

Negotiating the Grand Alliance

The role of the King-Stattholder's *corps diplomatique* in establishing a new alliance between 'Austria', the Dutch Republic and England, 1688 - 1690.

Student	M.B. Meerwijk
Student number	3410196
Supervisor	D.M.L. Onnekink
Course	OSIII: De Britse revoluties van 1688
Date	08 – 02 – 2011

Contents

Introduction	3
Chapter One: Origins of the Grand Alliance	9
Chapter Two: The Reception of the Glorious Revolution	17
Chapter Three: Chapter Three: The Austrian-Dutch Alliance and Grand Alliance	26
Conclusion	38
Literature and Sources	41

Introduction

The central theme in this thesis is diplomacy. Diplomacy conducted by the agents of the Dutch Stadtholder and English King William III of Orange-Nassau directly before and in the wake of the Glorious Revolution of 1688/1689. From the moment William set sail for England, the Dutch Republic and England became involved in the Nine Years War, making it a truly European-wide war. The Nine Years War was fought between 1688/1689 – 1696, principally between the members of the ‘Grand Alliance’ and France. This Grand Alliance was at first formed by Emperor Leopold I of the Holy Roman Empire – though in his capacity of ruler of ‘Austria’ –, the Dutch Republic and England. The main aim of this thesis is analysing the concluding of this alliance: from late in 1688 till 1690. This analysis will be based principally on the letters sent by three diplomats in the service of William III. A second aim of this thesis is to point out the importance of the international context – the European ‘side’ so to speak – of the Glorious Revolution.



The main issue of this thesis is to analyse the concluding of the Grand Alliance. The Grand Alliance was the outcome of two treaties; an Austrian-Dutch alliance, and a second treaty for the inclusion of England in the first alliance. These three nations formed the cornerstone for the Grand Alliance, which was joined, over time, by a large number of states. Bavaria, Brandenburg, Savoy and ‘Spain’ (including its Italian possessions and the Spanish Netherlands) were the most prominent states that joined the Grand Alliance.

The main source of information for this thesis is the information concerning the two treaties that was conveyed in the letters of William III’s diplomats. The envoys considered in this thesis are Jacob Hop, the Dutch envoy to the Emperor from November 1688 till July 1689; Lord Dursley (Charles Berkeley), English envoy to The Hague from October 1689 and minister at the ‘congress of allies’ held there from December 1689, and; Lord Paget (William Paget), also envoy to Leopold I from October 1689.¹ Their letters refer often to the alliance that is (to be) established. The letters address the wish and need to conclude such an alliance: between Austria, the Dutch Republic and England, as well as with other states. The letters

¹ Letters (and copies of letters) of these three diplomats are located, for Paget and Dursley, in the Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series (kept by the National Archives of the United Kingdom) for the Emperor and the Dutch Republic and, for Hop, in a letter book held by the Dutch National Archives.

address the problems that arise during the negotiations and ratifications of the (articles of the) treaties and their solutions.



The second aim of this thesis – highlighting the European ‘side’ of the Glorious Revolution – is mostly a point of view from which this thesis is written: that the Glorious Revolution is an international event. Looking into diplomacy at this moment is a way of highlighting the fact that the Glorious Revolution had a deep international impact and was part of international processes. This will be further illustrated by the available literature on diplomacy in the seventeenth century and the Nine Years War.

There is an extensive amount of literature on the regime change in England and several related issues. This literature mainly discusses the ‘domestic’ side of the Glorious Revolution: the internal processes taking place in England during the 1680s or the seventeenth century as a whole, William III’s role in the events, or an aspect of importance in the Revolution such as religion or the involvement of political parties (Whigs and Tories).²

However, there is a serious gap in scholarly literature when one wishes to look at the Glorious Revolution in a broader way. Some authors emphasize the influence of a specific state on England or the Glorious Revolution, but it is the interaction of several European states in the late seventeenth century that should come into view. Jonathan Israel, for example, discusses the role of ‘the Dutch’ in *The Anglo-Dutch moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact*.³ Steve Pincus’ *1688: The First Modern Revolution* examines French (and Dutch) influence on James II’s policy leading up to the Glorious Revolution.⁴ But how did these and other nations correspond to each other in the midst of rising international tensions of late seventeenth century Europe?

Also, it is important to place the Glorious Revolution in its context of the Nine Years War in which it took place. The Nine Years War – though starting before the Glorious

² Examples of these themes are: Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel en Nicholas Tyacke, *From persecution to toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford 1991); W.A. Speck, ‘The Orangist Conspiracy against James II’, *The Historical Journal* 30, 2 (1987) 453 – 462; J.H. Plumb, ‘The Elections to the Convention Parliament of 1689’, *Cambridge Historical Journal* 5, 3 (1937) 235 – 254; David Lewis Jones, *A parliamentary history of the Glorious Revolution* (Londen 1988); David Ogg, *England in the reigns of James II and William III* (Oxford 1955).

³ Jonathan I. Israel (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch moment, Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge 1991).

⁴ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven & London 2009).

Revolution – became a European-wide war only after William had left for England in November 1688 and the Dutch Republic and England joined in the war against France.

Scholarly literature that does have a more international approach to this period concerns itself with this war. Unfortunately the Nine Years War itself seems of relatively little interest to academic researchers as well. Perhaps this is because it was, as J. Childs states, a relatively defensive war. France was trying to hold on to its latest gains in territory while the Republic and England defended their liberty and territory as well as the recent political settlement in England.⁵ The war's conclusion, the treaty of Ryswick, appears to be the most investigated subject when it comes to international politics in the late seventeenth century.



In literature on the Nine Years War, the Glorious Revolution is hardly discussed at all; just as literature on the Glorious Revolution leaves out the international context of the Nine Years War. The recent study of Steve Pincus stresses the importance of looking at all aspects of the Glorious Revolution but leaves a blank space when it comes to international politics.⁶ It does however state – besides that it was a very widely spread, violent and ‘modern’ revolution – that there was “this nationalist context [against French influences in James’s reign and] ... that William and Mary, as king and queen of England, heeded their subjects’ call for war against Louis XIV”. Also: “[that] William enthusiastically accepted the Commons’ call to arms and declared war against France.”⁷ These and further statements are at least one step away from the more commonly accepted view that the Glorious Revolution imposed an unwanted war with France on England (and a step towards a more international approach). Pincus states that he “maintain[s] that there was a lively and vital debate among a wide range of English men and women of a variety of social classes about England’s proper role in European politics” but he does not go beyond mentioning this argument.⁸

A (very isolated) study connecting the Nine Years War and the Glorious Revolution is *King William’s European Joint Venture* by B. Cox.⁹ It seems to be somewhere in between a military-political analyses of the prelude to the Nine Years War, a hagiography of William

⁵ John Childs, *The Nine Years’ War and the British Army 1688 – 97: The operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester and New York 1991) 27 – 29.

⁶ Pincus, *1688*, 485 – 486.

⁷ *Ibidem*, 339 – 340.

⁸ *Ibidem*, 307.

⁹ B. Cox, *King William’s European Joint Venture* (Assen 1995).

III's struggle to form a truly European unity against France and an adventure novel. The emphasis lies on the joint action against Evil France by other European nations and the formation of this more unified approach. Fortunately, the study is not seriously impaired by its opinionated approach towards France and it is very useful in giving an overview of the main participants of the Grand Alliance (and, of course, its great adversary). Similarly themed is John Stapleton's dissertation *Forging a Coalition Army: William III, The Grand Alliance, and the Confederate Army in the Spanish Netherlands, 1688-1697*.¹⁰ Stapleton has examined William III's foreign policy and diplomacy in connection to the Grand Alliance and 'coalition warfare' in the Nine Years War.

D.B. Horn's *The British Diplomatic Service 1689 – 1789* gives a clear explanation of the workings of British diplomacy but does not deeply concern itself with specific debates or events.¹¹ Nor do Jeremy Black's *Trade, Empire and British Foreign Diplomacy, 1689 – 1815: the politics of a commercial state* or his *British Diplomats and Diplomacy, 1688 – 1800*.¹² M. Lane's study *The Diplomatic Service under William III.*, published in 1927, is in effect one of the most comprehensive studies examining how diplomacy was conducted under William III. Though it does not address the question of how specific issues were dealt with by diplomats; it is still a comprehensive general outline.¹³

Dutch literature on the Nine Years War and diplomacy in and after the Glorious Revolution is also scant. *Weensche Gezantschapsberichten van 1670 tot 1720* by G. von Antal consists mainly of a summation of the most interesting letters sent by Dutch envoys at Vienna.¹⁴ *Correspondentie van Willem III en van Hans Willem Bentinck, eersten Graaf van Portland* by Nicolaas Japikse is quite similar: a selection of the most interesting and important letters sent and received by William III and the Earl of Portland.¹⁵ D.J. Roorda's essay *Le*

¹⁰ John M. Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army: William III, The Grand Alliance, and the Confederate Army in the Spanish Netherlands, 1688-1697* (without place ('Ohio'?) 2003).

¹¹ D.B. Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service 1689 – 1789* (Oxford 1961).

¹² Jeremy Black, *Trade, Empire and British Foreign Diplomacy, 1689 – 1815: the politics of a commercial state* (Abingdon and New York 2007); Jeremy Black, *British Diplomats and Diplomacy, 1688 – 1800* (Exeter 2001).

¹³ M. Lane, 'The Diplomatic Service under William III' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th Series, 10th Vol. (1927), 87-109.

¹⁴ G. von Antal, *Weensche Gezantschapsberichten van 1670 tot 1720* 2 vols. (The Hague 1929 & 1934).

¹⁵ Nicolaas Japikse, *Correspondentie van Willem III en van Hans Willem Bentinck, eersten Graaf van Portland* part 2, vol. 3 (The Hague 1937).

Secret du Prince: Monarchale tendenties in de Republiek 1672 – 1702 discusses the workings of William III's diplomacy in the Dutch Republic.¹⁶



Initially, this thesis was supposed to look into the correspondence of one Dutch and two English diplomats in the service of William III to uncover how they proceeded at the courts they were allocated to, to explain and defend the events comprising the Glorious Revolution. It turns out, though, that primary sources discussing the conclusion of the Austrian-Dutch Alliance and Grand Alliance are both more numerous and more interesting. This initiated a turn in this thesis' subject. There is a relevant connection between these two subjects. The 'accepting' of the Glorious Revolution by William's allies – specifically the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire – and the concluding of the Grand Alliance partly go hand in hand. The 'defending' of the Glorious Revolution will therefore still be addressed.

Jacob Hop is an important source of information when it comes to the original subject of defending and explaining William's English adventure. Unfortunately there were no English ministers at important allied courts in Europe between February 1689 and late autumn of that year; a result of the Glorious Revolution. This is a gap of some eight months in which the most important subject in diplomatic correspondence had shifted from defending the Glorious Revolution towards the English inclusion in an alliance (between the Emperor and the Dutch Republic). So, no 'Foreign' Calendar of State Papers– English records of diplomatic correspondence – exist for this crucial period for the Republic, the Emperor and other states. Primary diplomatic sources discussing the English regime change are scattered.



The Glorious Revolution was never a singularly domestic revolution. It had everything to do with foreign relations, foreign policies, with diplomacy, with 'balances of power'. To better understand it, it has to be placed in the European context of the (route towards the) Nine Years War. It is important to impress this fact on those who wish to better understand the Glorious Revolution. This thesis will investigate diplomacy concerning the concluding of the Grand Alliance and in due course also point out that this international context was an inherent part of the Glorious Revolution.

The first chapter will begin by giving a clear outline of the European background in

¹⁶ D.J. Roorda, 'Le secret du Prince. Monarchale tendenties in de Republiek 1672-1702' in: A.J.C.M. Gabriëls, e.a. (red.), *Rond Prins en Patriciaat. Verspreide opstellen door D.J. Roorda* (Weesp 1984).

which the Glorious Revolution must be placed, as well as an outline of ‘diplomacy’ as conducted by William III. The second chapter will consider Jacob Hop’s first months at the court of the Emperor and his response to William’s expedition and the Glorious Revolution. In the correspondence of the three diplomats religious issues and difficulties are sometimes discussed. This religious aspect will be considered here as well, as it demonstrates the *relative* importance of religion at this time and its (sometimes difficult) position in foreign relations between a Catholic, a Calvinist and an Anglican nation. Lastly, the second chapter will consider the reactions of European princes to the Glorious Revolution. The third chapter will look deeply into the letters sent by Hop, Dursley and Paget discussing the forming of the Austrian-Dutch Alliance and the Grand Alliance.

Chapter One: Origins of the Grand Alliance

This chapter concerns itself with giving a comprehensive framework in which the subsequent analyses of primary sources must be placed. Firstly, it will give a quick sketch of political Europe in 1688/1689 as to better understand the situation in which the Glorious Revolution and the beginning of the Nine Years War must be seen. Secondly, it will turn to describing diplomacy as it was conducted under William III and ‘in general’ in seventeenth century England and (to some extent) the Dutch Republic.

Europe in 1688/1689

It seems best to begin this thesis with a brief sketch of how foreign policy in Europe was given shape in 1688/1689. Consequently, it will become clear in which context negotiations to the Grand Alliance and the diplomats that will be discussed must be placed. It could reasonably be argued that France was at the centre of much – foreign but also domestic – policy in Europe.. France was at this time, doubtless, the strongest state in Europe. Its King, Louis XIV, had an expansionist minded foreign ‘policy’ which threatened France’s neighbours.¹⁷ It should be noted that ‘policy’ is a term that should probably be used quite loosely when referring to seventeenth century politics and, indeed, is subjected to criticism by scholars. Some are of the opinion that seventeenth-century princes, or at least Louis XIV, governed on a more *ad hoc* basis or with relatively short term goals.¹⁸

The Spanish Netherlands, the Dutch Republic, (bordering) German states such as the Palatinate of the Rhine and Brandenburg, ‘the Holy Roman Empire’ (or at least the realms of its Emperor Leopold I), Savoy and the Spanish kingdoms all were or felt threatened by the ambitions of Louis XIV. Many German princes, at the instigation of the Dutch Stadtholder William III and the Emperor, formed the League of Augsburg in 1686 – which is sometimes described as a predecessor of the Grand Alliance – to counter French expansion.¹⁹ During the reign of James II (1685 – 1688/89), the kingdoms of England, Ireland and Scotland, became French allies in all but name. It was the Glorious Revolution of 1688/1689 which turned these states against France, joining in a ‘Grand Alliance’ against France under their new monarchs, William III and Mary II.

¹⁷ Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany, 1648 – 1840* (Princeton and Chichester 1964) 96; Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 37 – 39.

¹⁸ John Childs, *The Nine Years’ War*, 7.

¹⁹ Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 64, 147.

This regime change prevented the possibility of another ‘disaster year’ for the Dutch Republic such as in 1672 – in which France and England brought the Dutch Republic to its knees – and reinforced the alliance against France. War between France and the electorates of the Palatinate of the Rhine, Trier, Mainz and Cologne as well as the Emperor commenced in the autumn of 1688.²⁰ It was the beginning of the Nine Years War (evidently lasting till 1697) which was ended by the Treaty of Ryswick. It was the expedition to England of William III that was the direct cause for Louis XIV to declare war on the Dutch Republic.²¹ By the end of 1688, the Emperor, the Dutch Republic and various German principalities were at war with France. During 1689 and 1690 Spain, Savoy and other states declared war against France as well.²² Louis XIV had not expected his invasion of the Rhine Palatinate to have such heavy consequences: all of his neighbours uniting against him. What was intended as a short campaign became a long and costly war.



It is relevant to point out the existence of a ‘religious factor’ in foreign diplomacy and in the Glorious Revolution. William III’s invasion of England in 1688 was partially based on the argument of protecting the Protestant religion of that realm. However at the same time, there was a standing alliance between William and certain Catholic princes. ‘Whether’, ‘if’ and ‘how much’ religion was central to the Glorious Revolution (and the Nine Years War) is a matter of debate that will not be discussed any further in this thesis.²³ But it is noteworthy to point out the religious diversity in Europe in the seventeenth century. In the second chapter, this thesis will shortly address the difficulties that arose sometimes in diplomacy from differing religion. This will also demonstrate the connection between acceptance of the Glorious Revolution and the concluding of the Grand Alliance; both were partly driven by necessity despite reservations (most significantly caused by this difference in religion). The diplomatic letters make it quite clear that international policy was no longer principally or solely determined by religious factors; religious issues were not something that threatened the conclusion of the Austrian-Dutch Alliance and the Grand Alliance.

This is illustrated by a letter sent by Emperor Leopold to ex-King James II in April

²⁰ Cox, *King William’s European Joint Venture*, 203 – 205; Onnekink (ed.), *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713* (Farnham and Burlington 2009) 69 – 70; Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany*, 93 – 100.

²¹ Cox, *King William’s European Joint Venture*, 115.

²² Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany*, 95; Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 147, 199.

²³ See: D.M.L. Onnekink (ed.), *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713* (Farnham and Burlington 2009).

1689.²⁴ Leopold accused the French of “deceitful Insinuations ... whose chief aim was, by fomenting continual Divisions, between you and your People, to gain thereby an opportunity to Insult the more securely over the rest of *Christendom*”. Leopold also writes specifically about ‘Infractions of the Peace’ by France against Christendom, not (only) against Protestants. This was in line with propaganda from (and the view from) other princes who were threatened by France: Louis XIV was described as ‘a most Christian Turk’ and a threat to Roman Catholics (Spain, the Papacy, the Holy Roman Empire) and Protestants (the Dutch Republic, the Scandinavian kingdoms, England and the northern principalities of the Empire) alike.²⁵ It seems that seldom such a unity of mind existed between the European princes.

Louis XIV’s revocation of the Edict of Nantes – granting (Calvinist) Protestants, Huguenots, in France the right to worship – gave international politics a new edge. Louis’ harsh treatment of Protestants set other Protestant nations against France and brought about an exodus of Protestants to other states.²⁶

James’ succession to the English throne on 6 February 1685 caused alarm among Europe’s Protestant states. Although current historiography has discounted the notion that James intended to work closely with Louis XIV, there was certainly the perception that this very thing would happen, particularly in Protestant circles. This fear was exacerbated eight months later when Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, an event that shook not only Europe’s Protestant states, but the entire continent as well.²⁷

²⁴ Emperor Leopold I, *A Letter Written by the Emperor to the Late King James, Setting forth The True Occasion of his Fall, and the Treachery and Cruelty of the French* (Vienna, 9 April 1689).

²⁵ Christopher Storrs, ‘The Role of Religion in Spanish Foreign Policy in the Reign of Carlos II (1665-1700)’, 34, 43, in: D.M.L. Onnekink (ed.), *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713* (Farnham and Burlington 2009); William James Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV, the Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1976) 10.

²⁶ Tony Claydon, ‘Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William’s War Propaganda, 1689–1697’, in: Esther Mijers en David Onnekink (ed.), *Redefining William III: Politics and Culture in International context* (Aldershot, 2007), 129 – 147, 134 – 142; Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 63, 66.

²⁷ Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 58 – 59.

Also, the French King's alliance with the Ottoman Empire against Roman Catholics (the Emperor) and his apparent ambitions to Universal Monarchy created quite an uneasy feeling throughout Europe in the years leading up to 1688.²⁸

Diplomacy under William III

English diplomacy was usually managed by the two Secretaries of State who were concerned with both foreign and domestic policy. The division of the two was drawn on geographical lines: the Secretary of the 'northern' department dealt with foreign affairs concerning the Dutch Republic, the Scandinavian, Polish, Russian monarchies, the sovereign principalities and cities in Germany, the Holy Roman Empire and the Emperor himself. The Secretary of the 'southern' department concerned himself with foreign relations with the Spanish and Italian states, with France, Switzerland and the Ottoman Empire.²⁹ The most relevant Secretaries of State during William's reign were Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham for the northern department and Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, for the southern department.

Though relatively little is written on English diplomacy in the years directly following the Glorious Revolution (with an exception for the Treaty of Ryswick), what features prominently in what is written emphasizes King Williams great influence. Though D.B. Horn writes that "all British diplomatists received instructions to follow the orders sent to them by the secretaries [of State] and to correspond regularly with the secretaries; and, after 1689, it became increasingly rare for the crown to use any other channel", he himself states that during William's reign diplomacy was still largely in the King's hands.³⁰ During William's rule the Secretaries of State had a relatively minor role in foreign affairs. William himself exerted tight control on foreign issues and diplomacy and significantly shaped foreign policy. Consequently, the Secretaries of State were often bypassed.

M. Lane notes Williams "close personal supervision" on diplomatic issues and calls William "his own permanent Foreign Secretary".³¹ So "foreign policy, the conduct of diplomacy, matters of war and peace and strategy remained within the royal prerogative and were not the business of the Lords and Commons."³² William decided himself which agent

²⁸ Pincus, *1688*, 307 – 314; Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom', 129 – 147.

²⁹ William James Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 40 – 41.

³⁰ D.B. Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service 1689 – 1789* (Oxford 1961) 4, 144 – 146.

³¹ M. Lane, 'The Diplomatic Service under William III', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fourth Series*, vol. 10 (1927) 87, 89.

³² Childs, *The Nine Years' War*, 134.

should be sent where, and often whether someone should be sent at all.³³ The declining role of Secretaries of State in foreign affairs during William's reign was also noted by W.J. Roosen.

The role of secretaries of state under William III could hardly be called exalted.

During the king's numerous absences on the Continent, English diplomats were ordered to communicate with William Blathwayt, the Acting-Secretary of State who accompanied the king. Of course, William was in effect acting as his own secretary of state for foreign affairs at this time.³⁴

Indeed, it were the favourites and most trusted men in the service of William – such as the Earl of Portland, William Blathwayt and, in the Republic, Grand Pensionary Anthonie Heinsius – who handled the most important aspects of foreign affairs and diplomacy.³⁵

In foreign affairs, as in war, William saw fit to be his own minister, and he took only his Dutch favourites, Portland and the rising Albemarle, into his confidence. 'His chief characteristic is great distrust', remarked a French observer, "so that very few persons, even amongst those who are in office, are acquainted with his secrets."³⁶



In the Dutch Republic William had considerable, 'unprecedented', authority in diplomatic and military affairs since the murder on the Grand Pensionary John de Witt and his own elevation to Stadtholder and Captain-General during the Dutch 'disaster year' of 1672. The successive Grand Pensionaries, Gaspar Fagal and Anthonie Heinsius, were friends and confidants of William III.³⁷ Thus, William's hold on the foreign policy of the Republic was quite strong.

Dutch envoys were in a somewhat different position than envoys from other countries. There was no single sovereign who had to be informed but a 'States-General' who represented different provinces and cities. Secrets were sometimes hard to keep. Letters containing more general information were therefore often addressed to the States-General while more important information was conveyed in '*secrete brieven*' (secret letters) or in 'private correspondence' to the '*Griffier*' of the States-General and/or the Grand Pensionary

³³ Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service*, 144 – 146.

³⁴ Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 141.

³⁵ D.M.L. Onnekink, *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite. The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649 – 1709)* (Utrecht 2004) 56, 62.

³⁶ Quoted in: William Lewis Sachse, *Lord Somers: a political portrait* (Manchester 1975), 146.

³⁷ Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 44.

(the Pensionary of Holland) and, from 1672 onwards, often to the Prince-Stattholder William III.³⁸

One of the points of interest of the diplomacy in William's first year as King of England is that Dutch envoys were unofficially carrying out the work of the English envoys until William could send new English Ambassadors.³⁹ "In later years the English envoys in their turn were often asked to represent the Dutch government."⁴⁰ After a while both the Dutch Republic and England had Ambassadors at foreign courts; both reported to the same master. Sometimes, William preferred foreign – neither Dutch nor English – envoys altogether: for example Swiss, German or French Huguenot diplomats.⁴¹ William seemed to have chosen his diplomats for their skills and far less through patronage. He was also quite practical; not bothering to give his diplomats a high rank which might bring them in conflict with other Ambassadors over matters of precedence. "English envoys under William III tended to be young, not very wealthy men ...[;] it has been argued that at least under William III, most of the hard diplomatic work abroad was done by envoys rather than by the ambassadors" writes Roosen.⁴² And Lane writes:

What William III. required in his servants was unquestioning obedience, combined with intelligent observation and enough common sense to enable them to carry on in the absence of orders. Apparently he did not greatly care from what party or country such servants came. Prompt obedience was peculiarly necessary on account of the complicated interests of European policy, and of the general ignorance of that policy among Englishmen.⁴³



William took foreign policy largely into his own hands, and scholars are generally quite generous with their compliments when it comes to the Stadtholder-King's ability to handle these affairs. Lane writes: "the diplomatic history of the reign ... shows the gradual evolution

³⁸ Ibidem, 141.

³⁹ Lane, 'The Diplomatic Service under William III', 101 – 102.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, 104.

⁴¹ Horn, *The British Diplomatic Service*, 112; Roorda, 'Le secret du Prince'.

⁴² Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 89 – 90.

⁴³ M. Lane, 'The diplomatic service under William III' 92.

of a body of capable and disciplined public servants.”⁴⁴ She concludes her essay on the diplomatic service under William even more positive:

It is clear that on the whole this [diplomatic] system or want of system worked excellently in a small service and under the eye of such an experienced statesman as William III., better perhaps (as is often the case) than a more elaborate system. ... The ease with which the Grand Alliance was revived in 1701 and the smoothness with which it worked must be taken not only as a tribute to the King's statecraft, but also to the excellence of the diplomatic service trained by himself.⁴⁵

Roosen is also optimistic:

It is generally recognised that of all the English monarchs from Charles II to George I, William III was the most interested in foreign affairs. With the possible exception of Charles II, William was also the most effective in controlling them.⁴⁶

Roosen states that William's success was largely due to his ability to “[keep] affairs secret from his English subjects while entrusting them to his Dutch and refugee French protestant friends.” However he also states that William kept secrets from his most trusted servants, such as the Earl of Portland “for a quarter of a century, just as [he] hid [things] from everyone else.”⁴⁷ On the matter of William's favourites David Onnekink writes:

A few of William's closest confidants were employable in more than one way, holding military rank as well as political office. They ... were active in domestic as well as international affairs. But essentially Japikse was correct in arguing that William compartmentalised various aspects of his government, entrusting military, diplomatic and political issues to different men.⁴⁸

No-one, it seems, knew all the King's secrets.



⁴⁴ Ibidem, 92.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, 106 – 107.

⁴⁶ Roosen, *The Age of Louis XIV*, 41 – 42.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, 41 – 42.

⁴⁸ Onnekink, *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite*, 14.

Concluding, William III was a skilled politician when it came to foreign policy. He took the diplomatic service in his own hands and made it into a fine instrument of his policy. Through his diplomatic corps, William succeeded in concluding a multi-confessional alliance which was a match for Europe's most powerful state.

Chapter Two: The Reception of the Glorious Revolution

This chapter will focus on the reception of William III's expedition to England and the subsequent Glorious Revolution at the court of the Emperor. Furthermore it will consider the difficulties that sprang from differing religions between the future members of the Grand Alliance. Lastly, the reactions from other European princes to the regime change will be considered.

Jacob Hop at Vienna

Jacob Hop arrived in Vienna on the 4th of November 1688, shortly before William of Orange set sail for England from the Dutch Republic.⁴⁹ Hop had instructions to assist in the concluding of a peace treaty with the Ottoman Empire with the Emperor and to defend the policy of the States-General and William's pending invasion of England.⁵⁰ His later task to conclude an alliance with the Republic might seem, at first glance, fairly difficult. The Emperor was a pious Catholic, as were his advisers, and supported the Jesuits in his dominions. Since he had also persecuted Protestant subjects (in Hungary), he did not seem a good 'first choice' as an ally for the Protestant Republic and vice versa.⁵¹

Deliberations were at risk for further disruption because of a latent sympathy for the Catholic James II. The Empress openly sympathized with the English Queen (see below), and the Emperor clearly experienced difficulty in accepting the radical regime change in England. For years, the Emperor and William III had maintained good relations with each other. However, the Emperor was in a difficult position because he had to fight a war on two fronts: the east (against the Ottoman Turks) and the west (against the French). His court was divided over who were the more dangerous enemy of the Emperor and his Austrian realms. There were 'westerners' and 'easterners', who respectively encouraged war against France and the Turks.⁵² Though war against the Turks had gone well for Leopold for years, he tried to

⁴⁹ William arrives in England on the 5th of November 1688; England has an 'Old Style' calendar (OS), whereas on the Continent a 'New Style' (NS) calendar has been introduced. The difference in 1688 being ten days. So Hop arrives on the 4th of November NS, being the 25th of October OS. Williams landing being the 15th of November NS.

⁵⁰ This is deduced from Hop's letters, as his official instructions have not (yet) been found.

⁵¹ Spielman, *Leopold I*, 15, 35, 61 – 73.

⁵² *Ibidem*, 42 – 43.

disentangle from it during 1688 – 1689. “Leopold remained as anxious as ever to check France”, something which was not possible if his troops were occupied in the east.⁵³



On his arrival, Hop was quickly admitted an audience with the Emperor where he was immediately assured that “his Majesty wanted to live with her High and Mighty Lords [the members of the States-General] in the utmost confidentiality, religiously live up to the mutual agreements as well as concert with them on what had to be done presently in order to promote the common interest”.⁵⁴ Already from this friendly reception it can be deduced that the Emperor had something to gain from good relations with the Dutch Republic.

From the beginning of his mission, the Emperor held Hop, as well as the Spanish Ambassador, in complete trust in matters of the war against France and Leopold’s association with the States-General. This is made clear by the Emperor receiving a letter – on the 7th of November – of William III, that he read aloud for Hop and the Spanish Ambassador. This letter informed the Emperor of William’s intention of ‘travelling’ into England and his reasons for doing so. Leopold was grateful for the trust William showed by informing him, and was glad with the “great moderation with which His Highness has explained himself in respect to the King of England and the exercising of the Roman Catholic faith in that realm.”⁵⁵

Hop’s first month at the court was relatively uneventful. There were almost no voices at the court that pleaded for peace with France or against an alliance with the Dutch Republic (the ‘westerners’ had the upper hand). In fact, when Hop arrived at Vienna the French Ambassador, the Marquis de Lusignan, had already been denied further access to the Emperor. One month later (the 12th of December), Hop wrote to William and the Grand Pensionary of the Republic that Lusignan and the French minister at Regensburg were

⁵³ Ibidem, 143, 147.

⁵⁴ “Jacob Hop to the *Griffier*, William III en de Pensionary of Holland, 11 November 1688: “*sijne Majesteit met haer Hoog Mogende wilde leven in de uijtterste vertrouwelijckheijt, en religieuselijck naekomen de onderlinge tractaten, oock met deselve concerteren over 't geen in de jegenwoordige conjuncturen ten beste van het gemeen soude horen te geschieden*”, *Conceptverbaal van Hop als extraordinaris envoyé aan het hof van de Duitse keizer, met bijlagen*, Nationaal Archief, ref. 1.10.97 no. 25.

⁵⁵ Hop to William III, 11 November 1688: “*de grote moderatie met de welke Uw Hoocht. sich geexpliceert heeft, ten respecte van Coningh van Engellant, en van oeffeningh van Roomsse Godsdienst in dat rijk*”.

expelled, partially on the instigation of the Spanish Ambassador and himself.⁵⁶

Hop's dispatches during November informed the States-General and William III of the Emperor's enduring positive inclination towards William's expedition and the Republic. Hop wrote that the people at Leopold's court were '*in de uijterste impatantie*' of receiving good news about William's expedition, as it was viewed as "the means by which England could be brought in the right track, and also to employ the forces of that Crown as well against France and her aorta could be hit" and thus relieve the pressure on the German states.⁵⁷ This explains quite clearly the Emperor's enthusiasm for William's expedition: it is hoped that this expedition will initiate a sharp turn in English foreign policy, thus securing another ally against France, instead of a second (though for the Empire indirect) enemy.



From the beginning of December 1688 there was a significant deterioration of Hop's relation with the Emperor. On the 2nd of December the Dutch envoy wrote that a copy of William's famous *Declaration of Reasons* for invading England had arrived at Vienna. Leopold I was displeased, for it deviated significantly from the manuscript he had personally received from William. One of the most important subjects, surfacing often in Hop's letters for weeks to come, was the *Declaration's* disputation of the legitimacy of the newborn Prince of Wales, the son of James II. Leopold was very displeased that William apparently meant to 'meddle' with the succession of the crown. He thought this accusation was '*een gevaerlijck exempell*' and he feared the 'removing of the Prince of Wales' (from the line of succession) would consequently be the final stroke against the Roman Catholic faith in England.⁵⁸

Unfortunately, the Emperor had more grievances towards his allies. Hop is from now on seriously put to work to defend and explain certain events. Though Leopold was pleased by William's confidence in him when William's letter arrived on the 7th of November, after the recent arrival of the *Declaration of Reasons* and other information he was discontented. For example, certain allies – notably the Prince of Waldeck and the Elector of Brandenburg –

⁵⁶ Hop to the *Griffier*, William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 7 November 1688 & Hop to William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 12 December 1688.

⁵⁷ Hop to William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 14 November 1688: "*een middel, om Englant in een beter spoor te brengen, en also de forces oock van die Croon tegen Vranckrijck en dat van zee kant daer haer hertaeder soude kunnen werden geraeckt, te employeren*".

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, 2 december 1688.

were informed of the Stadtholder's intention far earlier than he was.⁵⁹ Leopold felt that William and other German princes had been inconsiderate of him: William's letter to him having been sent a day before 'he [first] went to sea' (October 29th) instead of an earlier time; because his allies ('closer to his enemy than he') had not attacked France at an earlier moment when they could have made important gains, and; because a number of German princes, members of the League of Augsburg, meeting at Magdeburg to discuss how to combat French invasion of the Palatinate, had only let information come to the emperor, 'their master', indirectly.⁶⁰

Furthermore, the Emperor also expressed doubt about how to view William III's expedition: was it a matter of 'state' or a matter of 'religion'? Since the Emperor had very recently reaffirmed an alliance between himself and William III, he wondered why the envoy in this matter, Baron von Görtz, had not been informed earlier if the invasion was a matter of state. If it was a matter of religion, the Emperor contemplated if he should have opposed the invasion.⁶¹

It becomes clear from his correspondence to the States-General and William that Hop was fully occupied with conciliating the Emperor with William's expedition. Hop repeatedly reminded Leopold that William had promised not to extirpate the Roman Catholic faith in both his private letter to Leopold and in his *Declaration*. Also, William had already addressed the 'succession issue' in his private letter in referring to his wife's, Mary Stuart, possibly endangered rights to the English throne. Lastly, Hop argued, it was William's intent to let all matters be settled by a 'free and lawful' Parliament.⁶² The Emperor finally stated his 'general' positive stance towards the English expedition and expressed that he had '*met leetwesen*' received word of France's declaration of war against the Republic.⁶³ Leopold immediately insisted that he still wished to work closely with the Republic.

The allegations to the Prince of Wales' legitimacy continued to be controversial, with even the Empress stating her sympathy for the Queen of England for having to endure such severe attacks concerning the legitimacy of her child.⁶⁴ And she was not alone in doubting the

⁵⁹ Ibidem, 19 December 1688.

⁶⁰ Ibidem, 2 December 1688.

⁶¹ Ibidem, 16 December 1688.

⁶² Hop to William III, 5 December 1688 & Hop to William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 12 December 1688 & Hop to the *Griffier*, the Pensionary of Holland and William III, 20 February 1689.

⁶³ Hop to *Griffier*, the Pensionary of Holland and William III, 23 December 1688.

⁶⁴ Hop to William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 12 December 1688.

reports stating that James Jr. is a 'pretender'. Hop maintained therefore, so long as this issue was relevant, that William would never state that the child was illegitimate if he was not absolutely assured of it.

From the beginning of 1689 'good news', concerning William's achievements in England, began reaching Vienna. On the 2nd of January 1689 Hop writes that the old year had 'joyously' ended, since the court was informed – through the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands and the Ambassador of Spain at Vienna – of the Prince of Orange's '*seer gewenschte successen*' in England. According to Hop everyone was very pleased by this news, as it was hoped that England would now soon be brought '*tot rust en eenigheijt*' and would join the war (against France), for the 'common good'.⁶⁵

The Glorious Revolution as '*Religionskrijgh*'?

The opinion of the Emperor on the expedition to England was at first positive (during November), turned to disapproval (December), and became somewhat ambiguous in the new year. On the 6th of January 1689 Hop wrote to the Republic and the Stadtholder that both the Chancellor of the Emperor and the Spanish Ambassador had once again stressed that they hoped that William was 'successful' (whatever that means) in England and that there would be a '*rupture*' between the English and French crowns. In the same letter, however, Hop mentioned considerations at court to send an envoy to England to mediate for the preservation of Catholicism and plead for war against France. Although such meddling with affairs would probably have slowed the deliberations in England; though, in retrospect, such interference would probably come too late to make a difference.⁶⁶ This is also curious, as Hop assured the Emperor repeatedly of William's good intentions towards Catholics which Leopold stated to appreciate (and believe).

From these and other statements by the Emperor it can be deduced that the religious aspect of the Glorious Revolution gave Leopold some difficulties.⁶⁷ For example, as mentioned above, Leopold doubted if he should see the expedition to England as 'a matter of religion' and he feared that the removing of the Prince of Wales from the line of succession would be the final stroke against Catholicism in England. On the 12th of December 1688, Hop wrote to the *Griffier* of the States-General that French attempts to portray the invasion of

⁶⁵ Hop to the *Griffier*, the Pensionary of Holland and William III, 2 January 1689.

⁶⁶ Hop to William III, 6 January 1689.

⁶⁷ See also: John P. Spielman, *Leopold I of Austria* (London 1977) 35 145 – 147.

England as an assault on Catholicism were unsuccessful in the Empire.⁶⁸ Also an attempt of the English envoy of James II on the 13th of January 1689 to have the Emperor recognize this invasion as ‘*religionskrijgh*’ failed; the Emperor did not even address the religious element of this plead.

“[The English envoy] was answered that, because the King of Great Brittain was so closely affiliated with the King of France, who had made himself an enemy of his imperial Majesty, this Court could not consider the case of the King of England”.⁶⁹

These English and French attempts to present William’s expedition as part of a religious war were not accepted by the Emperor. This emphasizes the relative importance of ‘religion’ in these times. While Leopold constantly worried about the fate of Catholics in England, he did not acknowledge these efforts to present the events as part of a religious war. Clearly, the worldly concerns of Leopold were more pressing than his religious ones. Similarly, William’s *Declaration of Reasons* is highly religiously phrased but portrayals of the ensuing war as a religious war were discouraged, perhaps with the exception of portraying Louis XIV as a threat to ‘Christendom’.⁷⁰

Leopold’s ambiguous attitude towards the English affair continued. William’s successes until now were described as ‘joyous’ and concern was displayed for the heavy consequences the expelling of James II would have for the Republic and England.⁷¹ Preparing and sending an official reaction on this regime change, though, took months.⁷² It was already since the first signs in early December 1688 that William wanted to ‘meddle’ with the succession to the throne that Hop mentioned a more icy tone towards William’s adventure and Leopold reacts carefully.



⁶⁸ Hop to the *Griffier*, the Pensionary of Holland and William III, 12 December 1688.

⁶⁹ Hop to the *Griffier*, the Pensionary of Holland and William III, 13 January 1689: “...*hem [James’ envoy] is daerop geantwoort, dat, naedermael den Koning van Grootbrittannien soo naeuw geattacheert was aen den Coningh van Vranckrijck, die sich tot een vijand van sijne keijserl. Maj.t en het Rijck hadde ingestelt, dit Hoff de saecke van Coningh van Engelant niet konde aenneem*”.

⁷⁰ See note 21.

⁷¹ Hop to the Pensionary of Holland, 24 February 1689.

⁷² See next paragraph.

Also in Lord Dursley's correspondence the relative importance of religion is obvious. At The Hague, Dursley discussed the matter of the 'Vaudois' – Waldensians, persecuted Protestants in south-east France and Savoy – with the Imperial and Spanish envoys.

"This morning ... I was also with the Spanish envoye, I find by him that the house of Austria will be very willing to give any aide to the Vaudois but he says that they have measures to keep with the Pope and some Princes of Italy but shall objections will be taken away whenever the King of Englands banner appears amongst the Vaudois, and if there be but 25 men under the kings colours the Governor of Milan will have 25.000 ready for their assistance."⁷³

Though Dursley considered this to be 'Spanish bragg', it once more states a *relative* importance of religion. It was believed that the Waldensians could greatly assist the war in southern France, but before they could be 'enlisted' by Catholic princes they had to be officially supported by a Protestant ally (how else to explain your leniency to the Pope).⁷⁴ When the Protestant King of England supports these people they will be assisted by the Emperor and the Spanish instead of persecuted. Spiritual interests bending to worldly interests once more. Difficulties of Catholic princes in dealing with the religious diversity in diplomacy and international politics are thus quite obvious at this time. It is also apparent in 'royal responses' to the regime change in England.

Royal Responses on the Glorious Revolution

It was to be expected that European princes and states would show a variety of responses to William's expedition in November 1688. King James II of England was of course outraged by this son-in-law's invasion and the support for it from both his daughters. James' ally King Louis XIV of France was obviously quite displeased by it. Evidently, because as soon as he heard of it, he declared war on the Dutch Republic (as he had promised).⁷⁵ More interesting are the reactions of William's allies (or: would-be allies).

By the 17th of March, news had reached Vienna that William III, and Mary II, had been declared co-monarchs of England. Hop naturally wrote a letter to William expressing his joy on this matter but there was a marked silence in the next letters when it comes to the

⁷³ Lord Dursley to Nottingham, 28 February 1689, *Calendar of State Papers, Secretaries of State: Foreign Series, Holland, 1689 – 1690/1689 – 1693*, TNA, ref. SP 84/221 and SP 84/222.

⁷⁴ Hop to the Pensionary of Holland, 24 February 1689.

⁷⁵ Cox, *King William's European Joint Venture*, 114 – 115.

Emperor's reaction to the regime change. A somewhat indicative reaction to the Glorious Revolution was expressed in a letter of the 9th April by Leopold I to James II. The Emperor's letter is a detailed – almost gloating – summation, of the facts that comprised the Glorious Revolution: that James was abandoned by this people; that he had to flee his kingdom; etc. Leopold expressed sorrow for this chain of events but, he-told-him-so, they were to be expected from the political course he had followed. “If Your Majesty had rather given Credit to the friendly Remonstrances that was made you by our late Envoy, the Count *de Cannitz*, in our Name, than to the deceitful Insinuations of the *French*” James would still be king.⁷⁶ This was, however, still no reaction to William's and Mary's elevation to James' former throne.

It was only on the 15th of May that Hop was finally able to write about the official reaction to the Glorious Revolution.

For four days is in a very solemn secret conference, composed of Counsellors of State, in the presence of the emperor, deliberated on the notification [concerning William's and Mary's elevation to the English throne] ... and is with parity of Votes agreed on the emperor sending his reaction and congratulation to his Majesty.⁷⁷

However, the court was still careful in sending this letter to William; waiting for the reaction sent by the Spanish government (though the Spanish ambassador claims that the Spanish Habsburgs will follow the Austrian branch of the family in this matter).⁷⁸ It was not until late June that the congratulations were finally sent to William.⁷⁹

The Protestant princes of Germany had less trouble expressing their feelings for the success of William. The Elector of Brandenburg wrote :

Je ne puis exprimer la grandeur de ma joie, que me cause l'accomplissement des souhaits que j'ai fait de pais quelques années et particulièrement il y a sia Moys a Minden pour Vostre elevation au Throne d'Angleterre, qui Vous est du egalement et

⁷⁶ Emperor Leopold I, *A Letter Written by the Emperor to the Late King James, Setting forth The True Occassion of his Fall, and the Treachery and Cruelty of the French* (Vienna, 9 April 1689).

⁷⁷ Hop to the *Griffier*, William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 15 May 1689: “*Voor vier daegen is in een seer solemnelle secrete conferentie gecomposeert uijt ... Raetsheeren van Staat, ten bijwesen van keijser gedelibereert over de notificatie [betreffende de verheffing van Willem en Maria tot vorsten van Engeland] ... en is met paerigheijt van Stemmen goetgevond des keijzers rescriptie en congratulatie aen sijne Majesteit te laeten afgaen*”.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, 15 May 1689.

⁷⁹ Hop to the *Griffier*, William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 26 June 1689.

*par le sang et par le bien fait que l'Angleterre et tous les Protestans ensemble, mesme toute l'Europe, recoivent pas vostre moyen J'en viens feliciter V.M. de toute mon ame, et souhaite le grand Dieu qui la mis miraculeusement sur ce Throne, l'áy conserve longues années et y adjouste le bonheur d'une heureuse lignée.*⁸⁰

Slightly more appreciative towards the King-Stadtholder's – no doubt – spectacular success and more the tone expected of an ally. Also the Dukes George William of Brunswick-Luneburg and Ernst August of Brunswick-Hanover sent their congratulations.⁸¹

Similar letters arrived from other princes. Already on the 15th of April – note the difference with the Emperor's late reaction – the Spanish court dispatched a letter of congratulation to William, who was addressed immediately as King of '*Magne Britanie*'.⁸² Even later than the Emperor, the Catholic Duke of Lorraine – via Hop – sent his congratulations to William's elevation to the throne of England.⁸³ Still later, the Duke of Bavaria – also a Catholic – congratulated William. (It is noteworthy that Mary's co-elevation to the same throne was completely ignored in these letters.)

Though all those mentioned above were already more or less 'allied' since they were all at war with France, there is this significant difference in the reaction of Protestant and Catholic princes. With the exception of the Spanish court, the Catholic princes were slow to praise William with his success and to show how pleased they were by the strengthening of the anti-French 'coalition'(-to-be). The Protestant princes, on the other hand, were simply delighted and speedily sent their congratulations to William. This ambivalent attitude of Catholic princes towards a 'Protestant' regime change is quite intriguing. It signifies how religion could still be a dividing factor in European politics, but it also shows that 'worldly needs', in the end, exceeded religious differences.

⁸⁰ Elector Frederic III to William III (Berlin 27 February 1689), *Calendar of State Papers, King William's Chest, Letters and Papers, 1689 Feb. – Sept.*, TNA, ref. SP 8/5.

⁸¹ Duke George William to William III (without place (Brunswick-Luneburg?), without date), *King William's Chest*; Duke Ernest August to William III (Hannover 13 March), *King William's Chest*.

⁸² King Charles II to William III (Madrid, 15 April 1689), *King William's Chest*.

⁸³ Hop to William III, 27 June 1689.

Chapter Three: The Austrian-Dutch Alliance and Grand Alliance

This chapter will look deeply into Hop's, Dursley's and Paget's correspondence in which they refer to the concluding of the Austrian-Dutch Alliance and the Grand Alliance. Attention will also be given to the *ratifying* of these treaties. Lastly, remarks by these diplomats concerning the further expanding of the alliances will be examined.

The Austrian-Dutch Alliance

On the 21st of November Hop wrote for the first time of an alliance between the Republic and the Emperor (of course in his capacity of ruler of his hereditary realms, 'Austria'). He was informed of a secret provisional agreement, 'alliance', between William III, on behalf of the Republic, and the Emperor.⁸⁴ This agreement was concluded by the German Baron von Görtz, empowered by the Stadtholder, who did not inform the States-General (only the Grand Pensionary had been informed).⁸⁵ It appears this was the agreement which was the base for the Austrian-Dutch Alliance. For the time being, the matter of an alliance between the Emperor and the Republic is no longer discussed in Hop's letters.

It was three months later, on the 21st of February 1689 that the matter was discussed in Hop's letters once more: in fact it immediately became the dominant issue discussed until May.⁸⁶ On the 21st of February Hop wrote an exceptionally long letter to the States-General *Griffier*. Hop had requested leave to return to the Republic, as it turned out in this and later letters the aim of this visit was to secretly discuss the concluding of an alliance. Both the Spanish Ambassador and the Emperor had pressed Hop to return as soon as possible to discuss the matter with the States-General. Hop had received letters in February saying that:

Her High and Mighty Lords, considering the letters of her Deputies in England wherein they write that His Highness was of the disposition that I [Hop] had to be immediately sent orders to move his imperial Majesty to the disposition of concluding an alliance ... [and] if it were not necessary that I [Hop] came to stay at this Court.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Hop to William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 21 November 1688.

⁸⁵ Roorda, 'Le secret du Prince', 176 – 177.

⁸⁶ Hop to the *Griffier* and William III, 21 February 1689.

⁸⁷ Ibidem: "... haer Hoog Mogende, in consideratie van missive van de Heeren haere Gedeputeerden in Engeland waarbij deselve schrijven, dat Sijn Hoocheit van advis was, dat mij [Hop] sonder uijtstell ord[r?]e behoorde te

Hop goes on to say that this was the Emperor's intent for some time now, but that he wanted Hop to go to the Republic to conclude the alliance there personally. From now on, however, negotiations on the alliance-to-be are done by mail (and in Vienna) after all.

Hop also wrote on the 21st February "that [the Emperor] is of the intention of binding himself, via his Highness [William of Orange], very closely to England".⁸⁸ There is a very interesting aspect in these letters, namely that this alliance "would not only last through the current war, but even to the keeping of the Peace, that would terminate this war".⁸⁹ Both Leopold and William had stated that they wanted this alliance to be 'perpetual'.



On the 27th of February 1689, Hop described in depth the Emperor's wish to establish an alliance with the Republic, and several of the conditions and issues he would like to see discussed.⁹⁰ Apparently, Hop thought that 'never before' there was such an advantageous base on which to conclude an alliance with the Emperor; the most serious issue was that the Emperor required financial support.⁹¹

"I take the liberty to relate of the overtures done to me by the emperor concerning a very close alliance with the State, not only for the duration of the current war, but also till that war will be ended by a Peace ... to the confirmation and ensuring of that same Peace."⁹²

The Emperor and his Chancellor, Count Stratman – both he and the Count of Koningseck (or: Conigseg) will be the ones with whom Hop will later negotiate on the alliance's articles –, were both of the opinion that negotiations should be conducted through Hop. Hop advised the

werden toegesonden, om sijne keijserlijke Majesteit tot een naeuwere alliantie te disponeren ... [en] of het niet dienstig en nodigh was, dat ick aen dit Hoff quame te verblijven".

⁸⁸ Ibidem: "*dat [de keijser] van verdere intentie is, om door middel van sijn Hoocheit oock met Engelant sich op het allernaeuwste te verbinden*".

⁸⁹ Hop to the Griffier, 24 February 1689: "*niet alleen soo lange de jegenwoordigen oorloch soude mogen duuren maer selfs oock tot bevestiging van Vrede, die den oorlogch soude mogen termineren*".

⁹⁰ Hop to the Griffier, 27 February 1689.

⁹¹ Hop to the Griffier and William III, 21 February 1689.

⁹² Hop to the Griffier, 27 February 1689: "*Ick [neem] de vrijheijt ... te relateren de ouvertures mij wegens den keijser gedaen tot een seer naeuwe alliantie met den Staat, niet alleen gedurende de jegenwoordigen oorloch, maer oock van dat hetselve, door een Vreede sal ... gedetermineert tot bevestiging en versekertheit van die selve Vreede*".

States-General to send a draft for a treaty to him, based on the issues the Emperor wanted to be addressed.

It should be a defensive and offensive alliance for the duration of the war, after which it would be a defensive alliance; it had to be directed specifically against France and her allies; the contracting parties would direct all their forces (maritime as well as on land) against their common enemies. Both the Emperor and the Republic would have to declare that they would make no separate peace and it was necessary the central war aim was to return France to the borders that were set by the ‘*tractaten*’ of Osnabruck (/Westphalia, 1648) and the Pyrenees (1659).⁹³ The pending Spanish inheritance would have to be discussed in more detail concerning the rights of the Emperor’s younger son. For the vacant position of Roman King the States-General would have to recommend the Emperor’s older son to their befriended German principalities (who would elect the new King).⁹⁴

It is the 10th of March when Hop wrote again to the Republic. He requested “*soo spoedig als immers doenlijck is*” to be sent instructions, a draft treaty and authorization to negotiate with Leopold I, so that the alliance could be made quickly.⁹⁵ Though the Emperor wished to enter into a treaty of alliance with England as well, he did not wish to negotiate with England and the Republic together at that moment.

To negotiate with England and the State together and directly is at the moment not a favourable disposition and it is said to me, that the alliance that was made would only be between the emperor and the State and that for her High and Mighty Lords would be concluded the possibility for England, as well as for her other allies, to be included in the same alliance later.⁹⁶

It is one month later, on the 10th of April, that Hop received word from the Republic of their willingness to enter into an alliance with the Emperor. Eleven days later, Hop received the authorization to conclude an alliance with the Emperor as well as a draft treaty and further

⁹³ John Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 85 – 86; Spielman, *Leopold I*, 147.

⁹⁴ Hop to the Griffier, 27 February 1689.

⁹⁵ Hop to the Griffier, William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 10 March 1689.

⁹⁶ Hop to the Pensionary of Holland, 10 March 1689 “*Om met Engelant ende den Staat tegelijck, en directelijck te tracteren schijnt tegenwoordig geene genoegsaeme dispositie te sijn, en men heeft mij voorgeslaegen, dat de alliantie gemaect werdende alleen tuschen den keijser en Staat door haer Hoog Mogende soude komen werden bedong de inclusie van Engelant, gelijk oock van haere verdere geallieerdens, of wel, dat het aen Engelant en haer Hoog Mogende verdere geallieerdens vrij sal staen sich mede in voorg alliantie te geven*”.

instructions. Hop entered into negotiations with Stratman and Koningseck to finally establish the treaty. By the 1st of May, already a number of articles had been drafted and approved by the Emperor himself, though further negotiations were delayed. There were some small problems, for example the matter of subsidy to the Emperor. The alliance had to be ‘general’ instead of ‘particular’ – as it was the idea that other states could join this alliance – so the subsidy could not be mentioned in the treaty.⁹⁷ Both England, or at least its new King, and Spain, by means of the Spanish Ambassador, had already stated the possibility of these nations joining the alliance and pressed for a quick conclusion of negotiations so copies of the alliance could be sent to the governments of these realms.⁹⁸



On the 8th of May, Hop wrote to the Grand Pensionary and William III that the treaty was as good as finished. The Emperor had informed Stratman and Koningseck “to agree ‘in substance’ (principally) the project of her High and Mighty Lords and ordered them, on this basis, to sign the Treaty and gave them the required *poivoir*”.⁹⁹ The only issue that had yet to be discussed was that the Emperor liked to see that the Duke of Lorraine’s rights separately included in the treaty. The Duke had lost his possessions to Louis XIV, his reinstatement as (de facto) Duke of Lorraine was included in the Treaty of the Pyrenees; the restoration of this entire Treaty was one of the goals of the Austrian-Dutch Alliance. Hop hoped that within four or five days the signed treaty could be send to the Republic.¹⁰⁰

On the 12th of May, Hop, Stratman and Koningseck finally signed the treaty. The only thing to be done now is for the treaty to be ratified.

“The duration set for the exchange of the ratifications is one month, so the alliance will be sooner completed, and invite their Majesties of Great Britain and Spain to join the same Alliance, so as to strengthen it without delay.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Hop to William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 1 May 1689.

⁹⁸ Ibidem.

⁹⁹ Hop to the Griffier, 8 May 1689: “*het project van haer Hoog Mogenden , in substantie te approberen, en [hen] vervolgens ... te gelasten op dit voet met mij te treden tot het dressereren en teeckenen van het Tractaat, en [hen] ... van het nodige poivoir te voorsien*”.

¹⁰⁰ Ibidem.

¹⁰¹ Hop to the Griffier, 13 May 1689: “*De tijd van uijtwisseling der ratification is genomen op een maent, om also te spoediger dese alliantie haer volkomen accomplissement te doen hebben, en de tijd te menageren, om*

Ratifying the Austrian-Dutch Alliance

While the new alliance between the Emperor and the Dutch Republic was signed on the 12th of May by representatives of both states, the alliance had not yet been ratified by either party. A number of difficulties still had to be addressed. There was, for example, the matter of the Duke of Lorrain. “By the adjusting of this Alliance his Imperial Majesty has urged that her High and Mighty Lords would agree in their ratification with the inclusion of my Lord the Duke of Lorrain.”¹⁰² This issue would become somewhat problematic, as it was not officially included in the alliance signed by Hop (who can further claim that all the articles in the treaty are ‘in substance’ corresponding to the articles sent to him by the States-General). This causes significant delay in the ratifications concerning both this alliance and the treaty for including England in it.

Certain issues, such as the including of Spain in the alliance, the recommendation for the new King of the Romans by the Dutch and (very important) the paying of subsidies, were discussed in separate articles and give less trouble.¹⁰³ Though it was until the very end of Hop’s stay at Vienna, the end of July 1689, that the ‘matter of subsidy’ was still not satisfactorily solved and it was the 17th of July when, finally, Hop wrote that a messenger from the Republic arrives bearing a resolution of ratification for Hop and the Emperor. The Emperor then also orders his ratifications to be exchanged for those of the Republic.¹⁰⁴

Assuming that this matter was now settled is premature. The English envoy to the Republic, Lord Dursley, wrote in November 1689: "As to the exchange of the Ratifications of the treatys with the Emperour the Pensionaire told me that would bee no matter of difficulty nor require no long time to bee done".¹⁰⁵ On the sixth of December Dursley had had his official audience with the States-General where:

[The Pensionary] told me that the ratifications were ready and signed between the States and the Empire but not exchanged and that since his Majesty [William III] desired that the Instruments for concluding him in the Alliance with the Emperor

haere Coninklijke Majesteiten van Grootbritannien en van Spagnen nodigen, om daerin mede te treden, en deselve Alliantie also volgens het gemeen oogmerck sonder dilay, soo veel mogelijk te verstercken.”.

¹⁰² Ibidem, “*Bij het adjustement van dese Alliantie heeft sijne Keijserlijke Majesteit doen urgeren, dat haer Hoog Mogenden in ratificatie souden willen accorderen de inclusie van mijn Heer den Hertoch van Lotharing.”.*

¹⁰³ Ibidem.

¹⁰⁴ Hop to the Griffier, William III and the Pensionary of Holland, 17 juli 1689.

¹⁰⁵ Dursley to Nottingham, 22 November 1689.

should be exchanged at the Hague the Pensionaire says that they will send to their minister at the Emperor's court to use all diligence for the procuring of them.¹⁰⁶

So, the ratification of Hop's treaty with the Emperor had already been postponed since the 12th of May, the delay being caused by King William's desire to be included in the treaty (apparently before the Republic and the Emperor's ratification). "The President [of the States-General] ... express'd the great desire the States had of taking all occasions of improving and maintaining their strict Alliance with the crown of England."¹⁰⁷ Though Dursley also wrote that the States-General were not very pleased with this delay.

It is unclear when the ratifications between the Emperor and the Dutch Republic were finally exchanged. It appears, and seems probable, that ratifications for both this treaty as well as the treaty for the inclusion of England were (more or less) exchanged at the same time: February 1690.

The Grand Alliance

When Jacob Hop left Vienna late in July 1689, the first part of the Grand Alliance still had not been completed, though ratifications appeared to be 'under way'. For all intents and purposes, it appeared to be accepted by the Dutch Republic and the Emperor that the alliance was a fact. The Austrian-Dutch alliance was a general alliance – aimed against France – with the intention of other parties being able to join it: more specifically it was the intention of the Emperor and the Republic that England and Spain would join. When Hop left the Emperor, he was informed of the latter's wish to empower the Spanish envoy at London, Ambassador Ronquillo, to treat with the English over their inclusion in the alliance.¹⁰⁸ He also stated that it would be very helpful if King William's new envoy to him – Lord Paget or 'whoever' would be Hop's successor – would be similarly empowered to treat with him. It was, however, Lord Dursley – Charles Berkeley – who was the central diplomat in the negotiations to include England, and thus form the Grand Alliance, from his station at The Hague.

Dursley arrived in the Dutch city The Hague in early October 1689, where he had been appointed envoy to the Republic. Dursley was only one of several English diplomats in the Republic: the Earl of Pembroke appearing to be the official Ambassador, Dursley as Envoy-Extraordinary and a number of less important diplomats – Dr. Aglionby, Matthew Prior and

¹⁰⁶ Ibidem, 6 December 1689.

¹⁰⁷ Ibidem, 6 December 1689.

¹⁰⁸ Hop to the Pensionary of Holland, 17 July 1689.

Abraham Kick – appear to be stationed at different Dutch cities. It turns out, though, that Dursley was in fact the most important English diplomat in the Republic.

Yesterday morning [6th October 1689] I went to wayte on the Pensioner who received me very jovially I told him that I addressed my self to him as the cheife Minister of the States and had orders to assure him that my principall busnesse here was to keep up the Alliance and freindship between His Majesty and this Government towards I should bee always ready to doe all the good offices that lay in my power.¹⁰⁹

Dursley was the one through whom the most important official business was related, though unfortunately he fell sick almost directly after arriving in the Republic for several weeks, delaying his mission.



When Dursley arrived at The Hague he had diverse articles and ‘instruments’ (and later received ratifications) for the inclusion of England in the Austrian-Dutch alliance which he could ‘trade’ with the States’ and the Emperor’s ministers for theirs. When he was shown a particular document by one party, he would disclose information concerning the same topic in return. A diplomacy of bargaining. On the 13th of December 1689 Dursley wrote that he:

[has] chosen to give into ... [the States] hands the ratifications for the Emperour; taking from them a writing to procure the same ... the day will bee soone appointed for my delivery of them into their custody as also for the exchange of the ratifications including his Majesty in the treaty of Allyance and seperate articles between the Emperour and this State I have seen a copy of the writing on their parts.¹¹⁰

This kind of bargaining took place a few times, according to Dursley’s letters.

This day the Agent of the States brought me and delivered into my hands their acts for including the King into the treaty and seperate articles betwift[?] the Emperour and the States upon which I delivered to him those I had for the States, but as for the others which I am to putt in their custody for the Emperour, I have not delivered, because the writing they are to give me in return is not ready.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Dursley to Nottingham, 7 October 1689.

¹¹⁰ Dursley to Nottingham, 13 December 1689.

¹¹¹ Ibidem, 17 December 1689.

In spite of this delicate and slow conduct of completing an alliance, affairs appeared to proceed without major complications for Dursley. On the 20th of December 1689 a serious problem arose: Hop had informed the States-General of the Emperor's (overdue) wish to include the case of the Duke of Lorraine in the treaty only this was not yet included in the treaty between Hop and the Emperor.

... the States have sent a message to me to lett me know that they desire to have the treatys perfect [that] have bin and are to bee exchanged with them which they are not, the inclusion of the Duke of Lorraine being omitted on our side and till that bee rectified they will not receive those I am to deliver to hem for the Emperor ... I suppose the errour procede from a copy sent from Vienna by Monsieur Hop before the Duke of Lorraine was so expressly nominated and that cobby had bin followed in England: this is an unforeseen delay which could not bee avoided by any care of mine I expect Your Lordships order for what is to bee done with the acts of the States which I have in my hands.¹¹²

This, of course, brought about a significant delay in the final conclusion of the Grand Alliance: it is only on the end of January 1690 that Dursley is in the possession of the treaty including the case of the Duke of Lorraine.

I have deliverd into the hands of the Agent of the States the Instruments wherein the article concerning the Duke of Lorraine is inserted and have taken back the other parchment wherein that article was wanting: Count Koningseck is arrived here in order to his voiage for England, and has brought with him the two instruments of the Emperors part to bee exchanged with those which I have from the king I have given the States notice of this and the exchanges will bee soone made according to my Instructions.¹¹³

It on the 10th of February that Dursley was (finally) in the possession of the Emperor's 'instruments' (articles) for the inclusion of England in the treaty.

¹¹² Ibidem, 20 December 1689.

¹¹³ Ibidem to Nottingham, 27 January 1690.

I have in my custody the Emperors wooden instruments for which I did exchange my silver ones with the Agent of the States who gives mine into the hands of the Emperors Minister here from whom he did receive those which he gave to me.¹¹⁴

Crystal-clear.



William Paget's arrival at the court of Leopold I was apparently not unexpected, Hop had mentioned his name twice in his own letters when referring to a successor as King William's diplomat for the Emperor.¹¹⁵ Immediately when Paget had his first audience with the Emperor, the matter of concluding England in the Alliance between the Dutch Republic and the Emperor was discussed. Leopold now wished to conclude the new alliance at The Hague – where he would send his commissioners for a congress of princes and diplomats of states that were at war with France at the end of 1689.¹¹⁶ On the 5th of December 1689, Paget was assured that the 'Act for Comprehending' the English King in the alliance was ready and would be dispatched. On the 26th of December Paget had to write practically the same thing, but can now 'assure' Nottingham, the Secretary of State, that this Act will be send within the week. As said, the ratification by the Emperor took place on the 23rd of December.

It is still the 31st of December 1689 when Nottingham wrote to Paget that:

In the Instruments ... whereby the King engaged in the Treaty with the Emperour and the States whereof your Lordship had a copy with you the Articles relating to the Duke of Lorraine was omitted the reason is this becauss 'twas no part of the Treaty but only a signification of the Emperours desirs, to the States who had not consented to it, or at least not given the King notice of it, when their Ambassador deliverd a Copy of the Treaty, but the King has now ordered the Article to be included in the Act on his part which will bee dispatcht assoone as possible ... [,] the King would have you acquaint the Emperours Ministers with what I have writt if they have heard of this omission and you see occassion and assure them that the kings Instrument with this Clause shall be

¹¹⁴ Ibidem, 10 February, 1690.

¹¹⁵ Hop to the Pensionary of Holland, 17 July 1689.

¹¹⁶ Paget to Nottingham, 29 November 1689 "*Calendar of State Papers, Secretaries of State: Foreign Series, Holland, 1689 – 1690/1689 – 1693*, TNA, ref. SP 81/17; Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 35 – 36, 291.

sent with all the repediton possible and press them to use the like diligence in dispatching theirs if it be not already done.¹¹⁷

So, on the 31st of December, neither William nor Leopold had sent the final ratifications yet to one another. The Emperor apparently sending them more than a month later, Dursley having the King's at the end of January. On the 10th of February 1690 Dursley received Leopold's 'instruments' – the complete ratification of the alliance – containing the articles for including the Duke of Lorraine in the treaty with England (as well as for the Austrian-Dutch Alliance?) from the Emperor. The delay on account of the inclusion of the Duke of Lorraine in the treaty is, in retrospect, a bit unfortunate. This Duke dies next April. An untimely death indeed, since he is one of the best generals in the service of the allies.

Summarizing; King William and the Dutch States-General had officially ratified the treaties, including England in the Austrian-Dutch alliance, on the 20th of December 1689; Emperor Leopold did the same on the 23rd.¹¹⁸ It is still later, probably the end of February or the beginning of March, that all members are certain that the alliance is ratified by all participants. All in all, even with diverse delays, the Grand Alliance was concluded in less than one year, counting from the moment that Jacob Hop received the States-General's authorisation to treat with the Emperor.

The conclusion of the Grand Alliance in December of 1689 in a sense marked the successful conclusion of the Dutch Republic's "Grand Design." With William and Mary on the English throne and England's army and navy fully committed to the war with France, the Republic's goal of mobilizing England's resources for the anti-French coalition appeared to be realized.¹¹⁹

Expanding the Grand Alliance

The cornerstone of the Grand Alliance was formed by the coalition of the Dutch Republic, the Emperor and England. Over time, the Grand Alliance was joined by other states. Already from Hop's letters it became clear that the Austrian-Dutch alliance was ment to be 'general' so other states could join in. Lord Paget and Lord Dursley actively pursued the inclusion of other states.

In July 1690, Paget joined in a memorial drafted by 'monsieur Heemskirk', the new

¹¹⁷ Nottingham to Paget, 31 December 1689.

¹¹⁸ Cox, *King William's European Joint Venture*, 118 – 119.

¹¹⁹ Stapleton, *Forging a Coalition Army*, 86.

Dutch envoy, to encourage the Emperor to try and persuade other German princes to join the Grand Alliance.¹²⁰ That same month:

Ye Emperor and King of Spain have signed articles of Friendship and Allyance with ye Duke of Savoy, and ye Emperor has engaged in one of ye Articles ye hee will procure (?) ye King of England to enter into it; but from ye Ministers I hear nothing of it, yet, ye Dutch envoyé and I have presented lastly two memorials to ye Emperor ye one, to desire his Imperial Majesty to use his most pressing instances to persuade ye several Princes in Germany to enter into ye Articles of Allyance mentioned in ye treaty signed at Vienna ye 12th day of May ye last year; by ye Emperor, and ye States General; and y[e]t hee would officialy propose ye same too ye Northern Crown; ye 2d was to desire his Imperial Majesty would consider ye present state of things, and while it is time inclind to a treaty of Peace with ye Grand Signor [of the Ottoman Empire] to offer which His Majesty of England ye States would apply ..., and most usefull help by ... ministers in yet and yet Court if, no might be told upon what condition it might be acceptable.¹²¹

So, Paget did not only try to include other princes in the Grand Alliance, he also actively promoted peace between the Emperor and his Ottoman neighbour (so the former could direct his armies against France). Both Paget and Hop were sent to the Emperor's court with instructions to promote a peace treaty between the Emperor and the Ottoman Empire.

Strangely enough, the inclusion of Spain in the Grand Alliance is rarely mentioned in the letters of Hop, Dursley and Paget, while Hop spoke specifically of including England and Spain in the Austrian-Dutch alliance. There is only the reference to the articles of 'Friendship and Allyance', mentioned above, between Spain, the Emperor and Savoy. On the 30 June 1690, Dursley writes to Nottingham:

I send Your lordship here inclosed the treaty betwixt the Emperor and the Duke of Savoy Count Berka told me that Hee was commanded by the Emperor to deliver it into my hands to send into England to the King my Master and too move that His Majesty would bee pleasd to enter into the same allyace.¹²²

¹²⁰ Paget to Nottingham, 13 July 1690.

¹²¹ Ibidem, 20 July 1690.

¹²² Dursley to Nottingham, 30 June 1690.

Incidentally; for his friendship and support, the Duke of Savoy asked a mere 30.000 crowns a month from England and the States-General.¹²³ There were also attempts to include Denmark in the alliance, but in the end nothing comes of these.¹²⁴

The Grand Alliance consisted, ultimately, of these states: the Dutch Republic, England (with Scotland and Ireland), the Emperor and 'Austria', Saxony, Bavaria, Brandenburg-Prussia, Spain, Savoy and a number of smaller German principalities such as Hessen-Cassel, the Palatinate of the Rhine, Liège and Brunswick/Hanover. The Austrian-Dutch Alliance became a Grand Alliance indeed.

¹²³ Ibidem, 23 June 1690.

¹²⁴ Ibidem, 3 January 1690; Ibidem, 31 January 1690; Ibidem, 7 February 1690.

Conclusion

This thesis is aimed at analyzing the conclusion of the Grand Alliance between Emperor Leopold I of the Holy Roman Empire (or: Austria), King-Stadtholder William III of England and the Dutch Republic, and the Dutch Republic during 1688 – 1690. A second aim is pointing out that there is an international context to the Glorious Revolution that has been neglected in scholarly research.



The negotiations leading to the concluding of the Austrian-Dutch alliance and finally the Grand Alliance between Austria, the Republic and England show the difficulties of establishing an alliance in seventeenth century Europe. However, it was obvious from the start of the Nine Years War that there was a ‘bond’ between these three states. Despite the Emperor’s reservations for William’s elevation to the English throne there could be no formal protest. The Dutch Republic, the Emperor, and England, were compelled to work together in their mutual war against France. Right from the start of the Nine Years War in the autumn of 1688 there was cooperation between German princes, the Emperor, the Dutch Republic and Spain. The Austrian-Dutch alliance is, in fact, only a clear summation of war aims, a promise of mutual support and a statement that no separate peace treaty would be made. It could be said that there was a *de facto* alliance between William III and Leopold I (as the two great adversaries of Louis XIV) that was now formally established, and of course there already was the promise of a future alliance as of the 21st of November 1688. The Dutch Republic, England and the Emperor were partners by necessity and their alliance a formal commitment.

The official dates for concluding the Austrian-Dutch and English inclusion are, in contemporary historiography, set at the 12th of May and the 20th of December 1689. Practically, it took months longer before they were really established. Jacob Hop and the Emperor’s commissioners signed the Austrian-Dutch treaty on the 12th of May but its ratification was delayed for months, until at least the last months of 1689. The same goes, to a lesser degree, for the treaty for including England, which was finally ratified two months after it was signed. Both treaties were also delayed because single (minor) article – the inclusion of the Duke of Lorraine’s rights – was initially omitted. Before a treaty was ‘perfect’ months had passed. Not only by the negotiators in the first place, but also since great distances had to be crossed by messengers and not in the least because the superiors of Hop, Dursley and Paget and the Emperor’s commissioners first held their own deliberations before ratifying treaties

and articles.

Despite these time consuming processes, the Austrian-Dutch Alliance and Grand Alliance can be considered to be concluded fairly easy and quickly. Both the Dutch Republic and England as well as the Emperor wanted (and needed) this official alliance; they also wanted it to be 'general' so that other states at war with France could easily join; they largely had the same war aim: to 'contain' France's territorial expansion. For this reason, the restoration of older (peace)treaties – those of Osnabruck/Westphalia (1648) and the Pyrenees (1659), determining France's borders – were set as the Grand Alliance's war aims.



The focus on William III's diplomats Jacob Hop, Lord Paget and Lord Dursley demonstrates the importance of international politics at this time. William depended largely on Hop to defend the proceedings in England in late 1688 and early 1689 at the Emperor's court, as well as for negotiating with the Emperor on the Austrian-Dutch Alliance. Later, Dursley was the centre for all Anglo-Austrian-Dutch negotiations concerning the Grand Alliance.

Since the Glorious Revolution was an international event, the need for a clear foreign policy from William's side was obvious. Firstly, he needed to defend the events in England that made him King; secondly, he required an (official) alliance with other states that were at France, since he (as Stadtholder of the Republic) was at war with that state from the moment he sailed for England in November 1688.

William's diplomats had some additional tasks. Both Hop and Paget were instructed to assist in concluding a peace treaty between the Emperor and the Ottoman Empire (consequently, it was hoped, more soldiers could be send to fight against France). Also, both endeavoured to include other states in the Grand Alliance. Hop was already preparing for other states – namely Spain and England – to be able to join the Austrian-Dutch Alliance. Paget tried to have the Emperor press other German princes, 'the Northern Kings' and Savoy to join the Grand Alliance. Dursley was appointed as English minister to the so-called congress of allies, which was supposed to coordinate the war against France. Envoys from all/most states at war with France were present, though there was no (single) clear alliance between these states.



This thesis makes quite clear that there is an extensive international context in which the Glorious Revolution takes place. It was an inherent part of the Nine Years War. The focus on

William III's diplomacy from 1688 – 1690 demonstrates that the King-Stattholder perceived the importance of foreign policy: both in legitimizing the English regime change and in directing the war against France that ensued from it. It is obvious as well that diplomacy before, during, and after the Glorious Revolution is a somewhat neglected subject in scholarly research. However, it was a vital component of William III's policy and essential for his achievements.

This thesis aims to be both an analysis of an important alliance in the seventeenth century and an argument for taking a less narrow, domestic, view at the Glorious Revolution. The revolution of 1688/1689 is very closely connected to the Nine Years War and it should be considered thus. Examining diplomacy in 1688 – 1690 demonstrates that this regime change was bound to stir international relations and contributed to a truly international outcome: a European-wide war that lasted nine years.

Literature and Sources

Books

- Antal, G. von, *Weensche Gezantschapsberichten van 1670 tot 1720* 2 vols. (The Hague 1929 & 1934).
- Black, Jeremy, *A History of Diplomacy* (London 2010).
- Black, Jeremy, *British Diplomats and Diplomacy, 1688 – 1800* (Exeter 2001).
- Black, Jeremy, *Trade, Empire and British Foreign Diplomacy, 1689 – 1815: the politics of a commercial state* (Abingdon and New York 2007).
- Childs, John, *The Nine Years' War and the British Army 1688 – 97: The operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester and New York 1991) 27 – 29.
- Claydon, Tony, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge 1996).
- Cox, B., *King William's European Joint Venture* (Assen 1995).
- Holborn, Hajo, *A History of Modern Germany, 1648 – 1840* (Princeton and Chichester 1964).
- Horn, D.B., *The British Diplomatic Service 1689 – 1789* (Oxford 1961).
- Israel, Jonathan I. (ed.), *The Anglo-Dutch moment, Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge 1991).
- Japikse, Nicolaas, *Correspondentie van Willem III en van Hans Willem Bentinck, eersten Graaf van Portland* part 2, vol. 3 (The Hague 1937).
- Japikse, Nicolaas, *Prins Willem III, De Stadhouders-Koning*, part 1 (Amsterdam 1930).
- Mijers, Esther and David Onnekink, *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot 2007).
- Onnekink, D.M.L. (ed.), *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648-1713* (Farnham and Burlington 2009).
- Onnekink, D.M.L., *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite. The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649 – 1709)* (Utrecht 2004).
- Pincus, Steve, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven & London 2009).
- Roosen, William James, *The Age of Louis XIV, the Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1976).
- Sachse, William Lewis, *Lord Somers: a political portrait* (Manchester 1975).
- Spielman, John P., *Leopold I of Austria* (London 1977).

- Stapleton, John M., *Forging a Coalition Army: William III, The Grand Alliance, and the Confederate Army in the Spanish Netherlands, 1688-1697* (without place ('Ohio'?) 2003).
- Troost, Wouter, *Stadhouder-Koning Willem III: een politieke biografie* (Hilversum 2001).

Essays

- Clark, G.N., 'The Dutch Missions to England in 1689' *The English Historical Review*, vol. 35, no. 140 (1920), 529-557.
- Claydon, Tony, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689–1697', in: Esther Mijers en David Onnekink (ed.), *Redefining William III: Politics and Culture in International context* (Aldershot, 2007), 129-147.
- Lane, M., 'The Diplomatic Service under William III' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th Series, 10th Vol. (1927), 87-109.
- Roorda, D.J., 'Le secret du Prince. Monarchale tendenties in de Republiek 1672-1702' in: A.J.C.M. Gabriëls, e.a. (red.), *Rond Prins en Patriciaat. Verspreide opstellen door D.J. Roorda* (Weesp 1984).

Primary sources

- *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, preserved in the Public Record Office (PRO)*, vol. 1 – 2 (London 1895 – 1927).
- *Calendar of State Papers, King William's Chest, Letters and Papers, 1689 Feb. – Sept.*, TNA, ref. SP 8/5.
- *Calendar of State Papers, Secretaries of State: Foreign Series, Holland, 1689 – 1690/1689 – 1693*, TNA, ref. SP 84/221 and SP 84/222.
- *Calendar of State Papers, Secretaries of State: Foreign Series, Spain, 1689 – 1694*, TNA ref. SP 94/73.
- *Calendar of State Papers, Secretaries of State: Foreign Series, The Holy Roman Empire, 1689 Oct. – 1700 Dec.*, The National Archives, Kew (TNA), ref. SP 81/17.
- Emperor Leopold I, *A Letter Written by the Emperor to the Late King James, Setting forth The True Occassion of his Fall, and the Treachery and Cruelty of the French* (Vienna 9 April 1689).

- Historical Manuscript Commission (HMC), *Fifteenth Report, Appendix, Part VIII, The Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry, K.G., K.T., preserved at Drumlanrig Castle*, vol. 1 – 2 (London 1897).
- HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of Allan George Finch, Esq. of Burley-on-the-Hill. Rutland*, vol. 1 (London 1913).
- HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry, K.G., K.T., preserved at Montagu House, Whitehall.*, vol. 1 – 2 (London 1899).
- HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Allan George Finch Esq. of Burley-on-the-Hill. Rutland*, vol. 2 (London 1922).
- Jacob Hop, *Conceptverbaal van Hop als extraordinaris envoyé aan het hof van de Duitse keizer, met bijlagen*, Nationaal Archief, ref. 1.10.97 no. 25.
- King William III and Queen Mary II, *Their Majesties Declaration Against the French King* (Hampton Court/London 7 May 1689).
- Scotland's Privy Council, *A Proclamation, Declaring War against the French King*. (Edinburgh 6 August 1689).