Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 48 (2021)

Tom Tölle

The Ailing Body of William, Duke of Gloucester between Medicine, News, and European Politics (1688–1714)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2021.1.93945

Tom Tölle

THE AILING BODY OF WILLIAM, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER BETWEEN MEDICINE, NEWS, AND EUROPEAN POLITICS (1688–1714)

CRISIS, [κρίσις, Gr.] a Judgment, Sentence, or Verdict.
CRISIS, [among Physicians] is a Sudden Change in a Disease, either for the better or worse, or Towards a Recovery, or Death[1].

Once, when people thought of crisis, they thought of the human body: early modern dictionaries, indeed, defined crisis in medical and religio-legal terms[2]. This is an article about one such medical crisis, the death of Queen Anne's last surviving son, William, Duke of Gloucester (1689–1700), and about those who witnessed the event. We begin in St Dunstan-in-the-West, a parish church in London in 1700[3], where sometime in August, the two early modern meanings of crisis collided: *O put not your trust in Princes*, William Fleetwood thundered in the duke's funeral sermon. Outside, in a façade alcove, bronze giants hammered their heavy clutches against two bells, while London's first public minute clock moved relentlessly forward with a mechanical sound. Fleetwood's audience shifted uncomfortably in their stalls. Many lived around Fleet Street – only a short walk from where Temple Bar joined London's commerce to Westminster politics[4] – and they will have entered the church with minds and ears still full of the voices of newsmongers in the street[5]. There may have been a few murmurs about seditious libel in Fleetwood's words, but those who knew their Bible remained calm.

With a smile, the preacher continued: *Nor in any Child of Man, for there is no help in them*[6]. What initially sounded like a potential attack on monarchical rule had given way to a more nuanced point. Fleetwood, chaplain to the ruling couple Mary II and William III, was one of many who grappled with the apparent frailty of royal bodies. Though he generally sought to stay above politics, his sermon invoked the second early modern meaning of crisis in order to criticize those who would use the dead boy to further their own political ends. Indeed, some had even gone so far as to suggest that the duke's death was divine punishment or judgement (in

1 S. v. »crisis«, in: Nathan Bailey, An Universal Etymological English Dictionary, London 1724.
2 Sabine Kalff, Politische Medizin der Frühen Neuzeit. Die Figur des Arztes in Italien und England im frühen 17. Jahrhundert, Göttingen 2014, p. 101 f.
3 Richard Newcourt, Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense. Comprising all London and Middlesex, London 1708, p. 335–337; Doreen Evenden, The Midwives of Seventeenth-Century London, Cambridge 2000, p. 158.
4 Edward Ward, Hudibras Redivivus or A Burlesque Poem on the Times, London 1707; Walter Thornbury, Fleet Street: General Introduction, in: Old and New London, London 1878, vol. 1, p. 32–53, 34 describes the curiosities.
5 Theophilus Charles Noble, Memorials of Temple Bar. With some Account of Fleet Street, and the Parishes, London 1870, p. 77 details that until 1760 stalls under St Dunstan's reached far into the king's highway.
6 William Fleetwood, A Funeral Sermon on his Late Royal Highness, William, Duke of Glocester Preach'd Aug. the 4th. 1700, London 1700.

dictionary terms) for the exile of King James II in 1688. Fleetwood continued: *I am only careful of guarding against two sorts of Men: First. Such as will needs call This great Misfortune, a Judgment of God, for what hath passed amongst us. 2d. Such as will certainly try to make it one, as soon as ever they can*[7]. This article argues that Gloucester's medical crisis was part of a wider European debate around failing dynastic reproduction. It deals with those – neither predominantly men, nor all members of an educated elite – who interacted with the duke most closely during his brief life. It also deals with those who marketed news about the duke's corporeal condition and worked to shape these medical crises in the popular imagination. Ultimately, Gloucester's death linked the English court to the European politics of information, and Fleetwood to the partisan war of words during the War of the Spanish Succession[8].

Historians have not yet systematically studied the rumors that news gatherers and writers in Britain, mainland Europe, and the British Empire spread about Princess Anne's »sickly« child. Scholars often bracket information about Gloucester's illness into distinct disciplines, while by contrast the reading public around 1700 perceived them to be intimately connected. Some historians of medicine, for instance, have used an approach of *médicine rétrospective* in order to establish which ailments various royal patients may have suffered[9]. Thanks to the work of recent cultural historians, Anne's body, and the Queen's body more generally, now attracts the scholarly attention it deserves[10]. Yet even these currents of historical disciplines have thus far paid little attention to information about sick heirs[11]. Political and intellectual historians have tended to focus on the heir's political function rather than on his physical body[12], and, with some nuance, historians of party politics have identified the waning importance of court poli-

7 Fleetwood, Sermon (as in n. 6), p. 2.

8 E. g. Nicolas Detering, Krise und Kontinent. Die Entstehung der deutschen Europa-Literatur, Cologne 2017; Matthias Pohlig, Marlboroughs Geheimnis. Strukturen und Funktionen der Informationsgewinnung im Spanischen Erbfolgekrieg um 1700, Cologne 2016; Karl Tilman Winkler, Wörterkrieg. Politische Debattenkultur in England 1689–1750, Stuttgart 1998.

9 E. g. Frederick F. Holmes, The Sickly Stuarts. The Medical Downfall of a Dynasty, Gloucestershire 2003, p. 159–183; John Dewhurst, Royal Confinements. A Gynaecological History of Britain's Royal Family, New York 1980; James Kemble, Idols and Invalids, London 1933; G[?]. E. F. Holmes, Frederick F. Holmes, William Henry, Duke of Gloucester (1689–1700), son of Queen Anne (1665–1714), could have ruled Great Britain, in: Journal of Medical Biography 16 (2008), p. 44–51; William P. MacArthur, The Cause of the Death of William, Duke of Gloucester, Son of Queen Anne, in 1700, in: British Medical Journal (1928), p. 502 f.; to an extent even in Elizabeth Lane Furdell, The Royal Doctors, 1485–1714. Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts, Woodbridge 2001, p. 231 f.

10 James Anderson Winn, Queen Anne. Patroness of Arts, Oxford 2014, 201–247 is an exception. See Susan Doran, Paulina Kewes (ed.), Doubtful and Dangerous. The Question of Succession in late Elizabethan England, Manchester 2014; Natalie Mears, Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms, Cambridge 2005; Regina Schulte (ed.), The Body of the Queen. Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500–2000, Oxford 2006; Andrew Barclay, Mary Beatrice of Modena. The »Second Bless'd of Woman-kind?«, in: Clarissa Campbell Orr (ed.), Queenship in Britain, 1660–1837. Royal Patronage, Court Culture, and Dynastic Politics, Manchester 2002, p. 74–93; Rachel Weil, Political Passions. Gender, the Family, and Political Argument in England, 1680–1714, Manchester 1999.

11 Joseph Hone, Politicising Praise. Panegyric and the Accession of Queen Anne, in: Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies 37/2 (2014), p. 147–157; Pat Rogers, Pope and the Destiny of the Stuarts. History, Politics, and Mythology in the Age of Queen Anne, Oxford 2006; an exception, e. g. Jonathan Spangler, Expected, then Passed Over. Second Sons in the French Monarchy of the Seventeeth Century, in: Valerie Schutte (ed.), Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe. Potential Kings and Queens, Cham 2017, p. 179–203.

12 Karen Harvey, The History of Masculinty, circa 1650–1800, in: Journal of British Studies 44/2 (2005), p. 296–311.

tics and of the »royal closet« in this period[13]. Bucholz's seminal work on Anne's household, which revived court history for the Stuart dynasty, seconded the established view[14] that sick royals may have engendered a pious remark or two about providence, but ultimately it was parliament and not the prince that mattered after 1688[15]. Historians of medicine, pageantry, and party, have thus studied Gloucester in terms of his clearly delineable modern roles – as patient, prince, and heir[16].

This article seeks to correct that established view. I argue that an early modern audience would have been acutely aware of the connections between all three, and that the widespread understanding of Galenic corporeality that was so prevalent around 1700 effectively negated the boundaries that our modern disciplines have since erected between them. The sudden death of the eleven-year-old heir to the throne forced royals into deep mourning, and for the political nation in its entirety, addressing the lingering succession question became the most pressing issue. Proximity to the dying heir and intimate corporeal interaction with him at this moment of crisis gave certain courtiers pride of place amongst the news-hungry. Using diaries, archival as well as published correspondence, the first part of this article studies why the British public put William's body under almost constant surveillance and how household officials sought to fortify him in response to this interest. The second part studies a set of observers – physicians, clergymen, courtiers, and household officials – as they gathered information and offered the prince partisan (health)care. The third part utilizes diplomatic correspondence and scribal newsletters in order to demonstrate the extent to which the dynastic problems of the Protestant Stuarts translated into a larger European political debate.

At a previous historiographical moment, crisis, the central concept here, resonated with a wider European historiography. Sparked by a debate between Eric Hobsbawm and Hugh Trevor-Roper, crisis indicated first and foremost a European-wide string of political upheaval in the seventeenth century, adding to the crisis of the European mind that Paul Hazard had discussed decades earlier[17]. This article is an attempt to return to the concept of a European crisis, but one of the dynastic body rather than of the European mind or economy. In the previous historiographical debate, the crisis-terminology served as a useful anachronism that allowed for European comparisons, but once it was criticized for imposing a distinctly modern concept onto early modernity, it lost most of its import[18]. I will seek instead to return to the threatening corporeality of dynasty in early modern Europe to unearth an earlier valence of crisis. Crisis,

13 Geoffrey Holmes, British Politics in the Age of Anne, New York, 1967, p. 196f; John H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England 1675–1725, London 1967, esp. p. 101–103, 134f, 144; William A. Speck, Tory & Whig. The Struggle in the Constituencies, 1701–1715, London 1970, p. 98–109.

14 Robert O. Bucholz, The Augustan Court. Queen Anne and the Decline of Court Culture, Stanford 1993.

15 Holmes, British Politics (as in n. 13), p. 185–216, here p. 210, who grants her »a peripheral place […] in the normal pattern of politics«.

16 Hillard von Thiessen, Diplomatie vom »type ancien«. Überlegungen zu einem Idealtypus des frühneuzeitlichen Gesandtschaftswesens, in: Id. and Christian Windler (ed.), Akteure der Außenbeziehungen: Netzwerke und Interkulturalität im historischen Wandel, Cologne 2010, p. 471–504; Mark Hengerer, Zur Konstellation der Körper höfischer Kommunikation, in: Johannes Burkhardt, Christine Werkstetter (ed.), Kommunikation und Medien in der Frühen Neuzeit, Munich 2005, p. 519–546.

17 An overview in John H. Elliott, The General Crisis in Retrospect. A Debate without End, in: Id., Spain, Europe and the Wider World, 1500–1800, New Haven 2009, p. 52–73; On Hazard's intellectual project see Anthony Grafton, Introduction, in: Paul Hazard, The Crisis of the European Mind 1680–1715, New York 2013, p. vii–xi.

18 Rudolf Schlögl, »Krise« als historische Form der gesellschaftlichen Selbstbeobachtung. Eine Einleitung, in: Phillip R. Hoffmann-Rehnitz, Rudolf Schögl, Eva Wiebel (ed.), Die Krise in der

I argue, was foremost a corporeal concept with which one could conceptualize the uncertain relationship between present diagnosis and future prognosis. In early modern medicine especially, it suggested an imminent moment of change – for instance, the evacuation of fluids – but without implying positive or negative consequences[19]. In the case of dynastic politics these moments of crisis – with two mutually exclusive outcomes: a battle of nature and illness as Michael Stolberg put it[20] – occurred frequently. In patrimonial societies such crises were political in a way that for the modern reader perhaps can only compare to a modern economic crisis – that is, a rare event but one that it is best to be prepared for.

The Heir's Body in a Divided Dynasty

In July 1688, during the so-called Glorious Revolution that replaced Princess Anne's own father, the Catholic James II, with her Protestant sister Mary and Mary's husband, William of Orange, Anne gave birth to a boy: William, duke of Gloucester. Although William lived, later authors saw his weak condition at birth as the result of suffering endured in the womb of his mother who had lived through a period of personal and political upheaval with *dejected spirits and an aching heart*[21]. However, the birth of James II and Mary of Modena's son James Edward, only a month earlier, sparked rumor-mongering. One writer noted with suspicion: *From 76 to 87 we heard of nothing but miscarriages, but then* [with Anne's looming pregnancy] *it was resolved that a child must be had*[22]. Anne's sister Mary was attacked as *the undutiful child of the kindest of princes* [James II] and critics considered her childlessness a divine punishment for dethroning her father[23]. These were not just the years of political revolution and of new imperial ambition, they were also the continuation – through the birth of two heirs – of what John Morrill has called the »war of the two dynasties«[24]. The hopes of a political nation divided along the lines of political ideology, religion, and economic orientation, now resided in two infant bodies – William and James – and loyal as well as critical subjects watched the toddlers' every step[25].

This interest, particularly in Gloucester, would be puzzling were it not for the larger context of the reproductive crisis plaguing William III and Mary at the time of his birth. Despite the baroque imagery of William III, who placed himself strategically in a framework created by

Frühen Neuzeit, Göttingen 2016, p. 9–32; John B. Shank, Crisis. A Useful Category of Post-Social Scientific Historical Analysis?, in: American Historical Review 113/4 (2008), p. 1090–1099.

19 Hannah Newton, Misery to Mirth. Recovery from Illness in Early Modern England, Oxford 2019, p. 51 f.; Kalff, Politische Medizin (as in n. 2).

20 Michael Stolberg, Experiencing Illness and the Sick Body in Early Modern Europe, New York 2011, p. 21–27.

21 [Jenkin Lewis], Memoirs of Prince William Henry, Duke of Glocester, From his Birth, July the 24th 1689, to October, 1697. From an Original Tract. Written by Jenkin Lewis, some Time Servant to her Highness the Princess Anne of Denmark, afterwards Queen of England, London 1789, p. 4; also in Gilbert Burnet, Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time. From the Restoration of Charles II to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne (henceforth: HOT), 2 vols., London 1840.

22 Remarks upon the Birth of the Pretended Prince of Wales by the present Lord Bishop of Worcester not taken notice of in other Books on that Subject, in: London, BL Add MS 38851, fol. 33.

23 E. g. Anonymous Jacobite epitaph, in: Coles MS Collection, vol. XXI, p. 65, cited in Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, From the Norman Conquest, 12 vols., London 1889, vi, p. 130.

24 John Morrill, Dynasties, Realms, Peoples and State Formation, 1500–1720, in: Robert von Friedeburg, John Morrill (ed.), Monarchy Transformed. Princes and their Elites in Early Modern Western Europe, Cambridge 2017, p. 17–43, esp. p. 27.

25 Georg Schnath, Geschichte Hannovers im Zeitalter der neunten Kur und der englischen Sukzession 1674–1714, 5 vols., Hildesheim 1982, iv, p. 161.

Charles I and as a continuation of the Restoration of the monarchy, William's corporeality was treated with suspicion[26]. As was common with any monarch who had close male favorites[27], the king was rumoured to have had homosexual relations with his closest intimates[28]. These claims were aggravated by his frequent absences from court, since William III often resided in the Dutch palace at Het Loo[29]. Travel thus not only removed him from courtly sociability, perhaps more importantly, it exposed him to news-writing that was deprived of reliable information but nonetheless fed a regular news cycle[30]. One pamphlet, for instance, described by Hanoverian envoy de Beyrie, framed Britons as Israelites, while the king's Dutch favorites featured as Gibeonites – that is, as cunning and untrustworthy foreigners[31]. To the insult of William's frequent absences and his foreign birth was added the fact that his marriage to Mary II did not produce a single child. Indeed, as he aged William's much-discussed gout came to stand in for his own political immobility[32]. The disease, a form of arthritis with periods of severe pain, was commonly associated with life at court and in the city[33]. While success on the battlefield shielded the monarch for a while from some of the critique, his failing dynastic reproduction heightened public accusations that the princely couple were alienated from its subjects and orientated towards the foreign king's male favorites rather than the political nation.

Decades of public debate about dynastic and political machinations aggravated these common dynastic concerns in the British case. As Noah Millstone has shown in his recent study of the Civil War, the practice of news-writing became deeply connected to the widening political rifts that defined British politics. For late Tudor England, Peter Lake has likewise pointed to the »eerie resemblance between each side's account of the other's sinister manipulation of news and rumour«[34]. Using a learned Galenic terminology that had become the talk of the town, diplomatic letter-writers spread comparable diagnoses about Princess Anne's *pessima stamina vitae*[35] as well as about Mary of Modena's *mala stamina vitae*[36]. Early modern thinkers concep-

26 Andrew Barclay, William's Court as King, in: Esther Mijers, David Onnekink (ed.), Redefining William III. The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context, Burlington 2007, p. 240–261.

27 John H. Elliott, The Count-Duke of Olivares. The Statesman in an Age of Decline, New Haven 1986; Robert A. Stradling, Philip IV and the Government of Spain 1621–1665, Cambridge 1988; Antonio Feros, Kingship and Favoritism in the Spain of Philip III, 1598–1621, Cambridge 2000; comparative cases in John H. Elliott, Lawrence Brockliss (ed.), The World of the Favourite, New Haven 1999; Magdalena S. Sánchez, The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun. Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain, Baltimore 1998, p. 6–8 and passim.

28 Wouter Troost, William III. The Stadholder-King. A Political Biography, Aldershot 2004, p. 25–27.

29 Ibid, p. 235; Robert Yard to Alexander Stanhope, Whitehall, 09/12/1699, in: Maidstone, Kent History and Library Center, Chevening MSS, U1590/O59/8–11.

30 Noah Millstone, Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England, Cambridge 2016; Rachel Weil, A Plague of Informers. Conspiracy and Political Trust in William III's England, New Haven 2013.

31 Envoy de Beyrie to Duke of Brunswick-Luneburg, London, August 20/31, 1700, in: Hanover, NLA HA, Cal Br 24 Nr. 1641, fol. 195r–196r.

32 Even if some argued that gout protected from more severe diseases, e. g. Stanhope to Blathwayt, The Hague, August, 3/14, 1701, in London, London, British Library, Add MS 21489, fol. 33r.

33 Roy Porter, George S. Rousseau, Gout. The Patrician Malady, New Haven 2000, ch. 2, on the longevity of this connection.

34 Peter Lake, Bad Queen Bess? Libels, Secret Histories, and the Politics of Publicity in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth I, Oxford 2016, p. 35.

35 Johann Philipp Hoffman to Emperor Leopold I, London, August 10, 1700, in: Vienna, AT-OeStA/HHStA Staatenabteilung (StAbt) England 31, fol. 529r–531r, fol. 529v.

36 Remarks upon the Birth of the Pretended Prince of Wales by the present Lord Bishop of Worcester not taken notice of in other Books on that Subject, in: London, BL Add MS 38851, fol. 33.

tualized the body of pregnant women as so permeable and exposed to outside influences that from without the womb adverse influences could quite literally leave their imprint on the unborn child[37]. Anne herself suffered seventeen miscarriages and stillbirths[38]. Miscarriages were quite common and were not considered a dynastic failure, for unlike no conception at all – as in case of William III and Mary II – even a failed pregnancy could instill hope[39]. However, while corporeal links and ties of blood were strong bonds in the world of dynasty, they were also known to be chronically hard to prove.

To thwart future ambitions, for instance, James's enemies spread rumors that the birth of his son was a fraud[40]. Indeed, James II's daughter Princess Anne, who had her own claims to the throne to protect, became one of the leading voices to encourage doubt about James Edward[41]. In letters to her sister Mary in the Netherlands, she regretted that she had not been at court when Mary of Modena, James's second wife, gave birth. With insinuations that the partisan press would repeat for decades, Anne argued that no credible witness had been present, touched the belly, or examined the lactating breasts[42]. Another witness account, however, declared the birth genuine for the reason *that my being a noted whig, and signally opprest by King James, they would never hasarded such a secret, as a supositious Child, which* […] *I was have come time enough to have discovered*[43]. Birthing, this so-called warming pan scandal suggested, was thus not a simple matter of individual corporeality, it should ideally involve the eyes, ears, and hands of a number of people besides the mother. Yet in a world permeated by news and political distrust this multitude of perspectives also raised questions about credibility: only the physical presence of the correct witnesses could guarantee the truth of dynastic reproduction.

William's aunt Mary, queen from 1688 onwards, soon gave up any hope of birthing a child of her own, and the duke of Gloucester was groomed as the Protestant heir apparent from an early age[44]. While William lived, the unresolved succession question at the late Stuart court was dormant, but the prince led a life under constant surveillance. Authors imagined the royal family as a crooked family tree, and the young duke of Gloucester – *a Child of fine Shape and pleasing Features* as some stated[45] – had become the branch that would one day save that royal oak[46]. However, the boy also suffered from illnesses that were a potent currency for all those who traded information about the royal family. Letter writers and pamphleteers paid close attention to William's upbringing, his medical condition, and ultimately his death. Thus, extensive

37 Mary Terrall, Material Impressions. Conception, Sensibility, and Inheritance, in: Id, Helen Deutsch (ed.), Vital Matters. Eighteenth-century Views of Conception, Life, and Death, Toronto 2012, p. 109–129.
38 Holmes, Holmes, Gloucester (as in n. 9).
39 Daphna Oren-Magidor, Infertility in Early Modern England, London 2017, p. 26.
40 Corrinne Harol, Misconceiving the Heir. Mind and Matter in the Warming Pan Propaganda, in: Terrall, Deutsch (ed.), Vital Matters (as in n. 37), here p. 130–147; Weil, Passions (as in n. 10), ch. 3.
41 Weil, Passions (as in n. 10), ch. 3 summarizes the question, if Anne deliberately absented herself.
42 Princess Anne to Queen Mary, The Cockpit, June 18, 1688, in: John Dalrymple (ed.), Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, London 1771, ii, p. 175 f. and Burnet, HOT (as in n. 21), ii, p. 477–479.
43 Hugh Chamberlin to Princess Sophia, The Hague, October 14, 1713, in: London, British Library, Add MS 4107, fol. 150v.
44 Weil, Passions (as in n. 10), ch. 4.
45 [Edward Chamberlayne], Angliae Notitia. or, the Present State of England. With divers Remarks upon the Ancient State thereof, London 1694, p. 116.
46 E. g. Neil Guthrie, The Material Culture of the Jacobites, Cambridge 2013, p. 43–45.

correspondence connected the country to the bedchambers of royalty in the period-defining years of 1688/9 and beyond[47].

The late Stuart courts in England and St Germain serve as the most important examples that provide a close-up view on the workings of dynasty. For authors writing during Gloucester's coming of age, his physical health was inextricably fused with his mental ability as a ruler. Regardless of their political outlook, pamphleteers and letter writers associated good political leadership with a strongly gendered educational program and a virile physique. Education was supposed to equip the young duke with the desirable skill set of a good prince[48]. His preceptor Bishop Gilbert Burnet appointed himself the role of *explaining the Scriptures to him, the instructing him in the principles of religion, and the rules of virtue, and the giving him a view of history, geography, politics, and government*[49]. Another tutor Samuel Pratt, by contrast, guaranteed that the duke would be able to read and write Latin and that he would learn about the state of the art in fortification[50]. Understanding scripture and reading Latin allowed the young prince access to the classical canon of religion, law, and philosophy, but it also shielded him from more controversial topics.

The educational program could not be divorced from the political outlook of William's later tutor, Gilbert Burnet. Burnet's political opinion differed markedly from Princess Anne's. He favored limits to kingship, religious tolerance, and defended resistance to unjust monarchs. Once William learned the history of English religion and England's ancient laws and liberties, the subject of his great-grandfather's beheading and his grandfather's exile were inevitable. Though evidence of William's exposure to these subjects is scarce, it does exist. By the time of William's death, Burnet had already worked through *the Psalms, Proverbs, and Gospel, read Greek and roman Histories, and of Plutarch's Lives*, and was just explaining *the Goth constitution, and the beneficiary and feudal laws*[51]. As Aysha Pollnitz has shown, some early modern educators imagined the process of educating as quite literally a process of healing. Erasmus, for instance, spoke prominently of religious education as an antidote to sin[52]. In an attempt to make his weekly dispatches more entertaining, the Prussian envoy reported home that discussing the virtues of princes, *one spared the Prince some application of bolder examples, of cruels, simpletons or idlers, which one had given to certain sovereigns in the past*[53]. The account of Jenkin Lewis, one of his young servants, narrativized this even further, detailing Gloucester's observations about the *burying place* of his grandfather Charles I, who was executed in 1649. In Lewis's version, the heir observed that this monarch lacked the monument erected for other royals. Gloucester allegedly commented that a king *should not be among those of the people in common*[54]. One can only speculate what courtiers thought of a man with known Whig-leanings speaking to the heir about the Gothic constitution and the vicious monarchs of the past. However, lessons about war heroes and gifted engineers were seen to balance that scale.

47 A digital humanities project at Oxford combined with newsletters among the *State Papers* indicates that widespread correspondence about Gloucester existed.

48 Burnet, HOT (as in n. 21); Abel Boyer, The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne, London 1722; [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21).

49 Burnet, HOT (as in n. 21), ii, p. 648.

50 Margaret A. Toynbee, William, Duke of Gloucester, and Campden House, Kensington, in: Notes and Queries 14/28 Jun. 1947, p. 24–48, 267–272, esp. 272. A book with over thirty Latin exercises between March 13, 1699/1700 and July 20, 1700 is at Christ Church, Oxford (MS 166).

51 Burnet, HOT (as in n.21), ii, p. 668.

52 Aysha Pollnitz, Princely Education in Early Modern Britain, Cambridge 2015, p. 114,

53 Entry, London, August 02/13, 1700, in: British Library, Add MSS 30,000 D, fol. 245r–248r, fol. 246vf.

54 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 72.

In many ways, Gloucester was meant to become a well-fortified bulwark himself[55]. For most of his childhood, England was at war with the Bourbon monarchy and this rivalry permeated his education. The perfect fortress, the skilled hunter, and the heroic general, thus offered lessons in more than one field, rhetorically demanding his physical transformation into a virile leader. Groom of the bedchamber, Hugh Boscawen, and keeper Sir Fleetwood Sheppard accompanied the duke when he first *took say*: *A term made use of by gentlemen who hunt the deer, when any one is initiated in the sport*. In this »passage rite«[56], the young prince's face was covered with *the blood of the animal* the party had killed, and – in turn – he covered the faces of his hunting companions[57]. Riding, fencing, and dancing similarly targeted his physical constitution. From Samuel Pratt, one of his tutors, Gloucester learned about the fortresses that Britain maintained against its enemies in Europe[58]. Lewis's report detailed how the heir *wished* the king *good success, and that he might conquer Ireland, as well as France, and the whole world*[59]. When interviewed by German guests of his father, the duke announced *with a brisk look, but I will go to France; for he had a notion, that France and England were not only then at war, but were ever like to be rivals in glory*. It is telling that such vivid narratives rarely featured in diplomatic correspondence[60]. Though often anecdotal, these accounts are nonetheless indicative.

At the very least, they bring British standards of masculinity to the fore. Early modern observers perceived his potential to succeed in battle as intimately connected to his potential to father an heir. Patriarchal theories unpacked princely rule from the role of a father in a household[61]. As James Anderson Winn has recently discussed, elegies drawing on the heroes of Homer and Virgil published at Eton, Oxford, and Cambridge also underscored Gloucester's virility in order to lament his unfulfilled qualities as a future leader[62]. This corporeal focus resonated powerfully with arguments of balanced monarchical rule because many authors believed that a well-educated prince whose tutors had set him on a path to virtue would not degenerate into a tyrant[63].

These aspirations to masculinity – a set of expectations »thrust upon boys« like a coat[64] – coexisted with prolonged periods of often life-threatening and debilitating frailty in William's case: By some, the duke was considered a *weakly child, and not expected to live long*. Agues, fevers, and fears of the smallpox regularly brought him to crisis early in his life. Commentators also suggested that his head *was big enough for most men* and that he had trouble climbing stairs without help[65]. Such evidence coexisted with dynastic imagery and eulogizing texts,

55 Justus Lipsius, Politica. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction, ed. with translation by Jan Waszink, Assen 2004, p. 503.

56 Pierre Bourdieu, Les Rites comme actes d'institution, in: Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales 43 (1982), p. 58–63, here p. 58.

57 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 69. On Sheppard, see Frank H. Ellis, Sheppard, Sir Fleetwood (1634–1698), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB), Oxford 2004, [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25342, accessed 24 Jan 2015].

58 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 8, 19, 50, 63, 76.

59 Ibid., p. 21.

60 Entry, January 07/17, 1696, fol. 5r–6v, fol. 6v.

61 Gordon J. Schochet, The Authoritarian Family and Political Attitudes in 17th-Century England, New Brunswick 1988; Weil, Passions (as in n. 10); Karen Harvey, The Little Republic. Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Oxford 2012.

62 Winn, Patroness (as in n. 10), ch. 5.

63 Pollnitz, Princely Education (as in n. 52), p. 311f regarding James I.

64 Anthony Fletcher, Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800, New Haven 1995, p. 87.

65 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 12; Winn, Patroness (as in n. 10), p. 206f, is right to success that these crises became less frequent as the duke grew up.

which rhetorically shielded him against a world of cutting rumors. As Kennet's *History* phrased it a couple of years later, Gloucester's *tender constitution bended* [sic] *under the weight of his manly soul*[66]. Almost parallel portraits of the duke of Gloucester and the Pretender in armour instead prepared James and William pictorally for a battle rivaling that of James II and William III: Harness and baton became extensions of the heir's public body as much as the anecdotes about his obsession with men-of-war, military drill, and fortifications became literary harnesses against public opinion[67]. Medical knowledge about the princes, leading to a conclusion at odds with these public images, could thus validate or invalidate claims about their respective virile and virtuous futures.

More broadly, early modern observers talked about court and city as health risks. The biggest threat to a young prince was the effeminizing effect of court flattery and London luxury[68]. Although courts offered power through proximity to the ruler, they could also corrupt. Many feared that constant dissimulation, rivalry, and alleged lax morals, turned manly heroes into effeminate flatterers. Furthermore, London often faced the threat of epidemia, and, beyond urban health, a tradition of country authors saw urban life itself as detrimental to virtue[69]. Knowing of children's weak constitutions, the royal court fled the malaria outbreaks of London in summer and special household for heirs were even removed from court at large. Accounts about Gloucester echoed the practice of a regular *change of air* to rid oneself of superfluous humours, which best-selling advice literature had advertised already by the 16th century[70]. Spas like Bath and Tunbridge Wells were popular destinations thought to restore frail bodies through exposure to the springs and the air[71]. Religious, moral, and medicinal ideas thus co-existed at these loci of healing[72].

Consequently, the duke of Gloucester spent some of his youth at estates outside the city: in Lord Craven's house in nearby Kensington or in one *Mrs Davies's* houses in Twickenham, which were rented for these occasions[73]. Physicians had declared Kensington a particularly beneficial environment because of the nearby gravel pits and the healing springs[74]. Creating a household shielded from court, staffed with a few select people who maintained a strict routine of airing, prayer, education, and play underscores how assumptions about corporeal malleability structured the duke's upbringing[75]. Yet contemporary accounts also emphasized the dangers of being weakened *by the over-care of the ladies about him*[76]. So even in these ideal spaces, special dangers – ranging from overtly eager physicians to female attention – awaited the heir.

66 White Kennet, Complete History of England, 3 vols., London 1719, II, p. 185 f.
67 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), e. g. p. 78, 85, and passim.
68 Cynthia Herrup, The King's Two Genders, in: Journal of British Studies 45/3 (2006), p. 493–510, here p. 499.
69 Holmes, British Politics (as in n. 13), p. 116–147.
70 Newton, Misery to Mirth (as in n. 19), p. 89.
71 Ute Lotz-Heumann, Repräsentationen von Heilwassern und -quellen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Badeorte, lutherische Wunderquellen und katholische Wallfarten, in: Matthias Pohlig et al. (ed.), Säkularisierungen in der Frühen Neuzeit. Methodische Probleme und empirische Fallstudien, Berlin 2008; Physician John Radcliffe cured relatives at Tunbridge: Miss Alice Spencer to Lady Radcliffe, Tunbridge Wells, August 1, 1699, in: Princeton University Library, Manuscripts, Radcliffe Family Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, fol. 1v.
72 Alexandra Walsham, The Reformation of the Landscape. Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland, Oxford 2011, ch. 6; Sara Read, Menstruation and the Female Body in Early Modern England, Basingstoke 2013, p. 73 f.
73 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 6, 25
74 Toynbee, Gloucester (as in n. 50); [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 6.
75 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 10.
76 Ibid., p. 13 and 56.

Partisan Healthcare and News Gathering

A great range of subjects wanted to cure frail royal bodies. Not just because in a traditional view of monarchy the process restored the health of society by proxy, but also since social recognition, access, and monetary advancement could be gained. Examples abound in Jenkin Lewis's account, which details that many potential *nurses, with young children, came many at a time, several days together, from town, and the adjacent villages*, when the infant needed *a change of milk*[77]. Furthermore, an apothecary, whose recipe had been *approved of by King Charles II* rushed to court to cure an ague with a *mixture of brandy, saffron, &c*[78]. And finally, we are told that a Quaker's wife offered a remedy that *had restored her children*[79]. When it came to the boy's wetnurse, a female courtier, Charlotte Beverwort, daughter of Lewis of Nassau, even *examined the parish books* to establish her true age, leading to the wetnurse's dismissal[80]. A word of warning about this source is in order since it was published only in 1789 and no manuscript copy survives. Indeed, the degree of detail is almost too good to be true, and it interlaces some of the text with later, rather prosaic, commentary[81]. Yet for the sake of this argument, this late eighteenth-century fabrication offers vital information about how the heir's corporeality was discussed during the early modern period.

The ideas of university-trained quacks, self-declared as well as divinely ordained healers, often centered on two related Galenic ideas of maintaing balance and restoring order[82]. The boundaries between university-trained and self-taught healers remained a blurred one during Anne's reign, and remedies were based on a tacit understanding of the young prince's overall humoral inclinations. These ideas steered treatment in the background, but only surface textually in formulations like *for fear of clogging him too much* or his being *naturally bound in his body*[83]. Bloodletting, cupping, and induced vomiting all aimed at purging the body of excessive liquids or humours. When, for instance, the duke of Gloucester contracted a fever, royal physician John Radcliffe gave him a nauseating *febrifuge julap*[84]. In his *Practical Dispensatory*, Radcliffe explained that using a large amount of a drink, including so-called Jesuit's powder made from the bark of a Peruvian tree to *be taken every third Hour for eight Times, out of the Fit,* would prove a remedy[85]. His colleagues frequently used cupping-glasses to draw blood or corrosive substances to create blisters filled with liquid on the skin that could be opened to let the fluid out. When Radcliffe explained to William III that *your whole Maß of Blood is corrupted* his practical medical repertoire thus touched on the old medico-political rhetoric of healing the body politic[86].

77 Ibid., p. 5.
78 Ibid., p. 17.
79 Ibid., p. 6.
80 Ibid., p. 5.
81 E. g. in [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 46f, which added to *human nature is too apt to be pleased with flattery* a bracket of 27 lines about misrepresentation and duplicity.
82 Peter Elmer, Chemical Medicine and the Challenge to Galenism. The Legacy of Paracelsus, 1560–1700, in: Id (ed.), The Healing Arts. Health, Disease and Society in Europe 1500–1800, Manchester 2004, p. 108–135.
83 [Lewis], Memoirs (as in n. 21), p. 17, 33, the latter suggesting that he should not eat cheese.
84 Ibid., p. 17.
85 [John Radcliffe], Dr Radcliffe's Practical Dispensatory Containing a Complete Body of Prescriptions, Fitted for all Diseases internal and external, Digested Under Proper Heads, 4th ed., London 1721, p. 246.
86 [William Pittis], Some Memoirs of the Life of John Radcliffe, M.D. Interspersed with Several Original Letters: Also a True Copy of his last Will and Testament, London 1715, p. 45 f.

Success could determine who would be accused of shortening the heir's life and who would be seen as her/his healer. In »The English Post« a Mrs Jane Allat advertised a medicine against convulsive fits with Gloucester's name[87]. Such healing methods, however, tread a fine line between cure and superstition. If exotic healing practices – such as Jesuit's bark – failed, the use of such ominous powders and juleps could also expose the physician to future recrimination. *Poison powders* had a long history in plots against British royalty: Elizabeth's royal physician Roderigo Lopez allegedly received money to poison the Queen[88]; after James I's death one physician, who suspected the use of poison, fled the country[89]; and there were plans afoot to poison Charles II's illegitimate son, the duke of Monmouth. Cups, juleps, and the new spring-driven scarificators heavily impacted a young body, often severely, and patients endured periods when blistered skin, intense vomiting, or the loss of blood weakened the ailing person[90].

What drove healers to seek royal employment, a risky affair under any circumstances, can be seen more clearly once we step away from the sickbed. If we look beyond their medical practice alone, historians can appreciate these doctors as political agents in their own right. Physicians collected information about royals that allowed them to obtain preferment, access, and even upward mobility. John Radcliffe serves as a keen example of this experience. He is remembered today as a major benefactor of Oxford University, to which he left a trove of particularly rich archival documents. This self-styled man of practice made a fortune curing the British aristocracy, the royal family, and its favourites. A lifelong bachelor, Radcliffe earned his doctorate at Oxford and was also instrumental in ending an epidemic in the university town. At the time, Oxford generally and Radcliffe's University College in particular took pride in its role as a center of Toryism. For decades, in waves of glowing support and hidden interest, a more extreme part of the student body even toasted the health of the Pretender[91]. Princess Anne, with her Tory leanings, tacitly acknowledged this through early visits when she became queen[92].

Mapping Radcliffe's circle further suggests that his sociability extended to Whigs and Tories alike. His annotated almanac for 1696 recorded those with whom he dined or drank. In entries from 1696, for instance, he mentioned a string of such meetings[93]. Details of what Radcliffe and his acquaintances may have talked about are lost to us, but it is possible to gain some insight by carefully reviewing epistolary consultations[94]. At least in their letters, physicians did not confine themselves to what modern readers consider medical advice. Quite the contrary, they mapped a panoply of social interactions and frequently commented on observations about the health of many other nobles as well as the royal family. When, for instance, one of Charles II's

87 English Post 32 (December 23, 1700).

88 Alistair Bellany, The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England. News Culture and the Overbury Affair, Cambridge 2002, p. 200 and id., Thinking with Poison, in: Malcolm Smuts (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare, Oxford 2016, p. 559–579.

89 Id., Thomas Cogswell, The Murder of King James I, New Haven 2015.

90 John H. M. Salmon, Bodin and the Monarchomachs, in: Id., Renaissance and Revolt. Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France, Cambridge 1987, p. 119–135 and Robert Zaller, Breaking the Vessels. The Desacralization of Monarchy in Early Modern England, in: Sixteenth Century Journal 29 (1998), p. 757–778.

91 E. g. letter from Merton College, Oxford, April 16, 1733, in: Cambridge University Library, Manuscripts, Cholmondeley Manuscripts [Houghton Papers], Correspondence, 2179 (Secretary of State Charles Delafaye to First Lord of the Treasury Robert Walpole, s. l., June 5, 1734).

92 Nigel Aston, Queen Anne and Oxford. The Royal Visit of 1702 and its Aftermath, in: Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies 37/2 (2014), p. 171–184.

93 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Radcliffe Records A.1/2.

94 Robert Weston, Medical Consulting by Letter in France, 1665–1789, Farnham 2013; Nancy G. Siraisi, Communities of Learned Experience. Epistolary Medicine in the Renaissance, Baltimore 2012; Ian Maclean, The Medical Republic of Letters before the Thirty Years War, in: Intellectual History Review 18/1 (2008), p. 15–30.

royal physicians Sir Edmund King wrote to his noble patrons Lord and Lady Hatton of Kirby, anything that could affect their social position was deemed of interest. In 1684 he regularly wrote about potentially important or upsetting news: being called to court to consult on *the Kings swelling in his leg*[95], for instance, or of an earthquake that shook his house. At other times, he mentioned the clandestine marriage of Lord Montagu and the duchess of Albemarle[96]. Instead of examining their patients' bodies, physicians often observed in detail the social setting that the sick inhabited. While difficult to trace in every instance, healing practices placed physicians in an ideal position – especially if they treated royalty in such a holistic sense that they could serve as informants to noble families.

Radcliffe was one of a handful of rival royal physicians. As their favors with their powerful patients waxed and waned, so too did relations between themselves. The terminal illness of Gloucester, during which numerous letters criss-crossed London, is a good example of this situation. A string of notes – now preserved at Lambeth Palace Library – connected preceptor and Anglican churchman Gilbert Burnet with Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury[97]. *The Duke*, Burnet wrote, *was a little ill the day after his Birthday which we imputed to the fatigue of that day* […] *Princesse sent for Dr Hans who* […] *has let him blood {superscript: three hours ago} 5 or 6 Ounces since that time his feaver is abated*[98]. Soon after, Burnet witnessed the opening of blisters *for which I have staied the sending this* [the letter, TT] and worried that *his Highnes is in a breathing sweat and sleepe so this is delaied*[99]. A bit later he commented on the conflict between the royal physicians[100]: *They are still all of a mind in their Prescriptions but Dr Ratcliffe is not yet satisfied whither it may not prove to be the small pox at night he believes it will be plainer*[101].

To be sure, Burnet – crucial in turning the prince into a veritable living fortress – was not a bystander in this terminal crisis. He was part of a diverse set of agents offering (in his case) spiritual healing. It must indeed have been a troubling sight when *the Doctors ordered him to be capped and some ounces of blood were taken from him but with no successe*. Just when the clergymen acknowledged that a moment of crisis had been reached – offering *the commendatory praier – he died*[102]. His last letter pointed to implications Burnet saw beyond an ordinary death: *God be merciful to a sinfull Nation* […] *and Preserve the King*[103]. Radcliffe was called in at a particularly risky juncture even though he no longer enjoyed Anne's favor: Attributing individual responsibility for a potential royal exitus, it seemed, was less likely if a number of physicians and healers were in attendance. Similarly, the constant involvement of Burnet underscores how his spiritual healing joined forces with the medical practice of Hannes, Radcliffe, and others. His letters underline that this was perceived as a deeply political event that required him to inform his political friends urgently.

Even after the boy was dead, his body could not rest; soon, those present in his last hours began to point fingers. Was providence alone responsible? Consequently, an autopsy of the young prince, intended to clarify the cause of death, also became the subject of letters. The court audience witnessed the physicians cutting open the chest, stomach, and head of the Stuart

95 Edmund King to Lord Hatton at Kirby in Northampton, January 22, 1684, in: London, BL Add MS 29585.
96 Same to same, September 22, 1692 and February 18, 1691, both in: ibid.
97 Seven letters from Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, to Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, in: Lambeth Palace Library (LPL), MS 953, nos. 68–75.
98 Ibid., here same to same, July 27, 1700, no. 76.
99 Ibid., here same to same, July 29, 1700, no. 70.
100 Furdell, Royal Doctors (as in n. 9), p. 237 and [Pittis], Memoirs (as in n. 86), p. 47.
101 Burnet to Tenison, July 29, 1700, in: LPL, MS 953, no. 74.
102 Ibid.
103 Ibid.

heir. Prussian envoy Friedrich Bonet commented: *The autopsy that one has done on the duke of Gloucester's body has discovered the disease he contracted; it's a malign and contagious fever*[104], and he continued in a language that almost verbatim resembled the physicians' report: *Few hours after his death his body turned all yellow, his intestines were found all corrupted and one has found water amassed in his brain, of a kind that all the body's faculties could not be able to battle*[105]. In this case, it seems, physicians were unable to provide remedies, suggesting that in many cases corporeality had triumphed over medicine.

In a pamphlet published in 1700, the royal physicians seemingly hurried to realign their individual testimonies. Though it is unclear who published the piece, there are some hints about who was involved. Dr Hannes, whose name appears on the frontispiece, may have had a say in publishing it[106], but Radcliffe was probably also part of the process. A manuscript version of the testimonies of Hannes, Radcliffe, and Dr Gibbons in a single hand survives among Radcliffe's personal papers[107]. It also notes when Radcliffe may have received the letter from Dr Hannes, suggesting that the physicians actually consulted one another. Yet another version, probably used by John Churchill, first duke of Marlborough, the heir's later governor, survives among the Blenheim Papers[108]. It suggests the circulation of the testimonies not merely in print, but also in manuscript. The physicians commented *in extenso* on his urine and stool, his fevers, cold sweats, and his short and dreamless sleeps. Hannes noted that after his birthday Gloucester was indisposed. On *Saturday morning, upon loosing a little blood, He thought himself better, but in the evening his Fever appaering more violent, a blister was directed, with such other remedies as were thought most proper* and added that *His Highness went this day very often to Stool*[109]. Gibbons wrote that on Sunday morning he *found him very feavourish with a quick and Low pulse,* […] *and was inform'd* […] *that he had had severall Stools that afternoon*[110]. After more bleedings, Gloucester developed a rash on his skin. A different hand in the Blenheim papers noted for Radcliffe that *We Ordered him Cordicall Powders and Cordial Julups to resist the Malignity. He took a Paper of the Powders that Night, which kept him in breathing Sweats, and brought out the Rash in greater Quantity*[111]. At night, all agreed, he could no longer breathe or swallow. Eventually he fainted, and before midnight, the boy was dead.

Before the printing presses ran wild with the news, letter writers had already publicized the event. Queen Mary's vice-chamberlain, George Sayers, for example, left a particularly rich account of Gloucester's medical crisis. Within a few days, detailed information had travelled abroad. Fleeting memories of personal interaction reached the desk of the aged philosopher and retired official John Locke. Martha Lockhart, one of the former Queen Mary's ladies-in-waiting[112], apologized that she *intended you* [Locke, TT] *a very merry letter but the poor Duke of Glocester's death and the Princess's unspeakable affliction has put me quite in the spleen*. She also gave away her source: *Mr Sayer's has been with me so long this Evening that I have scarce*

104 Ibid.

105 Entry, London, August 2/13, 1700, fol. 245r–248r.

106 Edward Hannes, An account of the dissection of His Highness William Duke of Glocester drawn up by Doctor H. and sign'd by him, and by the surgeons; from the original letter, that was sent over to His Majesty in Holland, London 1700.

107 Cf. Acc[oun]t of D[octo]r Hans concerning the Duke of Glocest[e]r, Rec[eive]d: t[he] Augus[t] 3/17, 1700; Letter Radcliffe, in: Bodleian Library, Radcliffe Records A.5. The latter may have been a copy for Radcliffe's personal use as we find passages in superscript, while version from Blenheim MSS seem to be abbreviated copies.

108 British Library, Add MSS 61101, fol. 40–42.

109 British Library, Add MSS 61101, here fol. 40.

110 Ibid., fol. 46.

111 Ibid., fol. 48 f.

112 Roger Woolhouse, Locke. A Biography, Cambridge 2007, p. 299.

time to write. Perhaps surprisingly, Sayers mentioned no disagreement among the physicians about his treatment or his autopsy *he tells me the Docters did agree in their prescriptions*[113]. So, while there is evidence to suggest that word spread fast in early modern London, we need not assume it was necessarily partisan. Indeed, though at times the news was piecemeal, it seems to have universally papered over any potential conflicts.

Attending to the sick boy at his moment of death was a risky business to say the least. After all, scarificators and scalpels were cutting into the body of a potential heir to the throne, and the body's reactions remained unpredictable. The court and the political nation knew that personal service to the heir apparent implied personal service to William III and to Anne. Many sources written after the fact, thus, minimized the personal obligations of those involved to the respective monarchs. Burnet, for instance, claimed that he had resisted his role as a preceptor. He *was also become uneasy at some things in the king's conduct: I considered him as a glorious instrument, raised up by God, who had done great things by him* […] *and yet I could not help thinking* […] *that he was giving his enemies handles to weaken his government*[114]. A letter in Lambeth Palace Library to the archbishop of Canterbury indeed testifies to Burnet's reservations at the time of the appointment[115]. Burnet did not go into more detail about his reasons, and the outright critique of William was penned from the safety of a writing desk *ex post facto*.

The death of a young heir to the monarchy soon also invited speculation about the political loyalties of those closest to him at his moment of death. Rhymed attacks and vicious conflicts about the settlement of the succession coexisted with the cultural tokens of mourning that Winn's splendid new monograph discusses[116]. The following manuscript poem preserved at Longleat House, for instance, seems to be one of the few known texts that tied the duke's untimely death to providence and ridiculed his Whig tutors:

> *For Gloucester's death, which sadly we deplore,*
> *Tho' Fate's accus'd, we should commend the more,*
> *Lest he with Burnet's faith should be imbu'd*
> *And learn of Churchill truth and gratitude;*
> *Lest two such masters should their rules instil*
> *And his young soul with pois'nous precepts fill.*
> *Untimely force Heav'n kindly did employ*
> *And to preserve the man destroy'd the boy*[117].

The poem may be seen as a stand-in for a group of authors who more or less openly linked Gloucester's death to a critique of governing circles, be they Jacobites or disgruntled Whigs. Another poem titled »Doctor Hannes dissected« attacked the physician in charge of the autopsy of the young heir and the circulation of the report[118]. Instead of dissecting the young Gloucester, the pamphleteer put Hannes himself under the scalpel and asked, *But how so great a man of Art, Shoud let a Royal Heir Depart*. The death of Gloucester, the poem suggested, gave ample

113 Martha Lockhart to Locke, August 3, [1700], in: Esmond S. De Beer (ed.), The Correspondence of John Locke, 8 vols., Oxford 2010, no. 2751.
114 Burnet, HOT (as in n. 21), ii, p. 648.
115 Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, to Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, declining an appointment, June 25, 1698, in: LPL, MS 953 Miscellaneous Papers, fol. 2.
116 Winn, Patroness (as in n. 10), ch. 5.
117 On the death of the Duke of Gloucester (July 30, 1700), »For Gloucesters death […]«, in: Longleat House, PO/VOL. XI (Bath MSS), fol. 32f.
118 Manuscript copies exist in Bodleian and Blenheim MSS. In print as: Doctor Hannes dissected in a familiar epistle by way of Nosce Teipsum, London 1700; Furdell, Royal Doctors (as in n. 9), p. 237.

proof that medicine was more about self-aggrandizement than skill (*But thus it is, may't please you all, To raise a P*[i]*mp a Prince must fall*). What, then, does Gloucester's death tell us about the alleged decline of court culture in late Stuart England?

Bucholz mainly deals with Anne's reign itself (after 1702). In his chapter on William, he fails to discuss the crucial role that the duke of Gloucester as a potential heir played in court politics until 1700[119]. All eyes focused on the (future) Queen, but only so long as she was seen as the mother of a potential successor. Sophia of Hanover, for instance, imagined this as a physical transformation. She wrote in a letter to her trusted advisor baron von Schütz in 1703, that she had »in my small room« amidst »the king's ancestry« a portrait of Anne, but that it no longer resembled her. It »had been made«, she explained looking back, »at a time when the Duke of Gloucester was still little«[120]. Without belittling Anne's agency, in the eyes of many the duke gave images of Anne's court perspective and a future. Once the view of Gloucester's body could no longer pay off, the information market at court may have been no more attractive an investment than parliament or a coffeehouse. In the eyes of some, a barren queen above the parties could not lend force to the notions of a hereditary (Stuart) monarchy that many Tories and Jacobites still wished for.

The succession, courtiers had to grudgingly accept, would now be decided in Westminster as much as in St James's Palace. Divine providence had removed the heir apparent from the nation[121]. Nonetheless, conflicts between advocates of a hereditary monarchy and that of parliamentary involvement, and all the variants existing between, would continue to be fought over the health of royalty. In order to understand how the crisis of one boy's body entered a larger European debate about monarchy, I turn next to the intellectual implications of Gloucester's death beyond Britain.

Gloucester's Death in European Succession Debates

Translation was crucial to the European succession debate that ensued after Gloucester's death. The dead prince sparked a correspondence between Britain and Europe; however, translation and comparison were not innocent affairs since they had the power to impact the *status quo*. The simple question of what the British political system was all about proved a focal point for political tactics. British authors writing, for instance, to Hanover needed to explain domestic politics to their European audience, and authors from the Holy Roman Empire offered comments on British liberties in return. A group of envoys constantly reported the British troubles to their princely patrons. Republican authors on both sides of the Channel advertised election by noble assemblies. Writers like Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz shared Tory views about divine election by providence, and many felt obliged to advise the heiress apparent.

Diplomatic correspondents varied in their reports on the death of Gloucester. Some envoys covered the events extensively, others conveyed the news in a few jotted lines. Those who did discuss the duke's death had for some time dwelt on the rivalries between the heir's physicians. Nicholas de l'Hermitage, envoy to the States General, wrote that *les medecins qui ont veu le prince se font une petire guerre, et comme ils ont succesivement ordonné des remedes, ils se con-*

119 The longest remarks are in a long footnote on Anne's popularity: Bucholz, Augustan Court (as in n. 14), p. 248.

120 Sophie to baron von Schütz, Hanover, October 28, 1703, in: Richard Doebner (ed.), Briefe der Königin Sophie Charlotte von Preussen und der Kurfürstin Sophie von Hannover an hannoversche Diplomaten, Leipzig 1905, p. 180f; Toynbee, Gloucester (as in n. 50), p. 271.

121 John Spurr, Virtue, Religion and Government. The Anglican Uses of Providence, in: Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, Mark Goldie (ed.), The Politics of Religion in Restoration England, Oxford 1990, p. 29–47.

demment les uns et les autres[122]. Johann Philipp Hoffman, the emperor's envoy, recalled the surprise at the prince's death despite the known fact that »the prince's bodily constitution (*Leibs Constitution*) had always appeared so weakly that one could not build hope for a long life upon them«[123]. Three days later, autopsy in hand, he continued that at least his royal physicians were not to blame for »applying more harmful than helpful medicine, which often happens«[124]. Some of these letters detailed even the autopsy and discussed the underlying medical conditions, and authors often turned the deep corporeality of their writing into plans for political reform. These plans, where they targeted the next Protestant in line, also took corporeality into consideration.

Once Gloucester died, Sophia, now an ageing princess, suddenly found herself the center of attention as the heir to the throne. Letters packed with often unsolicited advice arrived from all over Europe; but who was she? Above all, she shared in the exiled fate of the Stuarts. As the daughter of the so-called Winter Queen, Elizabeth Stuart, who fled Bohemia after the Battle of White Mountain, she had been born in Dutch exile. Later, she furthered family politics by marrying her mother's second cousin, later elector of Brunswick-Luneburg (Hanover) and moved to his Lower Saxon court. When William III sidelined 57 closer Catholic relatives to make her the heir to the British throne, the elderly Sophia, by then almost 70 years old, prepared for yet another exile to Britain, a set of remote, unruly islands marked by plotting and regicide. According to John Toland's description, Sophia was not merely a princess of great intellect and manners (a topic he commonly referred to)[125], he also noted that, *She steps firm and erect as any young Lady, has not one Wrinkle in her Face* […] *nor one Tooth out of her Head*[126]. Bridging the gap between great learning and physical resilience, he also stated that Sophia *reads without Spectacles* and is the *greatest walker I ever knew, never missing a day*[127]. Toland also made sure to discuss the resilience of her children in some detail, as if to underline the dynasty's bright future[128]. Sophia herself occupied the middle ground in this debate. She mentioned her old age herself, compared her ailments to those of William III, and modestly stated that she was »thinking more about the kingdom of heaven than that of England«[129].

Some authors who tried to sell her on the succession, translated British politics in the process. Whig pamphleteer and diplomat George Stepney, for instance, claimed that most British were moderates, and that, indeed, he was one of them. As a veteran diplomat to the Empire, Stepney knew that there were ideological gaps to bridge between a continental princess and her future subjects. Because of their history, Stepney explained, Britons feared overburdening monarchical powers, but they were not republicans: »The troubles that the English experienced in the time of Kings Charles I and James II and the excessive love that we harbour for liberty, may

122 Nicolas de l'Hermitage to Staten-Generaal, London, August 17, 1700, no. 781, marked secret, in: London, British Library, Add MS 17677 UU, fol. 289r–290r, here fol. 289rf.

123 Johann Philipp Hoffman to Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I, London, August 10, 1700, in: Vienna, AT-OeStA/HHStA StAbt England 31, fol. 529r–531r.

124 Same to same, London, August 13,1700, in: ibid., fol. 532r–533r.

125 Nick Harding, Hanover and the British Empire, 1700–1837, Woodbridge 2007, p. 26 ties this to British debates on politeness connected to Toland's friend the earl of Shaftesbury.

126 John Toland, An Account of the Courts of Prussia and Hanover sent to a Minister of State in Holland, London 1705, p. 65 f.

127 Ibid., p. 66.

128 Ibid., p. 69–71.

129 Sophia to Raugräfin Louise in Frankfurt, Herrenhausen, April 14, 1701 (no. 225), in: Eduard Bodemann (ed.), Briefe der Kurfürstin Sophie von Hannover an die Raufgräfinnen und Raugrafen zu Pfalz, Leipzig 1888, p. 209 or her letter Sophia to Raugräfin Louise in Frankfurt, Hanover, August 29, 1701, in: ibid., p. 204 f.

lead – especially foreigners – to think that we have a distaste for monarchy in general […]«[130]. He could assure Sophia of this because he knew »the genius of the English that they do not at all support republican principles«. On the contrary, Stepney claimed, English laws were in fact entirely opposed to such principles. The idea of regicide and of »civil war« still frightened them, for in Britain, unlike »Holland«, people were not »equal«.

There was another way in which Stepney worried about moderation. Carlos II of Spain had recently died without heir, and an anonymous writer, perhaps Alexander Stanhope, a British envoy in Spain, feared that the Bourbon monarchy would benefit from the fallout and gain power to Britain's detriment. *The Peace of Riswick*, he explained in a pamphlet, *had scarce compos'd the Differences of Christendom, when the King of Spain's Sickness, who is at length dead without Issue, alarm'd it afresh*[131]. The question of who should rule over such *vast Dominions* seemed pressing to Stepney for fiscal and economic reasons: They *furnish all this part of the World with Gold and Silver* he wrote. France, he feared, would seek to unite both houses under Bourbon rulers and *the present Union of France and Spain* would seriously harm Europe. Unless the paradoxic case occurred that *as his Power to do mischief shall encrease, his Ill Will to us, and his Hatred to our Religion, shall be lessened* this would be a disaster[132]. For Stepney, a speedy settlement for Britain seemed the only way to achieve not just internal, but European moderation. In a letter to Sophia, he offered minute details of how the parties would likely behave in the succession debate[133].

Stepney and Stanhope were not the only ones who saw the connection between the English and the Spanish succession. While this article previously introduced »Doctor Hannes Dissected« as a poem about incapable royal physicians, the poem also tackled European politics. It contrasted Spanish preservers of weak kings with British king-killers. Where the Spanish handed out chocolate to cure Carlos II, Hannes' medicinal touch itself led to a crisis:

They might have been great friends to Spain
And sav'd them many a needless Shilling,
That they bestowed on their Kings Killing,
By sending for a Neapolitan,
When we have much a quicker Man,
[…]
And wou'd you wonder at his Skill,
Whose business 'tis he shows to Kill;
Spaniards, dull Souls, presever'd their King,
By Chocholet, or some such thing:
When Hannes has Arts, as yet unknown,
Where 'tis but Presto, and they'er gone

130 This and the following Stepney to Electress Sophie (clxxxviii), London, September 11/21, 1700, in: Onno Klopp (ed.), Correspondenz von Leibniz mit der Prinzession Sophie, 3 vols., Hildesheim 1973, ii, p. 208–213.

131 This and the following [George Stepney], An Essay upon the Present Interest of England in the Present Circumstances of Affairs, Dublin 1701, p. 3. It is often attributed to Stepney, but since a draft version of it exists amidst Alexander Stanhope's papers, I assume him to be another possible author.

132 Ibid., p. 5.

133 Leibniz to Sophia, not dated, in: Klopp (ed.), Correspondenz (as in n. 130), ii, p. 245 f.

In their turn, European authors also had things to say about British politics[134]. Unlike Stepney, the Prussian envoy Friedrich Bonet had little interest in advertising the English system of government to his superiors. The offspring of a Neapolitan family of royal physicians understood medicine and European politics[135]. In a ruthless anamnesis, he wondered who was likely to cause trouble in the case of a Hanoverian succession[136]. The first group consisted of *those who hate foreigners*: while they would want Anne to remarry in case of her husband's death, they were not *willing to live under the maxims of a foreign prince*[137]. Indeed, critics of Hanover would spend years thereafter attacking the foreign dynasty for involving British soldiers in Europe's wars[138]. The second group, Bonet continued, were republicans. If offered an alternative, the high nobility opposed these radicals because they would abolish privileges and redistribute land. Furthermore, they exposed too many internal divisions to ever rule to the benefit of the common good. Lastly, he mentioned what he saw as the most divided group: Jacobites who put their hopes in a dethroned king at a far away court. In short, British politics, according to Bonet, was a mess. Some wanted no foreign king, others no king at all, and still others wanted the old king back.

Another participant in this debate, the polymath and Sophia's political adviser, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz used the welcome occasion to advance a genealogical argument that put the House of Guelph right at the center of British history[139]. As a loyal client of the Hanoverian dynasty, he played his role as an information broker, but also carefully selected what he presented to Sophia. Through Leibniz, Sophia received the first volume of James Tyrrel's »History« – a piece that Locke also recommended[140]. Leibniz's sources did not fail to point out that it contained »a very honourable mention of the Electoral family, having given a fine description of Henry the Lion in the reign of king Henry the second«[141]. Invoking Henry the Lion, Leibniz underlined precedents for a personal union. In the twelth century, this monarch had not only taken control of a vast continental kingdom, he had also married Matilda, the daughter of Henry II of England. Leibniz thus built a historical bridge between the medieval Guelph and Sophia's claims to the throne. At the same time, he diverted attention from another less palatable aspect of Tyrrel's work. Republicans knew Tyrrel for his earlier »Bibliotheca Politica« (1692–1694) in which he devoted nearly 250 printed pages to medieval parliaments and the claim that William the Conqueror had actually been a constitutional monarch[142].

In stressing genealogy, he excluded the rich and uncontrollable corporeality of Hanoverian dynasts. Channeling the argument into the well-defined realm of genealogy, this was no longer

134 It stands in for numerous examples of news about British politics in the German lands. Cf. [Edward Chamberlayne], Engelands jetziger Staat/Unter Der Regierung Ihrer Koeniglichen Majestaeten Wilhelms und Mariae, Frankfurt 1694, p. 329.

135 Peter Bahl, Der Hof des Großen Kurfürsten: Studien zur hoheren Amtsträgerschaft Brandenburg-Preussens, Cologne 2001, p. 437.

136 This and the following British Library Add MSS 30,000 A, »Transcribed from the Prussian State Archives, Berlin, 13 May 1876«.

137 Ibid., fol. 242vf.

138 Bob Harris, Hanover and the public sphere, in: Brendan Simms and Torsten Riotte (ed.), The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714–1837, Cambridge 2007, p. 183–212.

139 Andrew C. Thompson, Britain, Hanover and the Protestant Interest, 1688–1756, Woodbridge 2006, ch. 2.

140 The text in question is James Tyrrell, General History of England both Ecclesiastical and Civil, 5 vols., London 1697–1700. Locke's recommendations are listed in: Mark Goldie (ed.), Locke. Political Essays, Cambridge 1997, p. 80.

141 Extract from the work of Mr. Tyrell (cxlvii), in: Klopp (ed.), Correspondenz (as in n. 130), ii, p. 122f.

142 John P. Kenyon, Revolution Principles. The Politics of Party 1689–1720, Cambridge 1978, p. 37.

a matter of merit, faith, or qualification. It had become a matter of proving how far the Guelph connection reached back in time. In order to do so, he effectively countered voices in Britain that sought to marginalize the Hanoverians on grounds of biological distance to the royal line. Burnet, for instance, added a potential conversion of Catholic claimants to Protestantism to an already potent mix. In one of many letters to Sophia, he outlined that *it was thought too great a triall of human Infirmity to let all Popish Princes see that tho their Conversion might help them to the Kingdome of Heaven yet it could not bring them a step nearer to the Kingdom of England*[143]. In so doing, he echoed the earl of Danby who had helped forge a match between James's daughter Mary and William of Orange. Danby had made a comparable point that *all people were now possess'd of his* [James II] *being a Papist*, but *if they saw his daughter given to one* […] *at the head of the Protestant interest*, the king's religion would become *a personal thing*[144]. Leibniz strategically steered the debate away from the living, from ailing heirs and from Catholic claimants. Instead, he emphasized the longevity of the family connection, invoking the shared history of dynasty.

Perhaps, then, Fleetwood – whom we met at the beginning of this discussion – was not just speaking to his churchgoers: After he thundered *O put not your trust in princes*, the words of his published sermon reverberated in a European debate about the very nature of monarchy in Britain. The Whig bishop argued that divine providence left Protestants leeway for political choices. Believers should accept providence, but they should also make attempts to tame fate. It was not foolish to trust in virtuous princes, he claimed, as long as one did not neglect one's religion: *Sometimes we see a Prince truly noble, just, and merciful, wise and brave, a Father of his Country* […] *it would be Stupidity not to hope well of him*[145]. Yet, deaths like Gloucester's, he acknowledged, *must prove effectual Cures of all our Confidence in Princes*. Fleetwood turned to scripture next to explain humankind's desperate striving for political stability. It led the *People of the East* to utter the desperate demand *Oh King, Live for ever* [cf. Daniel 2:4, 3:9, 6:6, 6:21; Nehemiah, 2:3, TT][146]. Nothing short of the political nation's hope for lasting stability, in the face of human frailty, could provoke debates about a prince's death (*God* […] *build to these Princes a sure House!).* Fleetwood also stated that while providence encouraged humility, it also left ample room for political maneuver. Despite a providential blow to the House of Stuart, Fleetwood made a case for politics and human choice.

Others downplayed choice as a dynastic argument. At Queen Anne's accession to the throne in 1702, John Sharp, for example, did not speak of law and politics. This view was out of touch not just with Whig thinkers, but also with a group of Jacobite reformers in St Germain, who were busy reconceptualizing monarchy at the time[147]. Sharp, bishop of York, was Burnet's only high church protégé and he often voted with the Tories[148]. He invoked Anne's Stuart pedigree and declared motherhood the defining feature of her royal imagery[149]. Yet by invoking a hereditary and only in second place a legal or political claim to the throne, Sharp could not avoid

143 Burnet to Electress Sophia, London, December 17, 1689 (o. s.), in: Hanover, NLA HA Hann. 91 Kurfürstin Sophie Nr. 9, fol. 107rf.

144 David Wormersley, James II. The Last Catholic King, London 2015, p. 31.

145 Fleetwood, Funeral Sermon (as in n. 6), p. 5.

146 Ibid.

147 Gabriel Glickman, The English Catholic Community, 1688–1745. Politics, Culture, and Ideology, Woodbridge 2009, p. 115–117, 221–251.

148 Barry Till, Sharp, John (1645?–1714), in: ODNB, Oxford 2004, [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25213, accessed March 1, 2015] Sharp had a falling out with Anne when he criticized the Union of 1707.

149 John Sharp, Sermon XIX. Preached at the Coronation of Queen Anne, in the Abbey Church at Westminster, April 23, 1702, in: The Theological Works of John Sharp D.D., late Archbishop of York, 5 vols., Oxford 1829, i, p. 467–478.

also alluding to Anne's problematic ancestry as well as to her reproductive problems[150]. The ancestors that loomed largest in the churchgoers's minds were most likely the recently deceased James II and his beheaded father Charles I. Sharp preached that God *hath preserved us another branch of the same royal stock to repair our losses. Ramo uno avulso no deficit alter Aureus* [One branch broken off, there does not fail another (similarly) golden][151]. Torn between Fleetwood's sermon advocating human choice and Sharp's sermon pointing to hereditary principles, Britons entered into a war that was fought over the British and Spanish succession. As I have so far suggested, authors made the case that this future war would also be fought about the nature of monarchy itself.

Conclusion: *I put no trust in princes*

In 1771, Horace Walpole wrote to Horace Mann from Strawberry Hill: *I rejoice very disinterestedly at the Duke of Gloucester's recovery. I put no trust in princes: I doubt, I may add, for there is no health in them. Nor shall I be surprised if all the flattering symptoms vanish, and, in a few posts, contradict the prognostics of the surgeons*[152]. Walpole was surely referencing Fleetwood's sermon here, a copy of which he owned, but it was not the medical crisis of a frail royal body that he mocked, but rather the unpredictable nature of corporeality[153]. This William, duke of Gloucester, the son of Frederick Louis, Prince of Wales (1707–1751), fell ill after an unexpected encounter with the Pretender, Charles Edward Stuart, abroad. The reason for his trip was a scandalous one: Gloucester had married Walpole's niece, Maria, countess Waldegrave, *née* Walpole. When the duke of Gloucester married a Walpole, he tacitly acknowledged the rise of that Norfolk family to power. Thus, Horace Walpole's echoing of Fleetwood's word *I put not my trust in princes* was a disingenuous attempt to distance himself from generations of British elites who sought favor of the royal family by means of lived corporeality.

Arguing for a clear-cut transition of the center of power in Britain from court, to parliament, and from these two to an imperial commercial elite, seriously underestimates the resilience of kingship as a focal point of politics. Interest in Anne's court waned, but this cannot be attributed to a matter of principle. It was, as Bucholz has shown in his seminal work, due to a combination of factors that ranged from a lack of funds, an influx of court skeptics into royal households, and the rise of alternative arenas for sociability. In the context of lived corporeality, Jonathan Swift's infamous quote that the *court serves* him *for a coffee-house* reads differently[154]. Swift clearly considered court a place where the politically minded exchanged interesting and often vital news. The nature of this news has formed the subject of this article. When Swift merely used it to meet an *old acquaintance*, this had as much to do with parliamentary (monetary) constraints as with a specific crisis in courtly corporeality during the reigns of William and Mary, and Anne. They reinforced one another: Since two reigning couples could not produce an heir to form a lasting household, the forum to represent a political opinion critical of that in power – usually the heir's household – vanished. The powerful and politically central

150 Toni Bowers, The Politics of Motherhood. British Writing and Culture, 1680–1760, Cambridge 1996.

151 Ibid., here p. 474.

152 Horace Walpole to Horace Mann, Strawberry Hill (182), Nov. 18, 1771, in: Letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, to Sir Horace Mann, His Britannic Majesty's Resident at the Court of Florence, from 1760 to 1785, 2 vols., London 1843, ii, p. 179–181, here p. 179.

153 In his library sale »Fleetwood's Sermons and Tracts«, probably the complete edition of 1737, are listed: Strawberry Hill, the Renowned Seat of Horace Walpole. Mr. George Robins is honoured by having been selected by the Earl of Waldegrave, to sell by Public Competition, the Valuable Contenst of Strawberry Hill (April 25, 1842), p. 37.

154 Bucholz, Augustan Court (as in n. 14), p. 247.

means of physically engaging with the royal family vanished as well, while existing alternative *loci* mushroomed. The intensely corporeal exiled Stuart court suggests that court critique was a matter of principle only to some. Hanoverian dynasticism flourished again, albeit in a different – Lutheran and continental – form with its own specific demands regarding ritual but with no less emphasis on corporeality[155].

Historians have often dealt with monarchs in power. This paper has instead studied a powerless prince whose frailty paradoxically strenghtened the monarchy. Kingship was a success because every frail body invited reinvention. I have shown that even sickness allowed those who surrounded the princely patient to claim access to avenues of power, since through information about medical crises, political agents bartered for influence. Dynastic corporeality, they well knew, was a double-edged sword. The theory of the king's eternal *corpus mysticum* solved that problem in theory, but only there: kings could fail to father heirs and heirs could prove frail while kingship survived. As we have seen, tutors and family members rhetorically covered the weak boy in veneers of virility, but once stripped of these veneers, it emerges that every crisis allowed for politics that yielded unintended consequences. Frail royals allow us to see the degree to which early modern medicine, gender, and politics remained interlinked. The impact of human frailty on concepts of kingship continued well into the eighteenth century and may be best studied through those who witnessed it up close.

155 Hannah Smith, Georgian Monarchy. Politics and Culture, 1714–1760, Cambridge 2006.