: the House of Lords, 1660-1715* (Cambridge, 2016).

[163] Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp. 52-3.

attainder.[164] These public demonstrations of support were important as aided by the French, the exiled court in St Germain was an ever present threat to the Stuart-Orange dynasty, and it was in the interests of all concerned that the post-Revolution monarchy should survive.

Prince George of Denmark was crucial to the success of the Revolution since by virtue of his high royal status, he wielded considerable political authority. To a certain extent Anne's politico-religious activities in the Glorious Revolution have already been noted by scholars, but George of Denmark's have been neglected. This article has gone some way towards addressing that gap. When James became king, George provided dynastic support, but in a complete reversal, from around 1686 he began using his political power to promote Stuart-Oldenburg aims: the long-term security of the Church of England and a Protestant succession. Judging by George's correspondence to his confidants in Denmark and his patronage of key individuals such as von Plessen and Henrich Ludolf, he also wanted to curb the power of France and promote Protestantism internationally, thereby protecting the interests of the German principalities and perhaps aiding a shift in Danish foreign policy as sought by von Plessen. His actions also meant that George was protecting the 'Protestant religion in Europe' as set out in his letter to James II. On these issues George was more closely allied to William than James II, and this article inevitably contests assessments that cast the events of 1688-9 as a modern, English Revolution.[165] In an age when foreign affairs were viewed, 'as much in dynastic as national terms', a Danish prince living in England could pursue his own interests and those of his extended family in the international arena.[166] If George had remained with James II, Anne was unlikely to have acted alone. George was important, but Anne's defection played a crucial role in undermining James, politically and emotionally, and almost certainly

[164] R. Paley, 'George, Prince of Denmark', in R. Paley ed., *The History of Parliament: the House of Lords, 1660-1715* (Cambridge, 2016).
[165] Pincus, *1688*.
[166] R. Briggs, *Early Modern France, 1560-1715* (Oxford, 1977), p. 149; Adamson, 'The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court', pp. 7-42, especially 39-40.

informed his decision to leave England. It is also reasonable to question whether William could have entered London so easily if James had remained at Whitehall Palace with his queen consort and the rest of his family. Once the invasion had taken place, the Revolution was to a large extent driven by reactions in the localities, and George gave the revolutionary process powerful momentum. In a hierarchical society where deference prevailed, seeing George of Denmark and William together as they journeyed through the West Country may have emboldened others to join the Revolution: the same is true of Anne's progress in the Midlands, although the direct effects are impossible to calculate. What we can say with certainty is that the Denmarks' contribution to the Revolution was applauded at the time of the invasion and for years afterwards. Their involvement was mentioned in parliamentary debates, contemporary histories, and occasionally in sermons.[167] But as the first royal defector, George of Denmark's involvement was considered especially important. When George died in 1708 a dozen or more sermons commemorating his death were published, and all of them describe, in varying levels of detail, how George behaved in the 'late Revolution'.[168] From reading these we gain a powerful sense of the importance of his

[167] *Debates of the House of Commons from the Year 1667 to the year 1694, Collected by the Honble. Anchitell Grey, Esq., who was Thirty Years a Member* (10 vols., 1763), ix, pp. 490-510; J. Dunton, *The History of Living Men: Characters of the Royal Family, the Ministers of State and the principal Natives of the Three Kingdoms* (London, 1702), in the dedication Dunton extoled George for the 'part [he] acted in the Late Revolution' (unpaginated); A. Boyer, *The History of King William the Third. In III Parts* (III vols. 1702-3), ii, 1; C. Cotteril, *The Whole Life and Glorious Actions of Prince George of Denmark*… (London, 1708), pp. 4-5; L. Echard, *The History of England*, (III vols. London, 1718), iii, 917; I. Mauduit, *A Sermon on the Coronation of Her Most Excellent Majesty Queen Anne* (London, 1702), p. 17.

[168] D. Sturmy, *A Sermon Preach'd &c October 31st 1707 on the Death of His Royal Highness the Prince* (1708), p. 12, 13; D. Sturmy, *Serious Admonitions to Great Persons. Deliver'd November the 7th, 1708 in a Second Sermon on the death of His Royal Highness the Prince* (1708), p.4; P. Stubs, *The Sea Assize; or Sea Faring Persons to be Judged According to their Works. A Sermon Preach'd on Advent Sunday, November 28th, 1708 in the Oratory of the Royal Hospital Greenwich and in the Parish Church of St Mary Wolwich on occasion of the…death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark* (1709), p.22; T. Knaggs, *The Excellency of a Good Name: A Sermon Preach'd at St Giles Church in the Fields on…October 31, 1708. After the much Lamented Death of Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark*…(1708), p. 16; Tribbeko, *A Funeral Sermon,* pp. 3,5; W. Nicholls, *Afflictions, the Lot of God's Children being a Sermon Preach'd at the Parish Church of St James's Clerkenwell, October the 31st, 1707 upon the death of Her Majesty's Royal Consort, Prince George of Denmark* (1709), p.15;G. Dent, *A Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark, Preach'd at Westminster, November the 7th, 1708* (1708), p. 13; J. Davy, *Mortality and Mourning Consider'd in a Sermon Occasion'd by the Death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark…Preach'd at Croydon in Surrey November 21, 1708* (1708), p. 15; A. Boehm, *The Life of a Christian: A Sermon on the*

involvement in the Revolution in shaping his public reputation. John Davy extolled George for securing 'our religion, and other liberties, against an approaching deluge' and these sentiments were repeated time and again in sermons given by a diverse range of preachers.[169] Thomas Knaggs described George as 'a perfect pattern of Christianity' and lauded his 'Christian and military virtues'.[170] Revered for setting 'an illustrious example', George's behaviour during the Revolution together with his active Lutheranism, were crucial in the promotion of a fledgling Protestant monarchy, during the 1690s and when his wife became queen.[171] We should think of George and Anne as a political partnership, and rather than being led by others, they joined forces with William and Mary because they each had a distinct political agenda.

St Hilda's College Oxford JULIE FARGUSON

Occasion of the Death of His Royal Highness Prince George of Denmark….Preach'd in His Royal Highness's Chappel at St James's, on the 21st November…Now Done into English (1709), *passim*.
[169] Davy, *Mortality and Mourning Consider'd*, *pp*. 15-16.
[170] Knaggs, *The Excellency of a Good Name*, pp. 4, 16.
[171] Nicholls, *Afflictions, the Lot of God's Children*, p. 15.